

# REVOLUTION

THEORETICAL JOURNAL OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN  
NOVEMBER 1977 VOLUME 2, NUMBER 2.

PRICE 25p.

**Volume Five of Mao's  
Selected Works  
— An Arsenal of  
Materialist Dialectics**

**Take the Bolshevik,  
Not the Menshevik  
Road to Party Building**

**Victory over the "Gang of Four"**

**The Soviet Union —  
the More Dangerous Superpower**



# THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

The Revolutionary Communist League is a national organization with branches in half a dozen towns and cities in Britain. It is dedicated to the task of rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class.

Since the Communist Party of Great Britain was taken over by a band of revisionists, the working class in Britain has had no vanguard party to lead it. Without a party giving leadership it is impossible to overthrow the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie and the capitalist system; it is impossible to establish socialism and to enforce a dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie to prevent them seizing power back again.

Without a vanguard revolutionary Communist Party the working class cannot sustain their existing struggles against the attacks of the monopoly capitalists through to the end and cannot raise them to a higher level.

For these reasons building the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class is the central task in Britain today, the task around which we must arrange all our work.

The Revolutionary Communist League of Britain was founded in July 1977 out of the militant unity forged between two former organizations, the Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) and the Communist Unity Association (Marxist-Leninist). This militant unity was won through active ideological struggle, the weapon for ensuring unity.

The Revolutionary Communist League takes Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as the theoretical basis guiding its thinking. It strives to integrate this scientific theory of the international working class with the concrete conditions of the socialist revolution within Britain.

In its mass work the Revolutionary Communist League concentrates particularly on sinking deep roots among the industrial working class. The Revolutionary Communist League implements democratic centralism in its internal life in a centralized and lively way. It has published a Manifesto as an important step towards the programme of the future revolutionary Party.

The founding of the Revolutionary Communist League is an important advance in rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class.

**BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION!**

For information about the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain contact:

The Secretary RCLB,  
c/o New Era Books  
203 Seven Sisters Road  
London N4.

For criticisms, correspondence and contributions to 'Revolution' write to:

The Editor, 'Revolution'  
c/o New Era Books  
203 Seven Sisters Road  
London N4.

CONTENTS:

EDITORIAL.....pi

MESSAGES SENT TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA.....pI

VOLUME FIVE OF MAO'S SELECTED WORKS -

AN ARSENAL OF MATERIALIST DIALECTICS.....p5

TAKE THE BOLSHEVIK, NOT THE MENSHEVIK ROAD TO PARTY BUILDING.....p10

VICTORY OVER THE "GANG OF FOUR".....p20

THE SOVIET UNION - THE MORE DANGEROUS SUPERPOWER.....p24

THE THIRD WORLD IS A RISING FORCE AGAINST IMPERIALISM.....p35

LEARNING FROM THE MASSES - A LIVING EDUCATION.....p38

# EDITORIAL

## CRITICISE THE RIGHT OPPORTUNIST ERRORS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN (MARXIST-LENINIST)

*"In the course of the battle to unite all genuine Marxist-Leninists, the correct ideological and political line for the revolution in Britain will be strengthened through struggle". (Manifesto of the RCLB, 'Revolution' Vol 2. No 1., p26).*

If the line is correct, then successes will follow in Party building and in the British revolution. The RCLB states that active ideological struggle is the key link in uniting the Marxist-Leninist movement for Party building.

One of the immediate tasks is to narrow the target of attack and to focus criticism on the headquarters of the most serious incorrect lines. Birch, the leader of the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) is such a headquarters. In 'Revolution' Vol. 1. No. 3 the old Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) criticised the five main errors of the CPB(ML). In 'Revolution' Vol.1. No.5, in the article 'Call to the British Marxist-Leninist Movement' criticism of the opportunist errors of the CPB(ML) was sharpened. The CPB(ML) Chairman prides himself on not answering criticisms from other Marxist-Leninist organisations. He rejects the method of criticism and self-criticism.

This organisation has now published a pamphlet on the international situation called 'Britain and the World - 1977'. The pamphlet is a disgrace to the Marxist-Leninist movement and an insult to the working class. In the sneering and empty stereotyped style of the CPB(ML) Chairman, this pamphlet slanders the line of the Communist Party of China, dismisses the great struggles of the third world against imperialism and hegemonism, and actively tries to mislead the British working class. It must be sternly criticised.

There are many points for criticism in the pamphlet, but it is important to pick out the main aspects, and to concentrate our fire on them. The main characteristics of this pamphlet are: it is revisionist, and it slanders Mao Tsetung's revolutionary line on the international situation.

### The Revisionism of the CPB(ML)

Mao said of revisionism:

*"Revisionism, or Right opportunism, is a bourgeois trend of thought that is even more dangerous than dogmatism. The revisionists, the right opportunists, pay lip service to Marxism; they too attack 'dogmatism'. But what they are really attacking is the quintessence of Marxism".*

It is true that the line of the CPB(ML) sounds very 'left', with its talk about 'one world of exploited and exploiter'. But in reality it is a line which attacks the 'quintessence of Marxism'. It revises the teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

The pamphlet attacks the great strategic concept of the three worlds. It does so by means of rhetorical philistine questions such as: "Why three worlds? Who are they? Which is the first, the second? Maybe there is a fourth or fifth?" To pose the question in this way is to sneer at the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism, which sum up the experience of the international working class movement. It is to reject the fact that imperialism divides the world, and that the uneven development of capitalism produces, in Lenin's terms, 'great powers', lesser imperialist powers, and oppressed nations. It is also to reject the truth, also put forward by Lenin, and

elaborated by Mao, that there are divisions within the enemy that it is the duty of the working class to use to its advantage. It is to reject the basic principle of Lenin, Stalin and Mao, that the proletariat must ally with the oppressed peoples and nations in the anti-imperialist struggle.

All these basic principles are rejected by the CPB(ML). Instead they concentrate their fire on the rulers of the third world nations, and United States imperialism.

Soviet social imperialism does not exist for the leaders of the CPB(ML). Nor does the threat of war in Europe. Those who warn against this threat are accused by the CPB(ML) of calling for a 'Holy war' which will 'defend the European Fatherland'.

For the CPB(ML), it is not the crisis of capitalism which has "ruined British industry and agriculture", but it is membership of the EEC. And it is not the oppression of the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie, with its reliance on the US superpower, which attacks the sovereignty of the working class, but the threat of direct elections to a European parliament. This last point in particular is a key one, showing as it does how the revision of the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism leads the Chairman of the CPB(ML) into positions identical to those of the revisionist 'Communist' Party of Great Britain.

#### Slanders against Mao Tsetung's revolutionary line on the International Situation

The pamphlet states on pp10-11:

*"...the 'major super-power', the USA, is the greater enemy, therefore all forces must unite against it, especially in Europe. Therefore we are invited to form a Second International after the pattern of Millerand and Bernstein and so follow the betrayal of the Basle Manifesto and the Stuttgart Resolution, namely unite with one's own bourgeoisie for defence".*

The pamphlet nowhere names the Communist Party of China in its attack. But in their sneering references to the concept of the three worlds, and to the concept of superpowers shows that it is the line of the CPC that is under attack. These slanders must be exposed by the Marxist-Leninist movement. The line that the Soviet social imperialists are the more dangerous enemy is absolutely correct. But all talk about a 'Second International' and a 'European Fatherland' is a disgraceful distortion.

The majority of the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain grasps that the British monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie is the principal enemy of the working class. Many organisations also grasp that this bourgeoisie is a second world bourgeoisie which can be forced to line up with the third world nations. This is because of its contradictory class interests as the bourgeoisie of a minor imperialist power. In this struggle, the task of the revolutionary Communists is to struggle firmly against the bourgeoisie, opposing all attempts to rely on either superpower, and constantly exposing the class interests behind the actions of the bourgeoisie.

As far as the CPC is concerned, it has put forward its line on the contradictions in the world today, in the light of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. These must be integrated with the concrete practice of the revolution in each country, by the Marxist-Leninists of each country. The CPC has never asked any Marxist-Leninist organisation to form a united front with its bourgeoisie. The CPC gives correct leadership on the situation in the world today; it does not give advice on internal questions.

In putting forward this pamphlet, Birch is the one who follows in the footsteps of the old revisionists of the Second International. He attacks the essence of Marxism, revises its basic principles. In so doing he is betraying the international proletariat and the peoples of the oppressed nations. We urge the British Marxist-Leninist movement, and the rank and file of the CPB(ML) to criticise this new revisionism.

### THIS ISSUE OF REVOLUTION

In the first article in Revolution 2, the RCLB hails the publication of Volume 5 of the Selected Works of Mao Tsetung in English. The article points out that Volume 5 is an important weapon in class struggle throughout the world. Mao's contributions to materialist dialectics, political economy and scientific socialism should be studied by all Marxist-Leninists in Britain as a guide to building the revolutionary Communist Party.

In the struggle to unite the Marxist-Leninist movement for Party building, ideological struggle is the key link. One aspect of this is to criticise incorrect lines on uniting the movement, now that there is a strong tendency towards unity within the movement. The recent Conference of Marxist-Leninists was at the same time a positive example of the desire for unity, and a negative example of tendencies of small group mentality and Menshevism. The article 'Take the Bolshevik Not the Menshevik Road to Party Building' sums up the lessons of this conference.

The victory over the "gang of four" was a great achievement for the Communist Party of China. But this is of importance for the whole of the international Communist movement. The article 'Victory Over the "gang of four"' explains the reasons for this, and that it is our proletarian internationalist duty to support this great victory.

Soviet social imperialism is the more dangerous superpower, and poses the main threat of war. But there is still much confusion on this question within the Marxist-Leninist movement. The article 'Soviet Social Imperialism - the More Dangerous Superpower' explains the tasks of revolutionary Communists in the face of this threat. In this article, and in the one following it, 'The Third World is a Rising Anti-Imperialist Force', the criticism of the incorrect line of the CPB(ML) is deepened.

The last article in this issue of 'Revolution' sums up some key lessons learnt in the course of integrating with the masses at the place of work.

Editorial Committee

# MESSAGES SENT TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS TO THE  
CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA  
ON THE OCCASION OF THE 11TH NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE C.P.C.

FROM  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

To: Chairman Hua Kuo-feng and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

The Revolutionary Communist League of Britain is inspired by the great successes of the 11th National Congress of the Communist Party of China.

We warmly congratulate you on your Congress of victory and unity! We also send our congratulations to Chairman Hua Kuo-feng, and comrades Yeh Chien-ying and Teng Hsiao-ping.

The 11th Congress marks great new achievements for Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. Although Chairman Mao has passed away, Mao Tsetung Thought lives as part of Marxism-Leninism. It is an extremely important development of Marxism-Leninism and a weapon of powerful class struggle firmly grasped by the 35 million Chinese Communists headed by the bold and wise leader, Chairman Hua Kuo-feng. It is a weapon in the hands of the proletariat and all oppressed people throughout the world.

Chairman Hua has held up high the great banner of Chairman Mao and has carried on the work begun by Chairman Mao. Based upon the ground work Chairman Mao started, he led the eleventh struggle between the two lines in the Chinese Communist Party. He carried that struggle through to victory. The "gang of four" shamefully plotted to overturn the dictatorship of the proletariat in China, to usurp party and state power and replace it with a bourgeois dictatorship. They dressed their anti-working class scheme up in high sounding phrases and assumed the posture of "super revolutionaries". The Chinese masses hate them! Now the great Communist Party of China has exposed their bourgeois and revisionist nature. Like all dogmatists their rantings oppose the true interests of the masses and the revolution. By opposing the leading centre of the Communist Party of China and branding veteran revolutionaries as "democrats" and as "bourgeois class" inside the Party, they behaved like Trotsky who dreamed of a "revolution" against the proletarian dictatorship of the socialist state.

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is a weapon against empiricism and dogmatism. By seeking truth from facts and applying dialectical materialism firmly against metaphysics and idealism we can overcome the two revisionist dangers of empiricism and dogmatism. The Communist Party of China has this clear method and the fine style of following the mass line, conducting criticism and self-criticism, being modest and free from arrogance and impetuosity, keeping to plain living and hard struggle and practising democratic centralism.

The Communist Party of China has brought its first Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to a triumphant conclusion. The victory over the "gang of four" now ushers in a period of building great revolutionary order. The

11th Congress made the decision to grasp the key link of class struggle and bring great order across the land. We are convinced that this is correct. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution continued the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and steeled millions of new cadres in the struggle against revisionism and for socialist construction. It ensured the good health of the Party for many years to come. It dealt death blows to the revisionist lines of Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and the Wang-Chang-Chiang Yao "gang of four".

With the victory in these historic struggles between the two lines in the Communist Party of China, the Chinese people will advance from victory to victory, grasping revolution, promoting production, other work and preparedness against war. China will surpass world levels in time, demonstrating yet again the superiority of socialism over capitalism. This is an important aspect of the Communist Party of China's great revolutionary example to the proletariat and people of the entire world.

Chairman Mao's great strategic concept of the three worlds is a correct one. It is vigorously advanced by the Communist Party of China. This concept accurately sums up all the fundamental contradictions in the world today and gives clear orientation to the proletariat and oppressed nations and peoples in their just struggle against the imperialist superpowers - Soviet social-imperialism and US imperialism. It scientifically upholds the Leninist standpoint of mobilising all positive factors against the main enemy. This concept is proved correct daily as the world united front, with the Third World providing the main force, grows in unity and strength.

The Communist Party of China is a great, glorious and correct Party which leads the 800 million Chinese people, one quarter of humanity. Its example gives inspiration to the proletariat and oppressed nations and peoples of the whole world. The Chinese people are a great people who, led by the Chinese Communist Party with Chairman Hua at its head, will mobilise all positive factors and make China a great, powerful, modern socialist country by the end of the century and make even greater contributions to humanity.

LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT!

LONG LIVE THE GREAT, GLORIOUS AND CORRECT COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA!

Standing Committee of the  
Revolutionary Communist League of Britain  
26th August 1977

MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE TO THE  
CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA  
ON THE OCCASION OF THE  
FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF CHAIRMAN MAO TSETUNG

FROM  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

To: Chairman Hua Kuo-feng and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain we send our deep condolences to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on the first anniversary of the death of Chairman Mao Tsetung.



Chairman Mao was the great leader and teacher of the international proletariat. He inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism in unrelenting struggle against class enemies inside and outside China. Mao Tsetung Thought is a new pinnacle in the development of Marxism-Leninism. His contribution is immortal.

As we mourn the memory of Chairman Mao on the first anniversary of his death we are able for the first time to read Volume Five of his Selected Works in English, thanks to the great proletarian internationalist spirit of the Communist Party of China and the tremendous efforts of all the Chinese workers involved in this historic project. We are elated that because of this and other foreign language editions of Volume Five, the international Marxist-Leninist movement will soon be greatly strengthening its unity on the immortal principles of Mao Tsetung Thought.

Grasped by the masses in their millions, Mao Tsetung Thought is already a material force in China. We are determined that by integrating it with the concrete conditions of the struggle of the masses it will become a material force throughout the world.

ETERNAL GLORY TO THE GREAT LEADER AND TEACHER, CHAIRMAN MAO TSETUNG!

LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM-MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT!

The Standing Committee of the  
Revolutionary Communist League of Britain  
6th September 1977

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS TO THE  
CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA  
ON THE OCCASION OF THE  
28TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA  
FROM  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

To: Chairman Hua Kuo-feng and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

On the 28th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China we send the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Chairman Hua our very warm greetings on behalf of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain.

Once again we express our firm support for how the Central Committee have upheld Mao Tsetung's great theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and smashed the plot by the anti-Party clique a year ago. The gang of four tried to confuse the distinction between contradictions among the people and contradictions between the people and the enemy in order to create chaos and seize power. But they were thwarted by a Party, a people and an army trained and tempered in Mao Tsetung Thought.

We applaud the determined leadership the Central Committee is giving to implement Chairman Mao's great strategic policy of turning China into a powerful modern socialist country by the end of the century. This fully conforms to the wishes and needs of the international Communist movement, the international working class and the oppressed peoples and nations of the world. It will be a tremendous assistance in the revolutionary struggles

that lie ahead. We indignantly condemn the attempts of the gang of four to slander this great policy and undermine it with metaphysical and idealist arguments.

We warmly welcome the energetic and painstaking work of the People's Republic of China to promote the development of the international situation in a direction favourable to the people of the world according to Chairman Mao's great strategic analysis differentiating the three worlds. This fully complements the class struggle waged by the genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties and organizations in the rest of the world according to the concrete conditions in their own countries. It helps isolate the main enemies of the peoples of the world, the two superpowers, and particularly exposes the more dangerous superpower, the Soviet Union. It helps strengthen the third world, the main force opposing the hegemonism of the two superpowers, and helps delay the outbreak of a new world war.

We are convinced that by persevering in integrating Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought with its concrete struggles, the People's Republic of China, under the leadership of the Communist Party of China and Chairman Hua, will make further invaluable contributions to the people of the world.

The Standing Committee of the  
Revolutionary Communist League of Britain

29th September 1977

Chairman Mao was the great leader and teacher of the international proletariat. He inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism in unremitting struggle against class enemies inside and outside China. Mao Tsetung Thought is a new pinnacle in the development of Marxism-Leninism. His contribution is immortal.

As we mourn the memory of Chairman Mao on the first anniversary of his death we are able for the first time to read Volume Five of his Selected Works in English, thanks to the great proletarian internationalist spirit of the Communist Party of China and the tremendous efforts of all the Chinese workers involved in this historic project. We are elated that because of this and other foreign language editions of Volume Five, the international Marxist-Leninist movement will soon be greatly strengthening its unity on the immortal principles of Mao Tsetung Thought.

Grasped by the masses in their millions, Mao Tsetung Thought is already a material force in China. We are determined that by integrating it with the concrete conditions of the struggle of the masses it will become a material force throughout the world.

ETERNAL GLORY TO THE GREAT LEADER AND TEACHER, CHAIRMAN MAO TSETUNG!

LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM-MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT!

The Standing Committee of the  
Revolutionary Communist League of Britain  
6th September 1977

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS TO THE  
CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA  
ON THE OCCASION OF THE  
28TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA  
FROM  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

To: Chairman Hua Kuo-feng and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

On the 28th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China we send the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Chairman Hua our very warm greetings on behalf of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain.

Once again we express our firm support for how the Central Committee have upheld Mao Tsetung's great theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and smashed the plot by the anti-Party clique a year ago. The gang of four tried to confuse the distinction between contradictions among the people and contradictions between the people and the enemy in order to create chaos and seize power. But they were thwarted by a Party, a people and an army trained and tempered in Mao Tsetung Thought.

We applaud the determined leadership; the Central Committee is giving to implement Chairman Mao's great strategic policy of turning China into a powerful modern socialist country by the end of the century. This fully conforms to the wishes and needs of the international Communist movement, the international working class and the oppressed peoples and nations of the world. It will be a tremendous assistance in the revolutionary struggles

that lie ahead. We indignantly condemn the attempts of the gang of four to slander this great policy and undermine it with metaphysical and idealist arguments.

We warmly welcome the energetic and painstaking work of the People's Republic of China to promote the development of the international situation in a direction favourable to the people of the world according to Chairman Mao's great strategic analysis differentiating the three worlds. This fully complements the class struggle waged by the genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties and organizations in the rest of the world according to the concrete conditions in their own countries. It helps isolate the main enemies of the peoples of the world, the two superpowers, and particularly exposes the more dangerous superpower, the Soviet Union. It helps strengthen the third world, the main force opposing the hegemonism of the two superpowers, and helps delay the outbreak of a new world war.

We are convinced that by persevering in integrating Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought with its concrete struggles, the People's Republic of China, under the leadership of the Communist Party of China and Chairman Hua, will make further invaluable contributions to the people of the world.

The Standing Committee of the  
Revolutionary Communist League of Britain

29th September 1977

# VOLUME 5 OF MAO'S SELECTED WORKS— AN ARSENAL OF MATERIALIST DIALECTICS

Volume 5 of the Selected Works of Mao Tsetung has been published recently in English and is now available for study. This volume is an arsenal of materialist dialectics which will provide us with weapons in our struggle to build the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class providing we carefully study the work and get the skills to apply its truths. These articles, both those already published and the ones we are seeing for the first time, represent a continuation and a marked development in the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. Volume 5 greatly enriches the treasure house of Marxist-Leninist theory. Mao Tsetung Thought is truly Marxism-Leninism brought to a new height.

Volume 5 contains 70 articles, 46 of which were not published before. Covering the period of 1949 to 1957, these articles sum up the experience of the socialist revolution and socialist construction under the dictatorship of the proletariat in the 8 years following nationwide liberation in China.

In China this volume has helped unify the workers, peasants, soldiers and revolutionary intellectuals in the decisive class struggle against the "gang of four". The "gang of four" used leftist phrases to dress up their counter-revolutionary aim of overturning the dictatorship of the proletariat in China. They used every trick in the book to obstruct and sabotage the editing and publication of Volume 5 of the Selected Works of Mao Tsetung. Why did they do this? Simply because the materialist dialectics applied by Mao to the issue of socialist revolution and socialist construction in China blow the "gang of four's" one-sided rantings to Kingdom Come!

We draw readers' attention to the article by Chairman Hua "Continue the Revolution under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat to the End" in Peking Review no 19 1977. This, along with the article in Peking Review no 17 by the Committee for Editing and Publishing Chairman Mao Tsetung's Works, are valuable guides to the study of Volume 5.

What is the essence of Mao's writings in this period? Hua points out:-

*"The fundamental concept running through this volume is to uphold and develop the Marxist principle of continued revolution and, upon the seizure of political power by the proletariat, to switch over from the democratic revolution and carry it on under the dictatorship of the proletariat".*

(Peking Review 19, p16)

Throughout these writings Mao continually sums up the experience of the Chinese revolution and the experience of the international communist movement, drawing firm lines of demarcation with both 'left' and right opportunism, especially with modern revisionism. In the course of this he made outstanding contributions in the fields of materialist dialectics, political economy and scientific socialism.

## VOLUME 5 - AN ARSENAL OF MATERIALIST DIALECTICS

Comrade Mao's great philosophical contribution was to make more clear than ever and strictly apply the truth of materialist dialectics. The unity of opposites is the essence of dialectics. This principle is applied more firmly and confidently in these works than we have seen before. On page 366 Mao speaks of seeing things in "pairs":

*"In philosophy, materialism and idealism form a unity of opposites and struggle with each other. The same is true of another pair of opposites, dialectics and metaphysics. Whenever one talks about philosophy, one cannot do without these two pairs of opposites. Now in the Soviet Union they will have nothing to do with such "pairs" but are going in only for "singles", asserting that only fragrant flowers, but not poisonous weeds, grow there, and denying the existence of idealism and metaphysics in a socialist country".*

In all parts of these articles Mao thoroughly examines things all-sidedly, seeing both aspects of every contradiction. He precisely sums up the relative strengths of these aspects and makes plans accordingly. We get a deeper grasp of the truth "one divides into two". He fires salvo after salvo at the idealist and metaphysical ideas within the party in the course of waging warfare against the class enemy.

### MOBILIZE ALL POSITIVE FACTORS

In "On the Ten Major Relationships" (page 284) we have the most thorough analysis of the problems facing the Chinese Party and people. Some of us have already been able to study this article before publication of Volume 5 because it was published earlier on its own. The theme of the analysis is *"mobilizing all positive factors, internal and external, to serve the cause of socialism"*. This article urges the need to grasp the subordinate aspect of a contradiction as well as the main one. For instance, although in China the counter-revolutionary forces are subordinate, by patient and vigilant effort they can be turned to an extent into positive factors. On page 298 Mao explains why:

*"It is essential that different counter-revolutionaries should be dealt with differently on the merits of each case"*.

Thus some are executed, some are remoulded, others dealt with appropriately grasping the fact that all but the diehards can change. With every problem Mao shows how analysis and making correct distinctions gives a policy that mobilizes all positive factors.

### RELENTLESS CLASS STRUGGLE

Comrade Mao's great political contribution was to unfold the struggle against modern revisionism and carry forward the socialist revolution under conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He led the Party in relentless class struggle whilst at the same time applying the mass line and laying down sound policies to overcome the contradictions amongst the people. He narrowed the target of attack at all times uniting the many to hit at a handful. On page 328 'Some Experiences In Our Party's History' he says, *"To strike at everyone may seem very revolutionary, but actually it causes great harm"*.

He narrowed the target of attack at Khrushchev internationally in the struggle against modern revisionism and in China against the schemes of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-Shih who formed a conspiratorial alliance against the Party which aimed to split the Party and aid counter-revolution. It was in this struggle against the bourgeoisie within the Party that Mao said on page 156;

*"As communists, let alone as senior party comrades, we must all be open and above board politically, always ready to express our political views openly and take a stand, for or against on each and every important political issue"*.

The importance of this point has been demonstrated again more recently in the struggle against Lin Piao and the "gang of four". Here Mao urged the

strict application of the three do's and three don'ts.

On the emergence of modern revisionism Mao put his views in a clear cut way. He defended the name of Stalin and refuted the attacks made on him by Khrushchev. He summed up the positive and negative in Stalin saying:-

*"As we have indicated elsewhere, the assessment of Stalin should be 70% for achievements and 30% for mistakes". (p317).*

As far as Khrushchev's attack on Stalin was concerned Mao penetratingly observed on page 354:

*"At the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union they went for Stalin in a big way. Subsequently the imperialists stirred up two storms against communism, and there were two stormy debates in the international communist movement. Amidst these storms, the impacts and losses were quite big in the case of some Communist Parties in Europe and the Americas but smaller for the Communist Parties in the Orient".*

In a refutation of modern revisionism headed by Khrushchev, Mao says on page 341:

*"Khrushchev's report at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union says it is possible to seize state power by the parliamentary road, that is to say, it is no longer necessary for all countries to learn from the October Revolution. Once this gate is opened, by and large Leninism is thrown away".*

In China, Mao analysed classes and strata very carefully. In a short note written in 1952 he says on page 77:

*"the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie has become the principal contradiction in China".*

In carrying forward the socialist revolution under conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat he urged the necessity of taking the class struggle as the key link and reminded his comrades never to forget class struggle as the modern revisionists appeared to do. Mao clearly saw the bourgeoisie represented within the Party. In "Combat Bourgeois Ideas in the Party" beginning on page 103 we have a criticism of Po I Po's mistakes which makes a clear analysis of party composition "a small number are no good, their thinking is unMarxist." he says on page 104. The way in which capitalist roaders serve the bourgeoisie is demonstrated on page 107 when Mao says:

*"He (Po I Po) made his mistake because he succumbed to the influence of bourgeois ideas. The editorial preaching the new tax system was applauded by the bourgeoisie and Po I-Po was pleased".*

The struggle against the right opportunist line in agriculture and industry was not just a struggle against persons like Po I Po but against Liu Shao-Chi who represented the revisionist line and who manipulated those who mistakenly took the capitalist road.

The relentless class struggle waged by the Chinese Communist Party with Comrade Mao's leadership is one based on the masses of the people.

### THE CORRECT HANDLING OF CONTRADICTIONS AMONG THE PEOPLE

Comrade Mao made a great contribution on the mass line and unity of the people. The important article familiar to many comrades "The Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" is at the core of Mao's policy of how to handle the two major contradictions in socialist society. There is the contradiction between ourselves and the enemy and the contradictions among

the people. To confuse the two leads to setbacks.

The mass line is practised by Communists and opposed by revisionists. Every policy put forward by Mao in Volume 5 bases itself on the mass line. This is true of the suppression of counter-revolutionaries, collectivization, inner party struggle and all other matters. Mao was against Communists who posed as "condescending saviours" Nonetheless as a materialist he saw the masses; not as a featureless porridge of people but as masses with numerous great and small differences to be taken into account. He firmly grasped the contradiction between the workers and peasants, between town and country. In weighing up the differences he says on page 356:

*"It is true that the income of the workers is generally higher than that of the peasants, but the value they produce is bigger, and besides they have to pay more for daily necessities. The improvement of the peasants livelihood depends mainly on their own efforts to increase production".*

As the class enemy is constantly at work to open up differences among the people Mao takes pains to assess these problems and see to it that the gap is narrowed. The same is true of the other elements amongst the people. The intelligentsia, for instance, is weighed up in an all-sided way. On page 404 in "On Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" Mao makes the point already closely studied by Marxist-Leninists:

*"China needs the services of as many intellectuals as possible for the colossal task of building socialism."*

and

*"Although large numbers of intellectuals have made progress, they should not be complacent. They must continue to remould themselves, gradually shed their bourgeois world outlook and acquire the proletarian communist world outlook so that they can fully fit in with the needs of the new society and unite with the workers and peasants."*

We have something still to learn from these well known words when facing the task of building the Party in Britain.

Mao's boundless faith in and regard for the masses expresses itself well in the article beginning on page 95 "The Youth League in its work must take the Characteristics of Youth into Consideration". On page 96 he says:

*"Young people at school are prone to nervous tension and so often find it hard to get sleep and then hard to wake up. Be sure to make nine hours of sleep a rule."*

On the same page he says:

*"Young people, being what they are need more time for play, recreation and sports. Otherwise they won't be happy. And in time they will fall in love and get married. In all this they are different from older people"*.

This regard for youth is not sentimentality. It is a fact of nature that the next generation of leaders and people are today's youth with their aspirations and anxieties. Mao says, "You are protecting the younger generation so that it can grow sturdily." (p97).

## SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

The "gang of four" branded all plans to increase production as the "theory of productive forces". This was Liu Shao-chi's revisionist theory. But the "gang of four" pinned this ugly label on all who struggled to promote production. Is promotion of production inconsistent with socialist revolution? The "gang of four" thought so! But what worker would entertain empty talk about revolution without demanding a socialist productive effort to satisfy the needs of the people? On page 315 Mao says bitingly:



*"You have such a big population, such a vast territory and such rich resources, and what is more, you are said to be building socialism, which is supposed to be superior; if after working at it for fifty or sixty years you are still unable to overtake the United States, what a sorry figure you will cut!"*

Promoting production is not something which the revisionists alone call for! Soundly based on the political line of the proletariat it is right to go all out for production.

### THE BIRTH OF THE THREE WORLDS CONCEPT

The three worlds concept is a great strategic concept which gives the workers and oppressed nations and peoples clear orientation in the international united front against imperialism, especially the superpowers. This concept has its origin in earlier thoughts on the Suez crisis in 1956. On page 362 Mao says:

*"In the middle East, two kinds of contradictions and three kinds of forces are in conflict. The two kinds of contradiction are: first, those between different imperialist powers, that is, between the United States and Britain and between the United States and France and, second, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed nations. The three kinds of forces are: one, the United States, the biggest imperialist power, two, Britain and France, second-rate imperialist powers, and three, the oppressed nations."*

Let those who deny the fact that Mao himself originated the three worlds concept ponder this!

The struggle for unity on the three worlds concept is a vital one in Britain. Confusion in the movement in Britain must be overcome so that we may unite more closely for Party building.

Volume 5 gives us some of the best study material we have been able to get. In our central task of building the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class it has many things which help us. It helps us better to master the dialectical approach to problems and therefore avoid mistakes. We are still very one sided in our approach to problems and this causes us to make mistakes in the struggle for unity in the Marxist-Leninist movement. We are struggling for unity on principle. That means we must see both the differences and the similarities between us. We must clearly distinguish those things which divide us which are important, and require more struggle, from other things which are not so important. In struggling we must unite on those things where the difference is not important and concentrate on those things which are important. Volume 5 is an arsenal of materialist dialectics which can help us avoid many errors. All comrades should carefully study Volume 5 of the Selected Works of Mao Tsetung.

# TAKE THE BOLSHEVIK, NOT THE MENSHEVIK, ROAD IN PARTY BUILDING

There's a fair wind of unity blowing in the British Marxist-Leninist movement today. This is most refreshing and invigorating after the stale wind of stagnation and sectarianism which prevailed until fairly recently but subjective enthusiasm by itself will not build the Party, we must have a correct ideological and political line on Party-building, guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. As Chairman Mao said "*The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything.*" Not only must we have a correct line, we must fight for it in opposition to all incorrect and opportunist lines on Party-building.

One recent incorrect attempt at uniting the movement was the conference of Marxist-Leninists held in July this year. The conference was convened by one of the leading organizations in the movement, the Communist Workers' Movement (CWM), its aim was "to bring together the collective experience of Marxist-Leninists and to develop a programme of practical and theoretical activity towards the founding congress of the revolutionary party." ('Open Letter to all Marxist-Leninist Organizations'). These proposals were a sincere attempt to unite the movement, but one of the main reasons why they were incorrect was that they seriously underestimated the strength of opportunist lines on Party-building in the movement, and proposed no method of dealing with those lines.

In the interests of Party-building and Marxist-Leninist unity it is necessary to sharply criticise an opportunist line put forward at the conference. To a lesser extent it is also necessary to criticise the incorrect line of trying to unite the movement through conferences of this nature.

The criticisms of the opportunist line are sharp. As Chairman Mao said "*Criticism should be sharp. I don't find the criticism made by some comrades at this conference very sharp; they seem to be afraid of offending others. If you are not sharp enough, if the sting doesn't reach home, the person criticised will not feel any pain and take any heed.*" ('Selected Works', Vol.5, p170). The criticisms are sharp because we wish the comrades to "feel pain and take heed". The criticisms (and those of the method of conferences) are made in the interests of unity; we do not consider that the comrades concerned are opportunists, we think that they are making opportunist errors. In the course of struggle we confidently expect to unite with these comrades on the basis of a correct line on Party-building.

## THE CONFERENCE OF MARXIST-LENINISTS.

The conference had some limited achievements but in the main its impact on the struggle to rebuild the revolutionary Communist Party has been very small. Why is this? The conference was convened at a time of an upsurge of a subjective desire for unity on the part of the movement as a whole. This tide of enthusiasm had been fuelled by the fact that the CPB(ML), the headquarters of opportunism in the British movement, had been seriously weakened by the principled split of those comrades who later formed the CWM.

Superficially, it appeared that all that was necessary at that time to give a big impetus to Party-building was to convene a conference led by the CWM. But beneath the apparent readiness for unity and desire to accept the leadership of the CWM there was a very different picture. Mao said:

*"Don't be misled by false appearances. Some of our comrades are easily misled by them. There is contradiction between appearance and essence*

*in everything. It is by analysing and studying the appearance of a thing that people come to know its essence. Hence the need for science. Otherwise, if one could get at the essence of a thing by intuition, what would be the use of science? What would be the use of study? Study is called for precisely because there is contradiction between appearance and essence."* ('Selected Works', Vol.5, p165)

The essence of the situation in the movement today (despite the appearance of a widespread readiness for unity) is one of widespread ideological, political and organizational confusion. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as a theory is grasped only weakly by the majority of the movement - we are in a period of what Lenin called 'theoretical chaos'. Ideologically, many specific bourgeois ideological errors, notably liberalism and small group mentality, cripple the work of most groups; more generally idealism and metaphysics are rampant. Politically, much of the movement is engaged in blind activism without grasping that practical activity must be led by theory, and therefore their practice tails behind the spontaneous movement, in particular nearly all organizations fail to do bold work in alerting the working class and people to the threat from Soviet social-imperialism. Organizationally, the movement as a whole is not organized on a proper democratic-centralist basis; ultra-democracy and lack of leadership are normal and in some of the groups and circles are glorified as the correct method of organization.

This is not to paint a picture of gloom and despondency; on the contrary, there have been significant advances in rebuilding the Party in the last two years, but these advances have only been made because they have been made in accordance with a guiding line which conformed to reality. As Mao said "*Whatever we do must accord with reality, otherwise it is wrong.*" ('Selected Works' Vol. 5, p135). Provided that we grasp Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as the theoretical basis guiding our thinking, increasingly integrate it with the concrete practice of the British revolution and persist in struggle for what is right against what is wrong we will definitely meet with success in rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party.

The proposals of the CWM on uniting the movement through the conference did not accord with reality and therefore did not meet with success. However making mistakes can be a good thing provided we are good at learning from them. In the period leading up to the conference and at the conference itself, the CWM did learn from experience, struggled to sum up experience and increasingly guided its work in the light of that experience. The RCLB is confident that the CWM will persist in this spirit, grasp the weapon of systematic criticism and self-criticism and make an increasingly good contribution to the struggle to build the Party..

### SEIZE HOLD OF THE WEAPON OF ACTIVE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE!

One of the main reasons that the proposals on the conference were generally incorrect was that they didn't grasp the weapon of active ideological struggle. The CWM didn't grasp that bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideology is dominant in the movement and that a protracted war of active ideological struggle to smash the hegemony of bourgeois ideology and establish the supremacy of proletarian ideology is essential to unite the movement. The movement must grasp that unity among Communists must be an objective unity, a unity in the first place of ideas and thinking. Active ideological struggle is the key link in uniting the movement for Party building. How can we unite on a principled basis without boldly struggling against empiricism, which mistakes fragmentary, limited, direct experience for universal truth? Against subjectivism which says 'it must be so because it seems so to me' and 'damn all who

don't agree with me'? Against dogmatism which refuses to integrate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the British revolution? Or against ultra-democracy which insists that everybody discusses everything, and that without centralized guidance, and thereby paralyzes the proletariat in its fighting tasks? The answer is that we can't. We can unite in this way on an unprincipled basis by yielding to incorrect ideas and getting on with everybody, but such unity will be entirely spurious and will fall apart at the first challenge from the bourgeoisie.

#### CRITICISE SMALL GROUP MENTALITY!

Ideological struggle must hit the mark - we must criticize the main errors that hamper our work and hold us back and not hit out indiscriminately in all directions. Today the movement must concentrate its fire on small group mentality, the main error which is crippling the struggle for unity. We must launch a movement-wide rectification campaign against small group mentality.

The small group mentality resists the idea of uniting all the organizations, groups and circles of the movement into one army of the proletariat which will give bold, wise and militant leadership to the working class. Those infected with the small group mentality prefer to continue with their narrow local and largely ineffectual practical work and ignore the burning need to subordinate the selfish interests of the groups to the overall need to build the Party. Chairman Mao hit the nail on the head when he wrote:

*"Some comrades consider only the interests of their own small group and ignore the general interest. Although on the surface this does not seem to be the pursuit of personal interests, in reality it exemplifies the narrowest individualism and has a strong corrosive and centrifugal effect."* ('Selected Works', Vol.1. p112)

The proletariat's struggle to seize state power and build socialism requires a unified vanguard Party, not a collection of guerilla bands working in useless isolation from each other. Small group mentality is a particular manifestation of individualism; its social base lies in the petty bourgeoisie's characteristic aversion to discipline. Very often the 'leaders' of these small groups prefer to remain big fish in small ponds and have no desire at all to be merely one more comrade subject to the discipline of the proletarian party.

Failure to boldly struggle against small group mentality in the period leading up to the conference was a major reason for its relative lack of success. What substantial steps towards unity between different organizations have taken place as a result of the conference? None! By contrast the CFB and the CUA united into the RCLB shortly after the conference after a bold struggle against the small group mentality. The RCLB confidently expects to unite on a similar basis with another organization in the near future.

Why were several organizations conspicuous by their absence at the conference? Because of small group mentality! At least two circles thought that the proposals for a conference were incorrect and yet they refused to come and struggle for what they thought was a correct line. These circles didn't care that a large number of Marxist-Leninists might go down the incorrect path - they were quite happy in their mountain strongholds secure in the knowledge that they were right. What selfishness! What indifference to the struggle to rebuild the Party! What a gross example of small group mentality!

The small group mentality is an extremely serious bourgeois ideological error which robs the working class of its Party. Any line on Party-building must take it into account and propose methods of dealing with it; any line which fails to do so will not succeed in uniting the movement for Party-

building. We must take the ramparts of the mountain-strongholds of the various small groups by storm: our chief method for doing so is active ideological struggle.

#### THE RESULTS OF THE CONFERENCE.

The experience of the conference proved conclusively that such conferences cannot be the main way of uniting the movement. The level of ideological, political and organizational unity in the movement as a whole is so low that it proved impossible to make any real progress towards a principled unity at the conference. To take an ideological question - there was no agreement at the conference on whether we unite by mass meeting methods such as conferences or by the correct method of struggles for unity by leading and authoritative representatives of organizations. Such is the individualism of the movement that there was horror on the part of some comrades at the very thought that decisions might be taken not by them, but on their behalf. Theoretically there was no agreement on such vital questions as the primacy of theory over practice at the current stage of the revolution or on the two historical tasks of revolution - rallying the vanguard and leading the masses in practical political activity towards the revolution (see 'Manifesto of the RCLB' Revolution Vol.2 No.1. p25).

These matters are raised to illustrate that a period of establishing lines and differences and struggling over them is necessary before such conferences can be of any great significance in uniting the movement. We also need to clarify lines so that comrades know what they must struggle for and against. In the absence of such a process conferences of this type can, at best, merely do some initial clarification of lines and, at worst, they will sow confusion and demoralization.

At this stage the main way forward is by bilateral struggles for unity by two different organizations, by struggling to form larger democratic centralist organizations (see 'Revolution' Vol.1. No.5). This is the method which has already triumphantly united the CFB and the CUA into the RCLB.

The conference did have some limited success. Some clarification of lines took place, there was some progress in learning to speak a common language, and the correct line on Party-building grew stronger in the course of the struggle at the conference. The conference was also a teacher by negative example; it showed not only such conferences cannot be the main way forward but also that any future conferences with more limited objectives must have better preparatory work and leadership if they are to be of more than transient value. But most importantly, in the course of the conference a fairly systematic Menshevik line on Party-building was exposed, isolated and defeated.

#### BOLSHEVISM AND MENSHEVISM AT THE CONFERENCE.

*"The entire history of the international Communist movement is in fact a history of the struggle between Marxism on the one hand and opportunism and revisionism on the other, a history of the struggle between the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line and opportunist and revisionist lines of all descriptions." ('Peking Review', no. 43 1976, p18)*

Not only this, but these struggles take place again and again in each country. Our struggle to build the Party is very largely a struggle to grasp and apply to our concrete conditions the hard won and bitter lessons of the international Communist movement. In particular the victory of Bolshevism over Menshevism in the struggle to build the RSDLP holds many lessons for us. Today, throughout the western countries, the struggle of Bolshevism against Menshevism is taking place anew.

Menshevism has two main characteristics: it is vague on questions of principle and theory, preaching spontaneism and tailism, and it liquidates the Party organizationally. These characteristic features of Menshevism were well in evidence at the conference and, moreover, were particularly dangerous because they were dressed up as Marxism.

Because Menshevism liquidates theory and organization it also preaches unity at any cost. The call for 'unity' is very dangerous unless it goes hand-in-hand with a firm grasp that organizational unity must be based on ideological and political unity (not 'complete' unity - which this line has been misrepresented as a call for - such unity exists only in the graveyard, but unity on the main questions). As Lenin said:

*"In order to build the Party, it is not enough to be able to shout; 'Unity', it is necessary, in addition, to have some sort of political programme, a programme of political action. The bloc of liquidators, of Trotsky, the Vperyodists, the Poles, Bolshevik (?) party members, Paris Mensheviks, etc., etc., etc., was foredoomed to a scandalous downfall because it was on a lack of principles, on hypocrisy and empty phrases." ('Lenin on the Revolutionary Proletarian Party of a New Type', p5)*

In contrast to this, one of the papers submitted to the conference said "... it is a question of attaining sufficient ideological and political unity before we unite in one party-building organization: it is my view that most of the Marxist-Leninist movement already has that degree of unity politically and ideologically...."

Are we united on the importance of democratic-centralism? On the question of Ireland? On the need to practice systematic criticism and self-criticism? On the first historical task of revolution? On the threat from Soviet social-imperialism? On the need to devote all resources in mass work to the working class? No! Any organizational unity which evaded getting united on these crucial questions of ideological and political line would be a unity based on "a lack of principles, on hypocrisy and empty phrases". It would therefore equally be doomed "to a scandalous failure".

*"The crux of the matter is line. This is an irrefutable truth." (Chou En-lai. Report to the 10th Congress of the CPC). In order to unite organizationally we must thoroughly thrash out differences and struggle over them in order to reach unity. In Lenin's famous words "...before we can unite, and in order that we may unite, we must first of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation." ('What is to Be Done?' Peking ed. p26). Any unity that is not based on these principles is a unity that serves the bourgeoisie, not the working class. Such unity would be empty, based on nothing more than empty words and pious wishes, and could not be a firm unity based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Such unity would lead to splits and later demoralization because it would not have a firm line able to stand up to all the twists and turns of the class struggle. A unity based on struggle would on the other hand be a sure guarantee of eventual success. As Chou En-lai said "If one's line is correct, even if one has not a single soldier at first, there will be soldiers, and even if there is no political power, political power will be gained." ('Report to the 10th Congress'.)*

#### LIQUIDATIONISM ON THEORY.

Most of the contributions to the conference seriously underestimated the importance of theory and one-sidedly stressed the importance of practice. All the contributions from the headquarters of the Menshevik line gave first priority to practice. For instance a written contribution gave as its first

priority the drawing up of "... a programme of work nationally and locally to be carried out collectively by the Marxist-Leninists." Although this paper also called for some theoretical work this approach grossly underestimates the decisiveness of revolutionary theory.

Theory and practice are two aspects of a single contradiction. In general practice is the principal aspect of the contradiction, but under certain circumstances and at particular times theory can be the principal aspect. To deny this possibility is mechanical materialism not dialectical materialism.

In the current stage of the British revolution and of Party-building, when the movement as a whole has no guiding strategic and tactical line, no programme and no class analysis, we have a situation where, as Mao put it:

*"The creation and advocacy of revolutionary theory plays the principal and decisive role in those times of which Lenin said, 'without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement'." ('Selected Readings', p116)*

The rest of the quote from Lenin continues:

*"This thought cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand-in-hand with an infatuation for the narrowest forms of practical activity." ('What Is To Be Done?' Peking ed., p28)*

Does this not accurately describe much of our movement? Much of which beavers away at the narrowest forms of practical activity with splendid indifference to theory. To harp about the primacy of practice in the current situation sounds very Marxist and very materialist but is in fact to bow to the spontaneous level of the movement and thereby leave the working class movement to the leadership of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists. It is as Lenin sharply put it *"like wishing mourners at a funeral 'happy returns of the day'"*.

Much of our movement considers that the guiding line for the British revolution will come mainly out of practice. The document quoted earlier said that one of the tasks coming out of the conference should be to "work out a Party programme...based mainly on the experience of joint work and investigation..." In fact though what we must do in practice is to integrate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the British revolution. This means that most of our guiding line will come from indirect experience, from the experience of the international Communist movement. Stalin pointed out that theory is *"the experience of the working class movement in all countries taken in its general aspect."* ('Foundations of Leninism', Peking ed., p22). Through practice we will greatly enrich our understanding of theory, test it and develop it. But to deny that theory is primary over practice at this stage is to ignore all the hard-won lessons of the international working class movement.

It would take a very long time indeed to develop by our own efforts the theory of the two historical tasks of revolution. On the other hand we don't need to engage in practice to grasp that the revolution in Britain will almost certainly be a violent one. In fact we will never have enough experience of practice to create for ourselves all over again the theory accumulated by the international working class movement in the hundred and more years of its experience. As Mao said *"...most of our knowledge comes from indirect experience..."* (Selected Readings', p71)

We have much work to do in rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party, rallying the vanguard of the working class and leading the working class

towards the revolution. These are our vanguard tasks and "...the role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory." (Lenin - 'What Is To Be Done?' Peking ed., p29)

### OPPORTUNISM ON QUESTIONS OF ORGANIZATION.

"Opportunism in programme is naturally connected with opportunism in tactics and opportunism in organization." (Lenin 'One Step Forward, Two Steps Back' Moscow Ed., p193). It was not at all surprising that those comrades at the conference who were most vociferous in preaching spontaneism and tailism on matters of ideological and political line and theory were also those who were most hostile to the only proletarian method of organization - democratic centralism. Petty bourgeois individualism at the conference manifested itself in two different but ideologically and socially connected forms.

#### Federalism Raises its Head Again.

Opportunist proposals for organizational unity were put to the conference from two different sources, slightly different in form. Their essence was the same. To take one of them - it was proposed that the conference should set up "...a new kind of organization, a kind of joint organizing committee, whose central task would be to work to prepare the conditions for a single Marxist-Leninist Party to come into being." The tasks of the committee were to lead practical and theoretical work, to draw up a programme and constitution and prepare for the founding congress of the Party. The committee was also supposed to "...elect, at the conference or at its first meeting, a small functional committee..." to lead its work.

This is not a proposal for a "new kind of organization" at all! It's nothing less than a proposal for another Federation! Marx once said that history repeats itself, the first time as tragedy, the second as farce. Fortunately the conference rebuffed these proposals so the farce was prevented from appearing on the stage of history. But we have had the tragedy - for nearly seven years the members of the CFB were effectively prevented from playing their parts in the struggle to rebuild the Party precisely because they were organized in a Federation!

The old Federation and these proposals were fundamentally opportunist because they refused to accept that only democratic centralism can lead the movement and the working class in effective combat against the class enemy. The movement is starting to move out of the circle stage and to take practical steps to unity. Previously we didn't need rules and discipline precisely because each group and circle was working on its own mountain top and had no organizational ties between them; Lenin firmly pointed out that the transition from the circles to broader ties absolutely must be accompanied by strict organizational rules and discipline.

"...formal Rules are needed precisely in order to replace the narrow circle ties by the broad Party tie. It was unnecessary and impossible to give formal shape to the internal ties of a circle or the ties between circles, for these ties rested on personal friendship or an instinctive 'confidence' for which no reason was given. The Party ties cannot and must not rest on either of these; it must be founded on formal, 'bureaucratically' worded Rules (bureaucratic from the standpoint of the undisciplined intellectual), strict adherence to which can alone safeguard us from the wilfulness and caprices characteristic of the circles, from the circle wrangling that goes by the name of the free 'process' of the ideological struggle." ('One Step Forward, Two Steps Back', Moscow ed., pp 188/189).

Federal forms of organization are opportunist because they don't challenge



small group mentality head-on; they try to evade the challenge and think that some sort of spontaneous transition from the circles to the Party will take place. Well in fact it won't - the small groups will cling to their mountain strongholds like limpets to a rock. They will have to be prized off their mountains with the lever of active ideological struggle and organizational rules.

Joining a Federation rather than only working as a local small group may give the appearance of giving up one's 'own' rights as a circle in favour of the Party but in fact it doesn't. Because the formal rules of Party organization (such as the lower level being subordinate to the higher level) have not been won through ideological conviction, every time a decision is taken which the local circle (or individual) doesn't like it can retreat into its formal 'right' not to implement the decision and refuse to do so. This is precisely what happened when many of the local organizations of the RSDLP refused to implement the decision of its second Congress, when "...the old hidebound circle spirit overpowered the still young Party spirit." ('One Step Forward, Two Steps Back' Moscow Ed., p209)

This is precisely what happened in the CFB when the constituent groups raised the tired and tattered Menshevik banner of 'group autonomy' and refused to implement every decision which they disagreed with. And this is precisely what will happen in any new Federation. Bold and militant struggle is needed against the refusal of much of the movement to give up their 'rights' as groups and circles to a centre, against what Lenin called the "...tendency to defend autonomism against centralism, which is a fundamental characteristic of opportunism in matters of organization." ('One Step Forward, Two Steps Back,' Moscow ed., p192. Emphasis in original).

#### Petty Bourgeois Individualism.

Individualism at the Conference manifested itself not only in its subtle form of Federalism but also in quite open and blatant opposition to the very idea of democratic centralism. Several speakers were clearly imbued with petty bourgeois individualism and anarchism. It was of great significance that hardly any of the written or spoken contributions even mentioned democratic centralism (except to speak against it), let alone pointed out that it is an organizational imperative.

Several speakers opposed those comrades who insisted that the movement take up the question of democratic centralism. All these speakers said "of course" we need democratic centralism but then proceeded to oppose it on the grounds that 'we aren't ready for it'! Many of them said that only a Party could institute democratic centralism and that it is a luxury for pre-Party forms of organization. Yet these were the very same speakers who were advocating a new Federation. On what method of organization do they consider it would operate? They are opposed to the principle of the individual being subordinate to the organization and to that of the minority being subordinate to the majority. Clearly they wish to elevate individualism to the level of an organizational principle!

Many of these comrades made a great show of wishing to form a unified organization and yet were opposed to doing so on the basis of democratic centralism. Why? Because they wished to preserve intact within the formal shell of an organization, their 'rights', their 'privileges', their precious thoughts, their integrity as individuals. As Lenin sharply put it "*It is one thing to sacrifice the circle system in principle for the sake of the Party, and another to renounce one's own circle.*" ('One Step Forward, Two Steps Back', Moscow ed., p208). These comrades, like Saint Augustine who said "O Lord, give me chastity, but not yet", were saying "Give the movement democratic centralism, but not yet." Like Saint Augustine, these comrades

wish to have a bit more time satisfying their own inclinations before submitting to principle.

The social base of the bitter opposition to democratic centralism which exists in much of the movement lies in the intelligentsia which currently numerically dominates the movement. The proletariat has no fear of discipline and organization, its very existence in large factories in day-to-day struggles against the bourgeoisie teaches it that the isolated individual is nothing, whereas organized with fellow workers he constitutes a mighty force. The worker feels and is big and strong as part of a big and strong organization, whether Party or trade union. The intellectual though fights by his personal qualities, by reason and argument and therefore "*..it is only with difficulty that he submits to being a part subordinate to the whole, and then only from necessity, not from inclination.*" (Kautsky quoted in 'One Step Forward, Two Steps Back', Moscow ed., p124). These attributes brought into the working class movement, provide the social base for the widespread error of petty bourgeois individualism. As Lenin put it "*...the intelligentsia, as a special stratum of modern capitalist society, is characterised, by and large, precisely by individualism and incapacity for discipline and organization...*" ('One Step Forward, Two Steps Back', Moscow ed., pp68/69. Emphases in original). This tendency of the intelligentsia makes them view Party organization as a;

*"...monstrous 'factory'; he regards the subordination of the part to the whole and of the minority to the majority as 'serfdom'...; division of labour under the direction of a centre evokes from him a tragicomical outcry against transforming people into 'cogs and wheels'..."* ('One Step Forward, Two Steps Back', Moscow Ed., pp 187/188).

In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organization. Our ideological unification on the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought must and will be consolidated by the unity of democratic centralist organization on the basis of the four main rules of Party discipline: the individual is subordinate to the organization; the minority is subordinate to the majority; the lower level is subordinate to the higher level; and the entire membership is subordinate to the central committee.

In the struggle to rebuild the Party we must boldly and militantly struggle against those who wish to drag us down to the level of Menshevism, to the petty bourgeois viewpoint which:

*"...in the sphere of organization as in the sphere of our programme and our tactics, helplessly surrenders to the bourgeois psychology, uncritically adopts the viewpoint of bourgeois democracy, and blunts the weapon of the class struggle of the proletariat."* ('One Step Forward, Two Steps Back', Moscow ed., p210).

#### THE WAY FORWARD.

The current subjective tide of enthusiasm for unity in the movement is an excellent thing and is a reflection of the fact that objective conditions for moving out of the circle stage to a higher level of unity are beginning to mature. The movement must adopt correct policies to guide the struggle to rebuild the Party and ensure that the movement is not left demoralised and setback as a result of adopting incorrect policies to catch the tide.

The Manifesto of the RCLB put forward three specific immediate tasks to fulfill the aim of establishing a single democratic centralist Party-building organization: ideological struggle and education against small group mentality; protracted struggle against incorrect ideological and political lines on the British revolution (at this stage against the opportunist errors of the leadership of the CPB(M-L)); and forming larger democratic centralist

organizations. The few short months since this policy was first propagated in the May issue of 'Revolution' have shown that the policy is in all essentials correct.

Forming larger democratic centralist organizations by uniting smaller organizations is a correct policy and is still the immediate organizational task: we call on all individuals to join the democratic centralist organization which they think most correct; all circles to constitute themselves properly on the basis of democratic centralism; and all groups and organizations to struggle for democratic centralist organizational unity with the organization with which they have the closest ideological and political unity.

But this is not enough: just as the working class must have a centre of bold, scientific leadership in its struggle to seize state power and build socialism, so must the Marxist-Leninist movement have a similar centre in its struggle to rebuild the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class.

Although we can be sure of ultimate success in the struggle to rebuild the Party, there will be many reverses and setbacks on the road. As Chou said "*The future is bright, the road is tortuous.*" The Party will not be rebuilt easily, it will not drop from the skies or evolve spontaneously, it must be built through hard struggle by all of us in opposition to all opportunist and incorrect lines on Party-building and the British revolution.

A crucial part of the Party-building struggle is to build a single leading centre, able to give the movement as a whole bold and correct leadership through all the twists and turns of the struggle and able to withstand all the attacks of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists. This centre must be armed with the ideology of the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, have a strong grasp of revolutionary theory and closely integrate it with the concrete practice of the British revolution. The centre must be skilled in applying the mass line, speedily concentrating correct ideas upwards and giving correct guidance downwards. It must also be skilled at mobilising all positive factors for Party-building.

Such a leading centre will ensure that the Party is rebuilt much more speedily than it would be by the separate efforts of several organizations. This centre must shoulder the task of leading the whole movement. By virtue of bold and scientific leadership on the basis of a correct ideological and political line it will rally to its side all genuine Marxist-Leninists and advanced workers and weld the disparate organizations, groups, circles and individuals of the movement into one single fighting democratic centralist Party.

We cannot predict at this stage which organizations will form this centre; this will become clear in the course of struggle, out of which the centre will emerge and be recognised by the movement. But, implementing its policy of self-reliance not self-sufficiency in Party-building, the RCLB pledges itself to work hard to form that centre. We call on all genuine Marxist-Leninists to join with us in forming the single leading centre for the British Marxist-Leninist movement.

**BOLSHEVISM, NOT MENSHEVISM IN PARTY BUILDING!**  
**BUILD THE SINGLE LEADING CENTRE FOR PARTY BUILDING!**

## VICTORY OVER THE "GANG OF FOUR"

For the third time in a year the masses of the Chinese people came onto the streets in their millions in August following the eleventh Congress of the Communist Party of China. They were jubilantly hailing the victory led by Chairman Hua Kuo-feng over the "gang of four" anti-Party clique. They demonstrated enthusiastically, militantly and joyfully, just as they did in their millions in October last year when the plot of the "gang of four" was first smashed, and just as they did in July this year to greet the decisions of the Third Plenum of the 10th Central Committee to expel the "gang of four" from the Party forever.

Yet there are still forces in Britain in the Marxist-Leninist movement who block their ears to the triumphant shouts of the Chinese working people. Foremost among them are the handful of leaders of the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) who are intensifying their opportunist errors and heading straight down the path towards revisionism, trying to take their members with them.

Despite an extensive programme of public meetings the CPBML has not held a single meeting on China for a whole year. When asked about the view of the party on the victories in the class struggle in China comrades working in their bookshop, Bellman Books, have been told to say: "We don't think it's any of our business"! What an insult to the Chinese people and the British working class! What an insult to the Communist Party of China!

The genuine socialist countries have been built mainly by their own workers and working people under their own Marxist-Leninist Parties. But international support is also a contributory factor. For example in the 1930's British workers and progressive people gave internationalist assistance to the Chinese people's struggle against Japanese imperialism. Small though that contribution was compared to the struggles of the Chinese people themselves and of the entire international Communist movement, we are proud of it.

Today socialist China is a great base area supporting revolution throughout the world. We are immensely inspired by the victories of the Chinese working class. The fact that one fifth of the world's population is already living under socialism makes a tremendous difference to the balance of forces in the world.

In the past when the Soviet Union was also a great socialist state it inspired and strengthened the working class throughout the world. Then, when it was taken over by Khrushchev's clique of revisionists the loss to the working class was of world-wide significance. Genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties and organisations came into existence in country after country in the struggle against modern revisionism headed by the Soviet revisionist clique. It was and still is very much the "business" of all of us.

Now in the critical period after the death of the great leader and teacher Mao Tsetung when the great Communist Party of China was similarly threatened by a band of revisionists, the leaders of the CPBML try to tell us "it is none of our business"!

Their motives are sinister. They are not being open and above board. What they really mean to do is to encourage as many genuine revolutionaries as possible to withhold support from the Communist Party of China headed by Hua Kuo-feng. In fact they regard the class struggle in China as being very much their business. And their business is to try to give tacit support to the anti-Party clique of Wang, Chang, Chiang and Yao, the "gang of four"!

They want to see the Communist Party of China taken over by revisionists in the hope that these revisionists will support their own opportunist line on the class struggle in Britain and the world.

## TWO TELLING REASONS

Class struggle in a socialist country can often be protracted and complicated. The leaders of the CPBML have had plenty of time to make up their minds on the present struggle and give a lead to the working class. But honest rank and file comrades may still be confused. How do we know that Comrade Hua Kuo-feng and the Central Committee are the genuine supporters of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and revolutionary aims? There are two simple telling reasons which no opportunist or revisionist can deny.

### 1. The Enthusiasm of the Masses

All commentators including bourgeois commentators on China, report the tremendous enthusiasm of the masses about the overthrow of the "gang of four" and in favour of the present leadership of Chairman Hua. This was seen in October 1976 immediately after the downfall of the "gang". It was seen after the 3rd Plenum of the Tenth Central Committee in July 1977 and again after the triumphant 11th Congress in August 1977. These demonstrations were far more widespread among the masses and far livelier than the demonstrations in April 1976 after the Tien An Men Square incident when the "gang of four" were in control of a large amount of power and influence. The fact that the Party has been able to smash the conspiracy of the "gang of four" without fighting and bloodshed is because of the overwhelming support of the people and the extreme isolation of the anti-Party clique from the masses.

Is this isolation significant or not? To armchair "super-revolutionaries" this was very unfortunate for the "gang of four" but in no way significant. To Mao Tsetung however, isolation from the masses is of tremendous significance. He wrote in 1945:

*"Twenty-four years of experience tell us that the right task, policy and style of work invariably conform with the demands of the masses at a given time and place and invariably strengthen our ties with the masses, and the wrong task, policy and style of work invariably disagree with the demands of the masses at a given time and place and invariably alienate us from the masses". ('Quotations', p123)*

The "gang of four" were extremely alienated and isolated from the masses. That's not accidental. It was because they were a band of revisionists out to seize power for themselves and serve the bourgeoisie, not the working class and working people. That is its significance.

### 2. Hua was chosen by Mao himself

In 1975 Premier Chou En-lai, who had stood at Chairman Mao's right hand for forty years, became too ill to carry on the day to day business of the government. At this time two prominent members of the "gang of four" might have been expected to take over out of seniority, Chang Chun-chiao or Wang Hung-wen. Wang Hung-wen had sat on Mao's right handside at the 10th Party Congress in 1973. Chang Chun-chiao had acted as deputy prime minister. Yet they were passed over. In their place, on Chairman Mao's proposal, Comrade Teng Hsiang-ping took up the day to day work of the government. This was an unmistakable slap in the face for the "gang of four". It is a proof that by 1975 significant errors by the "gang of four" were already coming to light which they were not correcting through self-criticism. Mao Tsetung was clearly determined not to give any more power to the "gang of four".

On January 8th 1976 the great revolutionary Chou En-lai died. Following this, on Chairman Mao's proposal Comrade Hua Kuo-feng, who had previously

held somewhat more junior positions in the leadership, was appointed "Acting Premier". Once again it is unmistakable that Mao Tsetung deliberately passed over the "gang of four" as undesirable candidates.

On April 17th 1976 on Mao Tsetung's personal proposal the Central Committee went further: Comrade Hua Kuo-feng was appointed Premier and First Vice-Chairman. Again Chairman Mao's intention in blocking the "gang of four" are unmistakable. In particular no-one has ever held the position of "First Vice-Chairman" in the Party before. Can any of the supporters of the "gang of four", open or hidden, think of a case? Or do they imagine Chairman Mao overlooked the little word "First"! No, it is quite clear that this was a major strategic decision by Mao Tsetung to ensure that the Party and state leadership would not fall into the hands of the "gang of four" even when he was critically ill or had passed away.

#### STUDY THE CRITICISM OF THE "GANG OF FOUR"

These two telling reasons for supporting Comrade Hua Kuo-feng and the Communist Party of China - the enthusiasm of the masses and the decisions of Chairman Mao - cannot be denied even by the most cynical supporter of the "gang of four". They are based on entirely independent evidence.

In addition we most strongly urge all comrades to study material by the Communist Party of China exposing and criticizing the "gang of four". The material is militant and careful, lively and factual, as well as penetrating and profound. This is no bourgeois hatchet job like Khrushchev's secret speech slandering Stalin. It is the work of a great and deeply tempered revolutionary party drawing searching lessons to arm its battles in the future.

These articles, in Peking Review and other Chinese publications, tell of how Chairman Mao repeatedly warned the "gang of four" of their growing errors. But they did not listen because of their arrogance and their reactionary class background which they tried to cover up. These articles and particularly the powerful speech by Chairman Hua at the 11th Congress of the CPC, show how the "gang of four" perverted Mao's great theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under the pretext of waging the class struggle they treated contradictions amongst the people as contradictions with the enemy. They attacked many good people and tried to destroy comrades instead of helping them correct their mistakes. Their aim was to overthrow a large number of leading comrades and seize power themselves in the name of continuing the revolution. This is indeed revisionism, dressing bourgeois ideology and politics up in clothes of Marxism to deceive the working class and the people.

Had the "gang of four" succeeded in their plot they would have tried to turn the great Communist Party of China into a fascist party. Furthermore the rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie. They would have turned China from a socialist country to a capitalist country.

No! Once again they have demonstrated their preference for opportunism rather than standing up for the true interests of the working class.

We call on all genuine Marxist-Leninists in Britain to refute this opportunist stand of the leaders of the CPBML and themselves to come out clearly in support of the great Communist Party of China headed by Chairman Hua and against the line, policies and practice of the "gang of four"!

In its victorious struggle against the "gang of four" and its campaign to overcome their influence the Communist Party of China has been able to

gain an even firmer grasp of Mao Tsetung's 'invaluable teachings. In particular it has emphasised the importance of these basic principles, the "Three Do's and Three Don'ts":

*"Practice Marxism and not revisionism,  
Unite and don't split;  
be open and above board, and don't intrigue  
and conspire".*

These principles have tremendous significance for the international communist movement and for the struggle to rally all genuine Marxist-Leninists in Britain for the central task of building the revolutionary Communist Party. We must study them well and really take them to heart as we express our militant revolutionary support for the victory of the Communist Party of China over the "gang of four".

# SOVIET UNION —

## THE MORE DANGEROUS SUPERPOWER

There is no part of the world, from Norway to Zaire, from Argentina to India, from Britain to Australia, where each superpower is not struggling either to extend or to defend its domination or influence in its struggle with the other superpower for world hegemony. There is no struggle in the world today, whether it be the struggle for national liberation in Zimbabwe, the struggle for national independence in Australia, or the struggle for socialist revolution in Britain, which is not greatly affected by this fundamental contradiction.

The two superpowers are everywhere engaged in aggression, bullying and threatening of the other countries of the world in their attempts to bring these countries into their respective spheres of influence, in order to control them economically, politically and militarily. The two superpowers are the main enemies of the people of the world. It is of vital importance that the people of the world are armed with this understanding in the international class struggle. As Chairman Mao said "*Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? This is a question of the first importance for the revolution.*"

The basic answer to this question is Mao's concept of the three worlds, which states that: the United States and the Soviet Union make up the first world; the developing countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and elsewhere constitute the third world; and in between the two is the second world composed of Europe, Japan, Canada and other countries.

This concept of the three worlds is a great strategic concept which provides orientation for the workers and oppressed peoples and nations of the world in their fight against imperialism, especially the hegemonism of the two superpowers.

The many third world countries are the countries most bitterly oppressed and exploited by imperialism. For decades they have been subjected to the most brutal and rapacious plunder by the imperialist countries. In recent decades, these countries, notably the countries of Indo-China, have been in the vanguard of the struggle against imperialism. These countries are the main force in the fight against the superpowers.

The second world countries are mainly the second rank and declining imperialist countries of Europe, Canada and Japan. These countries, particularly Britain and France, were once the biggest imperialist powers and still to a considerable extent participate in the imperialist plunder of the third world.

But compared to the two superpowers these second world countries are second-rate imperialist powers. Britain's role as a world power, for instance, is diminished compared to its pre-war role. At the same time these second world countries are also subjected to superpower oppression, exploitation, control or threat. They can therefore play a role, although inevitably an unstable and vacillating role, in the great international united front against the two superpowers, especially the hegemonism of the two superpowers.

The two superpowers are the biggest international exploiters in the present era. They are the biggest powers representing contemporary imperialism and the most ferocious forces of aggression. Both superpowers stretch their tentacles around the world, and everywhere they contend for hegemony. This contention is leading to war. The rising superpower, Soviet social



imperialism in particular is more openly struggling to expand its influence and is the more dangerous source of war.

### STATE MONOPOLY CAPITALISM - BASIS OF THE SOVIET ECONOMY

The Soviet Union was once a glorious socialist country and under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin blazed a trail for others to follow and rendered great services to the cause of the workers and oppressed peoples and nations of the world. But in 1956 a revisionist clique, representing the new bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union, staged a counter-revolutionary coup and started a process of capitalist restoration. Today the Soviet Union is a fully-blown monopoly capitalist country under the dictatorship of a fascist big bourgeoisie.

In the social-imperialist Soviet Union, state monopoly capitalism takes the form of ownership by the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class, with its members - a handful of people represented by the Soviet revisionist clique - running the state machine and directly controlling the entire national economy and all economic lifelines. The state, under the dictatorship of the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class, has become, in Engel's phrase, '*the ideal personification of the total national capital*', while all monopoly capital is under the exclusive control of this centre. Compared with the old-style imperialist countries, state monopoly capitalism in the Soviet Union is more monopolistic by nature, has a higher degree of concentration and exercises tighter state control. A handful of Soviet bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists have assumed complete control of the country's economy and home market.

### THE SOVIET UNION IS THE MORE DANGEROUS SUPERPOWER

Monopoly capitalism is imperialism.- the Soviet Union is a social imperialist state. Under imperialism all the existing contradictions of capitalism are heightened and sharpened to an extreme. Capitalism basically developed on a national basis but under imperialism a process of internationalization of capital takes place. As Lenin said:

*"Imperialism is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, reached only in the twentieth century. Capitalism now finds the old national states, without the formation of which it could not have overthrown feudalism, too tight for it. Capitalism has developed concentration to such a degree that whole branches of industry have been seized by syndicates, trusts and associations of capitalist billionaires, and almost the entire globe has been divided up among the 'lords of capital'!"*  
(*'Lenin on War and Peace'*. Peking ed. p7.)

In particular the concentration of capital (which has reached a uniquely high degree in the Soviet Union) compels imperialist states to struggle among themselves for a division of the world to ensure that they have markets for commodities, outlets for the export of capital and sources of raw materials and labour. Imperialism must do this if it is to obtain a high enough level of profit to survive. Again to quote Lenin:

*"The capitalists divide the world, not out of any particular malice, but because the degree of concentration which has been reached forces them to adopt this method in order to obtain profits."*  
(*'Imperialism'*. Peking ed., p100).

One of the main features of imperialism is that the world is largely divided up among the imperialist great powers. This was the situation that confronted the Soviet Union when it developed into an imperialist power.

The existing division of the world among the imperialist powers is the main cause of imperialist war. The law of uneven economic and political

development among capitalist countries means that some develop into imperialism later than others and are therefore impelled to challenge the existing division of the world, to demand a redivision. It was mainly the exclusion of Germany from the imperialist division of the world between Britain and France which led to the imperialist war of 1914-18.

As Stalin pointed out the struggle for a redivision of the world is a struggle "waged with particular fury by new financial groups and powers seeking a 'place in the sun' against the old groups and powers, which cling tenaciously to what they have seized." ('Foundations of Leninism'. Peking ed., p5)

Today it is only the two superpowers which can strive for world hegemony. Both superpowers' monopoly capitalist ruling classes are doing their utmost to monopolise world resources and markets and to deny them to the other.

US imperialism is though in decline and it is the Soviet Union which is demanding a redivision of the world in its favour. Although the United States is generally in advance of the Soviet Union economically, its internal economic and political contradictions and the sharp blows struck against it by many successful national liberation struggles have forced the United States rapidly downhill. From a position of undisputed mastery of the imperialist dunghheap at the end of the Second World War the United States has suffered reverse after reverse. It has had major military defeats inflicted on it in Korea and Indo-China, its economic supremacy has been challenged by Europe and Japan, it is suffering serious setbacks in southern Africa and in its own backyard, Latin America, many countries are nationalizing or expropriating US monopolies.

By contrast the Soviet Union has had some successes, although as its true imperialist nature becomes clearer to the people of the world, it too is meeting reverses. It is still in control economically, politically and militarily of eastern Europe, with the exceptions of Albania, Rumania and Yugoslavia. It has edged out US imperialism in India, Angola and Mozambique and even in Latin America has had many economic successes. Recently the Soviet Union became Argentina's biggest trading partner!

But all these are to the Soviet Union mere appetisers before the main course. Driven on by its internal contradictions it will not be satisfied until it achieves world hegemony. As it lags behind the United States economically and financially the Soviet Union increasingly sees that only military struggle can decisively shift the balance in its favour. The Soviet Union is actively preparing for a new world war to bring about a redivision of the world.

Faced with the challenge of the Soviet Union, US imperialism is pursuing a policy of appeasement. Everywhere the United States is making concessions to the Soviet Union, hoping to avoid the inevitable conflict. Whereas the United States used to talk of the Rhine being its first line of defence, it now talks of the Pacific outposts of the Phillipines being so. Sonnenfeldt, a leading bourgeois spokesman of the US, recently spoke of the need for US imperialism to be 'realistic' and recognise that eastern Europe is within the Soviet Union's 'sphere of influence'. ('Guardian'. 10.5.76)

The Soviet Union is greatly helped in its war preparations by the state apparatus of fascist dictatorship and the highly concentrated means of production. The Soviet fascist bourgeoisie, far more easily than their counterparts in a bourgeois democracy, can channel manpower, materials and capital to military objectives, and can ruthlessly suppress any opposition to this policy from the working class and people or from within its own ranks.

Military spending in the Soviet Union has risen year by year. As a proportion of national income it has risen from 13p in the pound in 1960 to 19.6p

in 1974. This is a bigger proportion than pre-war Nazi Germany (19p) or US imperialism at the time of the Korean and Vietnam wars (15p and 10p respectively). For every pound that the US has in national income the Soviet Union has only 66p, but it spends on military projects £1.20 for every pound that the United States does.

All this spending shows up in a huge Soviet war machine. The Soviet Union now has 1,618 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) (compared with 75 in 1962), 784 submarine guided missiles (100 in 1963), 4,000,000 front-line troops and 25,000,000 reservists and 40,000 battle tanks. (All figures in this and preceding paragraph from 'Peking Review' 30.1.76).

Although the Soviet Union still lags behind the United States in aircraft, it outstrips them in every other field of military hardware: 40,000 battle tanks against 10,000, 4,000,000 front-line troops against 2,084,000, 326 submarines against 114 and so on. (All figures from 'Sunday Times' 18.4.76).

The Soviet Union is mobilising all the factors it can to launch a large-scale war of aggression and will do so whenever it thinks the time is ripe.

### SOCIALISM IN WORDS - IMPERIALISM IN DEEDS

In the days of Lenin and Stalin the Soviet Union rendered selfless help to the struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations of the world against imperialism. The Soviet Union was a great bastion of the world revolution and during this time built up a great fund of popular goodwill among the peoples of the world.

By contrast the United States was exposed as a vile and bloodstained tyrant of the oppressed peoples and nations and was hated as such by the people of the world.

Capitalising on these two facts the Soviet Union has used them to cover up its true nature. The Soviet Union is socialist in words but imperialist in deeds.

From the beginning of its career as an imperialist superpower the Soviet Union has used words of socialism to cover up its ugly deeds. Its invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, carried out to maintain its imperialist control of that country, was said to be justified by the 'international dictatorship of the proletariat'. The Soviet Union attempts to justify its ruthless economic control and plunder of the countries of eastern Europe, Cuba and also India by the so-called 'international division of labour'.

In its struggle with US imperialism for global supremacy the Soviet Union is similarly attempting to deceive the peoples of the world with false words of friendship. After many years of pushing the revisionist interpretation of peaceful coexistence, it is now once again referring to its 'proletarian internationalist duty' to 'help the anti-imperialist struggle'.

In many parts of the world heroic struggles are being waged against old-style imperialism, particularly US imperialism, colonialism and white racism. In Africa, the middle east, south-east Asia and Latin America the people of the world have inflicted heavy defeats on these vicious enemies.

The Soviet Union is attempting to move in and take the place of these old enemies. It calls itself the 'natural ally' of the third world countries, claims that it gives them 'selfless aid' and demands that these countries 'rely firmly' on the Soviet Union. In their struggle against old-style

imperialism and colonialism it is understandable that the people of third world countries should look for help but they must beware of letting in the Soviet tiger by the backdoor while expelling the US wolf from the front.

In Angola the Soviet Union for years refused aid to the liberation movements, but when the three organisations MPLA, UNITA and FNLA had concluded agreements to govern Angola collectively the Soviet Union sent in 12,000 Cuban mercenaries on the side of the MPLA in order to be sure that it would control Angola after independence, and thus gain a vital foothold in southern Africa. Today the Soviet Union and its Cuban lackeys are trying to do the same thing in Zimbabwe, Namibia and Azania.

It takes time for the people of the world to see through the phoney 'socialism' of the Soviet Union but steadily and surely they are doing so - more and more countries are seeing what a fraud and a danger Soviet social imperialism is. In the recent past the Egyptian people have thrown out their Soviet 'advisers' and recognised them as agents of social imperialism. Elsewhere in the middle east the attempt of the Soviet Union to overthrow the Sudanese government exposed it to more people. As the Sudanese president Nimeri said "...the Soviet Union has been turned from a defender of victims of aggression into a defender of aggressors." The Arab countries he added "... are now confronted with an international pirate...the Soviet Union." ('Peking Review' 8.10.76). After the Soviet interference in the internal affairs of Angola President Kaunda of Zambia boldly pointed out "Africa has fought and driven out the ravenous wolves of colonialism, racism and fascism from Angola through the front door, but a plundering tiger is coming in through the back door." ('Peking Review' 28.1.77.).

By persisting in armed struggle and self-reliance the people of Africa and other third world countries will undoubtedly defeat both old-style imperialism and social imperialism. As one African liberation leader commented "To liberate Africa is Africa's task. We do not want our 'friends' from foreign countries to come to liberate Africa for us". (ibid).

#### PERSIST IN UNITY AGAINST THE SUPERPOWERS

The Soviet Union also tries to split the third world countries by using the old imperialist tactic of divide and rule. It tries to set these countries against one another by calling some 'progressive' and others 'reactionary!'. It has used this tactic against the Afro-Arab countries. The African countries have increasingly strengthened their unity and the July 1976 summit of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) pledged that "we will not be divided". A good example is the successful meeting of the heads of state of four Red Sea states - the Yemen Arab Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of the Yemen, the Sudan and Somalia - in March of this year to discuss ways of strengthening unity and co-operation.

The Red Sea area is important to the superpowers as the Red Sea is an important strategic waterway between Europe, Asia and Africa. Both superpowers have been paying a lot of attention to this area and trying to split the Red Sea states. In particular the Soviet Union has been making use of territorial disputes left by old-style imperialism to strengthen its hold on Ethiopia and Somalia. It has also been trying to set 'progressive' Ethiopia against 'reactionary' Sudan.

It is completely incorrect to use these terms in this way. They are both relative and can be used only in relation to real struggles. Undoubtedly some third world countries have internal policies which are better suited to the needs of the people than others, but this is not the main question. What all third world countries have in common, irrespective of domestic policies, is their exploitation and oppression by imperialism, especially the superpowers.

All of these countries can objectively fight against this oppression and they are 'progressive' to the extent that they do so. As Stalin said:

*"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 struggle that the Emir of Afghanistan is waging for the independence of Afghanistan is objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the monarchistic views of the Emir and his associates, for it weakens, disintegrates and undermines 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;..."*  
(*'Foundations of Leninism'*. Peking ed. ps 75/76. (emphases in original))

And, we would add, the struggle that the Egyptian and Sudanese bourgeoisie are waging, and the struggle of the Shah of Iran, against superpower domination is objectively a revolutionary struggle, irrespective of their opposition to socialism.

By contrast the Soviet Union says that countries are 'progressive' according to whether or not they support the Soviet Union - the more a country supports the Soviet Union the more 'progressive' it is; the more it resists the Soviet Union the more 'reactionary' it is! It also demagogically says that countries like Ethiopia which have persisted in struggle against feudalism and old-style imperialism are taking the 'socialist road' and are therefore inherently 'progressive' and tries to split them from countries like the Sudan and Egypt.

These efforts are doomed to failure. The third world countries are increasingly seeing the need to sink their differences in their common struggle against the superpowers.

#### SOVIET SOCIAL IMPERIALISM THREATENS EUROPE

The struggle between the two superpowers will inevitably lead to a new world war someday. This is an objective law independent of man's will. It is imperialism which is the source of war and as long as social imperialism and old-style imperialism exist the threat of war will remain. The elimination of war can only happen after the elimination of imperialism, the elimination of the exploitation of man by man and of one nation by another, and not before. We cannot predict whether this new world war will occur in 5, 10 or 30 years but occur it will.

The people and countries of the world must get prepared to defend their national independence against either superpower. However as the United States is on the decline and the Soviet Union is the rising superpower it is mainly from the Soviet Union that the threat of war comes. It is understandable that the people of the world, who suffered greatly in the last two world wars, should wish to prevent another one. The Soviet Union plays on this desire of the people for peace to push its line of 'detente'. It tries to fool the people into thinking that phoney agreements by the superpowers on 'disarmament', 'nuclear arms control' and 'strategic arms limitation' can ensure peace. In fact not one of the superpowers' agreements has had any significant effect on the Soviet Union's war preparations. For instance almost immediately after signing the Helsinki agreement on European safety and co-operation the Soviet Union sent its aircraft carrier 'Kiev' into the Mediterranean for the first time.

Imperialists have always tried to fool the people by covering up their war preparations with talk of 'peace'. Stalin pointed out that the imperialists

"have only one aim in resorting to pacificism: to dupe the masses with high-sounding phrases about peace in order to prepare a new war." (Quoted in the 'Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement'. p224). This thesis is entirely borne out by history. In 1913, one year before the start of the First World War, Britain and Germany signed a series of 'peace agreements'. The Munich agreement between Britain and Germany for 'peace in our time' was similarly signed only one year or so before the start of the Second World War.

Only revolution can prevent war. But firmly standing up to the superpowers, waging a tit-for-tat struggle against them and making serious preparations for war will deter them from lightly committing aggression, gain time and ensure that countries will defeat the superpowers if they do dare to invade. Appeasing the superpowers will only increase their appetites and make them launch a new war all the sooner - this is the lesson of the appeasement of Nazi Germany before the Second World War.

It is particularly important that the people of Europe grasp this situation as it is Europe which is the main area of contention between the two superpowers and where the next world war will probably mainly take place.

Strategically, Europe has always been important for the imperialists - it has been the main battlefield in the last two world wars. Europe is an area rich in raw materials, with advanced means of production and high level of technology. It has important access and connections to the middle east and north Africa, rich in oil and with important strategic waterways. It is also the area which history has left as the border of the two superpowers' respective spheres of influence.

The deployment of the armed forces of the two superpowers inevitably reflect these facts, particularly the armed forces of the Soviet Union, whose forces are overwhelmingly superior to those of the USA in Europe.

ARMED FORCES OF THE TWO SUPERPOWERS DEPLOYED IN EUROPE

	Troops	Tanks	Tactical Aircraft	Medium Missiles	Tactical nuclear warheads	Sub-marines	Aircraft carriers	Other warships
USSR	895,000	19,000	2,900	583	3,000	235	1	180
US						40	4	76
NATO	625,000	7,000	2,300	180	7,000			

More important than the current figures is the trend which shows that the Soviet Union is expanding its armed forces far more rapidly than the United States and is clearly preparing for a war of aggression in Europe. Whilst the Soviet Union spends up to 14.5% of its gross national product on defence, the United States can spend only 5.4%. Similarly, the annual growth rate of Soviet arms production is 16%, 2.3 times that of its total industrial output value. As a western bourgeois newspaper pointed out "Soviet superiority in conventional weapons is reflected by the fact that in tanks, armoured personnel carriers and tactical aircraft, the Russians have been outproducing the Americans since 1965. The current American advantage in helicopters will be ended by 1977". (Statistics and quote from 'Peking Review' 18.2.77). The

edge which the United States has on tactical nuclear warheads is also rapidly being eroded as the Soviet Union spends more on nuclear armaments.

The Soviet fascist leaders admit that Europe is the centre of their plans for aggression. Brezhnev said that the "house of Europe has become extremely small and can easily catch fire" and that Europe "has turned into a powder keg, or to be more exact, an atomic keg". They have also frankly said that the battlefield of "a central war (a war against the principal enemies) is in Europe". They have arrogantly declared that the west "can no longer decide the destiny of Europe" and that the Soviet Union alone has the "decisive say on Europe's destiny" and on whether "Europe is heading for war or peace".

True to their imperialist words the Soviet Union is everywhere stirring up trouble and seeking to extend its influence in Europe. They stirred up a lot of trouble in Portugal after the overthrow of the dictatorship there in 1974, using their agents in the revisionist 'Communist' Party of Portugal. Likewise it is trying to use its agents in the revisionist Parties of France, Italy and Spain as trojan horses in its efforts to gain control of those countries. It was mainly the Soviet Union which was behind the conflict in Cyprus in 1975. In northern Europe they have seized part of Norway's Svalbard Islands and are illegally building military installations on them to threaten western naval interests in the north Atlantic and the Arctic. They arrogantly interfere in western Europe's internal affairs and try to undermine the unity of western Europe by refusing to negotiate with the EEC collectively and instead speaking only to individual member countries of the EEC.

#### COMBAT OPPORTUNIST LINES ON THE THREAT FROM SOVIET SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM

The tasks of revolutionary Communists in the face of this threat are clear. A bold lead must be given to the working class to firmly add their weight to the great international united front which is developing against imperialism especially the superpowers. This is of great importance because Europe is the main focus of contention between the superpowers.

In the course of doing this it will be necessary to struggle firmly against opportunism - against the revisionist fifth column of Soviet social imperialism, and against their sympathisers on the 'left' wing of the Labour Party. But of central importance at this stage is the struggle against opportunism in the Marxist-Leninist movement itself. The headquarters of these errors is the leadership of the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist). This clique attempts to conceal the threat from Soviet social imperialism from the working class, and actively misleads the workers on the situation in the world today.

How does the leadership of the CPB(ML) conceal the threat from Soviet social imperialism? In its desire to be 'revolutionary' and to direct the main blow against a declining enemy, US imperialism, it presents the threat from Soviet social imperialism as a figment of the British bourgeoisie's imagination! For example, 'The Worker' of July 18th 1977 stated:

*"...especially in Britain, every effort is being made to distort facts in an attempt to show a growth of Warsaw Pact forces which threatens to engulf the whole of Europe".*

The article then goes on to turn reality on its head, by trying to show that NATO is superior in men, and some weapons, to the Warsaw Pact forces. The article does this in the face of all evidence, which proves the overwhelming superiority of Warsaw Pact forces, and all other actions which show that Soviet social-imperialism is preparing for war.

The conclusion to this article states:

*"..the new war propaganda calls for a clear response from our labour movement; to quit NATO, and declare for socialism as the only guarantee for peace, freedom and independence for the British people".*

This is a thoroughly revisionist statement. The contention of the superpowers is dismissed as 'war propaganda'. Furthermore, what this article proposes would play right into the hands of the Soviet social imperialists. This line disarms the working class at the time when revolutionary Communists should be preparing the class for the task of actively combating the Soviet threat.

In 'The Worker' of June 20th this year, there was an article which further exposed the stand of the leadership of the CPB(ML) on the class struggle internationally. Their attitude to Mao Tsetung's great theory of the three worlds was given in the following quote:

*"To avoid dividing up the world by class, you do it either geographically - East and West - or mathematically - First, Second, and so on ad infinitum".*

It is not surprising that the leadership of the CPB(ML) cannot grasp the reality of the world situation, when it has such a philistine approach to Marxist-Leninist concepts. The results of such opportunist errors are revealed later in the same article when the present great struggles of the third world countries for a new economic order are described as:

*"...the rulers try to divert the attention of the masses from the real cause of their poverty by pointing to the older capitalist nations and trying to squeeze more money out of them".*

This is a capitulation to social chauvinism, and denies openly that imperialism oppresses and exploits the peoples of the third world.

The errors of the CPB(ML) have been pointed out before in 'Revolution' and by other Marxist-Leninist journals, but they persist in these errors. In doing so the CPB(ML) are entrenching themselves in their opportunism and social chauvinism, and are failing in their duty to the working class and to the oppressed peoples and nations throughout the world.

#### FORM THE BROADEST POSSIBLE UNITED FRONT AGAINST IMPERIALISM, ESPECIALLY THE HEGEMONISM OF THE TWO SUPERPOWERS.

In the face of the threat from the two superpowers it is essential that the working class and people of all third and second world countries strengthen their unity.

The main force in the struggle against imperialism is the third world countries. The working class of Britain must strengthen their unity with the third world countries and must struggle as much as possible to force the British imperialist bourgeoisie to accede to the just demands of the third world countries.

In the era of imperialism the two great revolutionary movements are the struggle of the working class of the advanced capitalist countries for socialism and that of the oppressed peoples and nations for national liberation and independence against imperialist oppression and exploitation.

A fundamental thesis of Leninism is the alliance of these two revolutionary movements: that each can be victorious only on the basis of unity with the other - in particular that the proletariat of the imperialist countries must firmly support the struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations against imperialism - and that the national question in the era of imperialism can only be solved under the leadership of the working class. As Stalin succinctly put it:

*"...the national question can be solved only in connection with and*



on the basis of the proletarian revolution, and ...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." ('Foundations of Leninism'. Peking ed., p73).

It is essential for the success of the struggle for the socialist revolution in Britain and for British independence that the British working class firmly supports the struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations. In particular the British working class must give unswerving support to the struggle of the peoples of those countries oppressed by British imperialism in order to concretely show the people of those nations that the British working class gives no support to national privileges and oppression by 'its' bourgeoisie. Only then will the people of the oppressed nations see that the alliance of their struggle with that of the working class of the imperialist countries is real and that their struggle is a common struggle. In turn support by the British working class against imperialist domination by Britain will hasten the overthrow of British imperialism abroad and at home. Notably the impending victory of the liberation movement in southern Africa will strike a mighty blow against British imperialism. In contrast support or acquiescence in British imperialism abroad will strengthen it at home and thus delay further the socialist revolution. In Lenin's pointed words "*The English working class will never be free until Ireland is freed from the English yoke. Reaction in England is strengthened and fostered by the enslavement of Ireland.*" ('The Right of Nations to Self-Determination' Selected Works, Vol.1, ps 634/635).

For both the British working class and imperialist bourgeoisie, imperialism is a bread-and-butter question. As Cecil Rhodes said "*If you want to avoid civil war, you must become imperialists.*" For the British working class, supporting the struggle of those countries oppressed by imperialism is not a question of abstract moral principles; it is in their economic and political self-interest. The more they support these struggles the more they weaken their own main enemy, the British imperialist bourgeoisie, and hasten their doom.

However the great international united front is not only a united front of the workers and oppressed peoples and nations; it is also a united front of all countries oppressed and exploited by imperialism, especially the hegemonism of the two superpowers.

In Britain today the principal contradiction is between the working class and the imperialist bourgeoisie and the target of the revolution is socialism. Therefore there can be no let up in the struggle against the ruling class and their attacks on the working class. However in the event of a direct threat of invasion from either of the superpowers or of war with one of them, the principal contradiction would not be between the working class and the imperialist bourgeoisie but between the people of Britain and whichever superpower was committing aggression against Britain, which would almost certainly be the Soviet Union. In that event a united front with that section of the bourgeoisie which was prepared to fight for British independence against superpower domination would be both correct and absolutely necessary.

Today the contradiction with the superpowers is secondary to the internal class contradiction. But being secondary does not mean that it should be ignored. It is essential for the working class to pay attention to the secondary contradiction and combine the struggle for British independence

with the struggle for the socialist revolution. The key to handling this complex problem correctly lies in struggling as much as possible to make the British imperialist bourgeoisie join the broad international united front against imperialism, especially the hegemonism of the two superpowers.

### THE SUPERPOWERS ARE PAPER TIGERS!

Although the superpowers look very powerful on the surface, they are rotten underneath. They are beset with contradictions internally, which is why they are so aggressive, and the more countries they try to exploit and oppress the more resistance they provoke. Their final defeat is inevitable.

The superpowers are paper tigers. And as Mao pointed out, this means that they are at once real and paper tigers. They are real tigers because they have claws and can devour people. They still exploit and oppress the people of the world. Communists must build their tactical thinking on this aspect, and prepare to defend themselves against the superpowers.

But the superpowers are also in the process of being changed into paper tigers. The struggles of the world's peoples against the superpowers is gradually achieving this change. It is on this aspect that we base our strategic thinking. The superpowers will be defeated!

Just as the people of the world defeated the mighty Nazi war machine and the people of Indo-China the militarily superior US imperialism, so the people of the world will defeat the superpowers. US imperialism is already on its knees - it is reeling from defeats in Indo-China and afraid of the future in southern Africa and Latin America. The people of Russia, eastern Europe, India, Egypt and the Sudan have dealt big blows against the Soviet Union and so will soon the people of Angola and Mozambique.

Even if the superpowers start another world war that will only hasten their doom and (more than likely) bring about the final defeat of all imperialism. The people of the world can only be inspired by Mao's bold statement:

*"...if the imperialists insist on unleashing another war, we should not be afraid of it... the first world war was followed by the birth of the Soviet Union with a population of 200 million. The second world war was followed by the emergence of the socialist camp with a combined population of 900 million. If the imperialists insist on launching a third world war, it is certain that several hundred million more will turn to socialism, and then there will not be much room left on earth for the imperialists; it is also likely that the whole structure of imperialism will utterly collapse". ('Quotations'. ps 67/68).*

# THE THIRD WORLD IS A RISING FORCE AGAINST IMPERIALISM

(Editor's Note: This article has been sent to 'Revolution' by a reader. It is a bold and largely correct criticism of the 'left' opportunism of the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) leadership on the situation in the world today. It is for this reason that we have decided to publish it. But it is also a clear indication of the tide of criticism which will flow from the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain, directed against the headquarters of this revisionist and social-chauvinist line.)

Is there "some homogeneous mass called the third world, all on a single path of progress struggling for liberation and socialism"?

The question has been raised in the name of Marxist-Leninists and deserves the attention of Marxist-Leninists, both in theoretical and in concrete terms.

The problem concerns the relationship between the world proletarian revolution and the proletarian revolution in a single country. That is, it concerns Marxism-Leninism in its totality, and unless we get this right we will get nothing right.

Historical materialism teaches us that, without exception, all genuine revolutions in history have had as their main force the masses of exploited and oppressed people. This has been the case irrespective of the class which has led the revolution and the class which has won power. Chairman Mao crystallised it for us in his epoch-making statement: "*THE PEOPLE AND THE PEOPLE ALONE ARE THE MOTIVE FORCE IN HISTORY*".

This standpoint is at once, both scientific and an inspiration for the revolutionary people. It is scientific because it sums-up historically the struggles of all previous classes and explains the progress of humanity. And, to use Comrade E.F.Hill's words, it is "*magnificent*" because it represents and inspires "*infinite confidence in the common folk*".

This understanding of the historical materialist position teaches us that every would-be leading group which struggles against modern imperialism (the final stage of capitalism), has behind it, irrespective of its private wishes or those of the class it represents, the masses of the oppressed people, pushing it ever forward.

Is it not the case that it is the struggle of the various peoples of the third world which has brought about the single mass demand for a "new economic order" in the world? And is it not also the fact that every struggle against the forces of imperialism is also a struggle against capitalism and that in this struggle the proletariat, alone, is the victor?

The struggle against imperialism is the struggle for socialism. And Marxist-Leninist parties, the genuine leaders, are everywhere; at one with the masses, building their forces, making their revolutions, consolidating their gains and continuing the revolution.

Any outlook which denies, or cannot encompass this concept, and the momentous developments of the present era, contains within it the seeds of reaction and fascism. A view which sees only homogeneity and unity, and which fails to understand the necessity for diversity and contradiction, is seriously in error. For example, the CP(ML)'s slogan 'One World, Divided by Class'.

Chairman Mao's brilliant exposition of the "three worlds" provides the perspective and orientation, precisely to avoid mistakes of this kind. It bequeaths to genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of all countries the world outlook which is indispensable for their struggle against the domestic enemy and at the same time for correctly linking their domestic struggle with the world revolution.

If we don't thoroughly grasp this concept we will inevitably lose our way. If we cannot understand and place our trust in the overwhelming majority of the exploited and oppressed, neither will we understand and take the correct view of the two superpowers, the principal forces of world oppression today.

How can we understand the strengths and weaknesses of our domestic enemy and conduct our own struggle successfully, if we don't understand its relations with our friends and with our friends' enemies? Without this understanding we would find ourselves picking on possible friends and making enemies of them; this would mean isolating ourselves and helping the counter-revolutionary forces to unite against us.

For example, the leadership of the CPB(ML) have picked on certain EEC countries and would make enemies of them. This has been done with the best of intentions; the call is "Out of the EEC" for an "independent, self-reliant, socialist Britain". But can such a programme be the result of a proper understanding of the forces involved? Does it in any way conform with the concrete conditions and does it meet the needs and raise the political consciousness of the working class and people of Britain?

How can we take the EEC as our starting point? Are we to suppose that Britain only began to compromise its independence and national sovereignty when it joined with the other EEC countries?

Such a suggestion is absurd! Everyone knows that it has been a deliberate policy of each British government since the war to rely on US imperialism and that it is this anti-patriotic, treacherous reliance which has compromised British independence and sovereignty.

Marxist-Leninists don't look for scapegoats! It is our duty to thoroughly expose, discredit and isolate that section of the British bourgeoisie which is conniving with the US in its interference in Britain and in other EEC countries.

In diverting attention away from those who are conniving with the superpower at our front door, the programme "Out of the EEC" also diverts attention away from those who would welcome the superpower at our back door.

Can this be the way to raise the political consciousness of the British people and win the hearts and minds of millions to the great cause of an independent, self-reliant, socialist Britain?

Some comrades are in danger of forgetting the simple truth that; capitulation to imperialism is the very essence of the bourgeoisie.

It is their enforced opposition to superpower interference and control, followed by their certain capitulation, that is the principal political weakness of the bourgeoisie of a second world country like Britain. And, since the bourgeoisie represents the dominant aspect of the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, this weakness is necessarily a key factor in the struggle of the proletariat and the people of Britain.

We should have as much determination to pursue the concrete application of this truth as we have trust in the masses of exploited people of the world and their genuine leaders to continue their revolutionary advance.

We should never forget Chairman Mao's strategic concept of the "three worlds". We should always remember that the revolutionary class wins, because it is the advanced class which has the single world outlook that reflects reality and so leads it to unity; whereas the capitalist class loses because it is the moribund class and has the single world outlook which leads it to disunity.

It is only natural that mistakes will be made in the course of our struggle; what genuine Marxist-Leninist hasn't made a mistake? Indeed we owe it to those who are bold enough to grasp hold of concrete problems, that we can practice criticism and self-criticism and promote unity in the process.

Only in this way can we build the revolutionary Communist Party, master the problems together, win victories for the working class and people of Britain and eventually be able to describe the party as a "great, glorious and correct party".

(Contributed.)

# LEARNING FROM THE MASSES

## — A LIVING EDUCATION

(Editor's note. This article, contributed by a RCL comrade, sums up some important experience gained in the course of integrating with the working class. The article shows that the mass line is a powerful weapon for Communists in giving leadership to the day to day struggles of the masses. Rallying the advanced workers to revolutionary Communism must be combined with the struggles of the masses. The article also shows that combating opportunism is a key aspect of every struggle if a real victory is to be won by the masses.)

In order to have a real grasp of Marxism, one must learn it not only from books, but mainly through class struggle, through practical work and close contact with the masses of workers.

### INTEGRATING WITH THE MASSES

I started work at P's just over a year ago as an assembly worker at one site and after three months was transferred to the second site. The first stage was one of making friends and finding out about the place, conditions etc. The firm was medium-sized for the area and divided between the two sites. It was a family firm originally. There were a majority of women workers with men setters and skilled workers and in some sections black men workers on operating jobs. It paid low wages for the industry (light engineering) - £28.00 plus bonus and supplements.

I first worked in a section which was organised with an active shop steward. Most of the workers had been there a long time. By the end of three months it was possible to identify the advanced workers - a couple of younger women, a young bloke and I wasn't sure about the shop steward. The majority were in a general union but some of the skilled men are in the AUEW.

The section was organised in the sense that there was a low level of unity and minor grievances were taken up and dealt with well by the shop steward. The level of unity reflected the steward's leadership. On the one hand, he had a strong class consciousness and sense of the strength of mass action but he had been educated by the union into social-democratic thinking, was a member of the Labour Party and wanted to be a union official. He had a pragmatist attitude - work on the shop floor is our business and politics is for the higher-ups to decide. At this stage it wasn't clear which was the primary aspect.

In integrating, I didn't 'push' my politics but was open about being a communist when it came out of discussions. I took copies of a 'Class Struggle' bulletin and gave them to the workers I thought advanced at the end of this period.

At the end of this period, I was transferred to the other factory and had to start integrating again. There was virtually no union organisation here. (It took some time to grasp this.) There was less paternalism, more younger and black workers. It was also bigger. Foremen were openly rude and ignored union agreements on many minor things. Resistance was generally individual. The convenor asked me to be shop steward and I refused on the basis that I didn't know conditions or people there, and they didn't know me.

## UNITING WITH THE MASSES IN STRUGGLE

After about five months, there was a struggle on our section over a minor matter, and people asked me to be shop steward. After a shop floor meeting to discuss it, I agreed to take it on. At this point I made clear: 1. that they should make criticisms openly if I made mistakes; 2. that democracy and decisions taken by rank and file were important; 3. that people knew my politics. They thought this was a personal matter that didn't come into union work. I made it clear that I thought politics did come into it, but I thought this would be shown better through practice.

During the next period, there were minor struggles over timing of rates on jobs and individual grievances: some won and some lost. I also attended shop steward/management meetings. On the shop floor, the beginnings of getting organised helped distinguish between moaners and people who were prepared to fight. The piece work system divided workers. I found out how weak the union really was and encouraged people in other rooms to get organised and elect stewards. The union held no shop steward or branch meetings. During this time, I won respect for hard work, being prepared to let people know what was happening and listen to them, and some minor short term gains. I began to draw the class struggle out of the situation and discuss this in more detail with advanced workers.

When the company announced redundancies which the union accepted without questioning I argued in a minority they should not and overtime should be banned. I also argued for shop stewards meetings and rank and file discussion before these decisions were made.

## COMBAT OPPORTUNISM

The pay offer was the main issue that affected everyone. The convenor had put in a claim in line with union policy which had not been discussed on the shop floor. When this came back from management, stewards were called to a meeting to discuss who should inform workers - stewards or foremen. I raised the question of the offer itself. The Labour Party supporters tried to squash any discussion with the line - 'Keep politics out of it'. The revisionist steward backed this up with: "You can't question the Social Contract".

This was taken back to the shop floor. We had an initial discussion of the offer. Out of this came three important points: 1. Class struggle and politics did come into the union - discussion of Social Contract etc. 2. Even in the short term the union was not fighting for the interests of the workers - the union leaders hadn't even got the best terms within the Social Contract. 3. It was not correct to chuck out of the union but join and play a more active part, not relying on social democratic leaders, officials of the Labour Party, but on our own strength.

The Labour Party shop steward came down to put the union line on the pay offer. In essence what she said was: "You've got to accept it - there's nothing you can do. Union officials and Labour government know better than you." She went round all sections giving this talk. People were bitter and angry and drifted away from the meetings. Usually no vote was taken so the offer was 'accepted'.

We had a shop floor meeting to vote on the pay offer. We passed a resolution rejecting the pay offer but recognizing our position of weakness at present. (We were the only room to reject it.) We would accept it on certain conditions: 1. Minor changes in offer; 2. Union struggle for better wages in future; 3. More democracy in union and discussion of questions like the Social Contract. The vote on this showed that people accepted the lead I had given on short term struggles and more important, there is now a good

basis for discussion of general points.

The pay offer was accepted without further discussion. But the union has been forced to hold branch meetings for the first time and push for shop stewards meetings to discuss policy. There is growing activity and interest in making the union into a fighting class organisation and getting it out of the gaffer's pockets. More important, I have got to know workers all over the part where I work and must now consolidate this in terms of using 'Class Struggle' to rally the advanced workers.

Some particularly important lessons:

1. Proper investigation showed that the ideas of the masses on the role of the union leadership were correct. Social democratic shop stewards said people were stupid, backward, afraid etc. The ideas of the masses were correct and given a better lead they took up the struggle.
2. In the struggle over the line on social-democracy (in the old (CFB(ML))), one of the parts that was questioned most was on advanced workers. How do we treat a shop steward who may be active but involved in Labour Party or revisionists because he had never had a better lead? I was unclear which was the primary aspect of the social democratic steward I first worked with. In the course of the struggle, it is clear that the social democratic side is primary. He has not faith in the masses, is elitist and wants to be a union official. He uses manipulative tricks to get shop floor support and to stifle discussion in meetings; and does not listen to workers. This does not mean there can be no unity but he is neither a reliable ally, nor an advanced worker at this stage.
3. The correctness of the line is proved in practice. There are great limitations on what one individual can do. But even then, if we struggle for a correct line and rely on the masses, we will win their support. People often take more notice of practice first rather than theory. e.g. many people thought 'communists' were undemocratic, but it was shown through practice that we are democratic while social democrats aren't. Politics have been brought out in the course of practice, specifically the struggle to build the union as a fighting class organisation. In the struggle with management, it has been constantly necessary to expose and struggle against the opportunists. Workers understand this at one level but this has to be raised to a higher level and linked with class struggle. None of it could have been brought out so clearly without giving a lead on immediate issues. Because of this, advanced workers take more notice of the overall communist world outlook.





# New Era Books

*"WITHOUT REVOLUTIONARY THEORY THERE CAN BE NO REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT"* (Lenin)

## MARXIST-LENINIST CLASSICS

The works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung sum up the scientific world outlook of the working class and are indispensable weapons in class struggle and the struggle for the new revolutionary Communist Party.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN AND OTHER MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANIZATIONS

The journals of the British Marxist-Leninist movement give a lead in the struggle to build the new party of the working class.

## CHINESE AND ALBANIAN BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

Publications from the People's Republic of China and the People's Socialist Republic of Albania describe the construction of socialism under the leadership of the working class and lead the struggle in the world against imperialism, especially the two superpowers.

## PUBLICATIONS OF MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANIZATIONS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Marxism-Leninism is international. These publications show the progress in the common fight of the international working class and oppressed peoples of the world.

## BOOKS AND PERIODICALS ON THE STRUGGLE IN THE THIRD WORLD

The third world is the main force in the struggle against imperialism and especially the two superpowers. This literature shows the great achievements of the people of the third world.

## BOOKS AND JOURNALS ON THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN BRITAIN AND OTHER IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES

These show the struggle of the working class against exploitation, racism and women's oppression

## HANDICRAFTS AND POSTERS

Handicrafts illustrate the achievements of the Chinese people. Posters vividly portray the struggles of the people throughout the world.

NEW ERA BOOKS  
203 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD  
LONDON N.4.  
Tel 01-272-5894

Nearest Tube - FINSBURY PARK  
Opening Hours 10 - 6 Monday to Saturday  
Late Night Thursday till 7.30

# CLASS STRUGGLE



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

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

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

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

'Class Struggle' is being published to help the working class rally its forces and build that revolutionary Communist Party. It is the political paper of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain.

'Class Struggle' serves the central mass work task: building Communist Bases in the industrial working class. Most of the articles are agitational, showing a particular injustice of capitalism, or a single truth. The propaganda articles, which analyse events and issues more deeply and in a more all-sided way play the decisive role in rallying the advanced workers to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and to the political task of building the revolutionary Communist Party.

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

COUNTRIES WANT INDEPENDENCE!

NATIONS WANT LIBERATION.

PEOPLE WANT REVOLUTION!

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