

Notes on Organisation and Party Growth

1. These notes will cover some features of the Party's development over the last two years. They will not repeat what has been dealt with in earlier documents such as "Branches--A Guide" or "On Discipline". Suffice it to say that there can be no organisation without discipline and no discipline without conviction. A well-organised Party is one in which when two members agree to sell papers at a factory gate at 7.30 am both arrive at 7.15. No amount of organisation as such will achieve that: it is the ideological alarm clock which gets them out of bed.
2. * As examples of successful organisation consider the Students', Teachers' and "White Collar" committees. They provide a structure whereby two or more people in some trade who would never otherwise have met can discuss their experience in application of the line and agree on some form of joint action such as production of a "Worker" article. Not everybody turns up (level of conviction is the limiting factor) but those who do benefit and the Party as a whole has benefited.
3. Growth. Since Third Congress we have grown in membership slowly but steadily; this in contrast with other allegedly "left", allegedly "political" organisations which flare like meteors and die as quickly. We are a fixed star in the political firmament and as others fade our light shines ever brighter. We are one of the three political parties in Britain; all others are groups.
4. Uneven development (unequal growth in all spheres) is both a feature of the class and of the Party. This applies in terms of region, sex and trade. It should not be dismissed as "inevitable under capitalism": this means acceptance that they dictate our disposition of forces. Nor should it be attributed to deficiencies in our line; it is a line for an entire class and if it works for journalists it must also work for miners. Nor should it be justified "theoretically"--that would be the sheerest opportunism. If we have failed in a given section we must reconsider our own understanding of the line and the practical form our work has taken and then redouble our efforts.
5. Style. The Party is forging a unique style which sets us apart from all other "political" bodies--a positive defined by a series of negatives: no broad fronts, no "YCL", no quotation as a substitute for thought, no personalities, no martyrs, no press or TV splashes, no poncing on the Party, no debts or debtors. Anything less is unworthy of the working class.
6. Sectarianism comes usually from those who have not fully overcome their own opportunism. Because they are still trying to convince themselves that social democrats are bad they feel threatened when a social democrat (a worker also when all is said and done) does something good. Instead of nourishing that precious flower of Marxism-Leninism which has peeped through the cold winter of social democracy they stamp it out as a poisonous weed all the more insidious because it seems so good. This sort of approach is infantile Leftism, absolutely undialectical, and can mean death to a Marxist-Leninist Party.
7. Education and propaganda. One fundamental of our line is that this Earth is inhabited by intelligent beings. Workers are thinking creatures. They are not "white, pure white inside" and tarred with the brush of social democracy by a Daily Mirror; they are social democrats because they want to be. Equally they will be Marxist-Leninists when they want to be and not before. Historical materialism teaches us that that day will come. The task of the Party is to hasten the process. This process is one of education which takes place in the crucible of class struggle against the bourgeoisie. In the white heat of that struggle the Class is transformed into Party by the direct action of our members. Propaganda plays but a small part in this: its role is to make the Party visible and to make the ideas of Marxism-Leninism readily accessible.
8. In London the work at the Centre, which is still very much the organisational hub of the Party, expands from year to year and gets done without full-timers and without much fuss and bother (the true mark of organisational competence). Does the Party understand how much it owes to such as the Premises Upkeep Committee or the "Worker" production manager? Did you even know that these people exist?

9. Districts. From London origins we have grown into a national Party with branches throughout the country. Now we must move to forms of district organisation as proposed in the main document. One of the organisational tasks of these districts must be to plan work within the district so that no section of the working class is untouched by us, so that new branches can be established and small ones nurtured by the larger. All this has been started in certain areas already (especially in the South West); now it must be instituted in all parts. There will be no local Gauleiters; branches will retain their direct links with the Central Committee. Branches vary in size and of course there are advantages in bigness but it can also bring its own forms of corruption. Passengers, sleepers, free-loaders appear and "specialists" who say that if they polish the door handle why should they shake out the mat? A spell in a three-member branch might be just the tonic they need.
10. Reports should be carefully prepared and to the point (see the Teachers' Report as an example). Branch reports are required once a month. Honesty and realism should be the keynotes. What is the Branch doing and thinking? Who is attending and who contributing?
11. Security has been raised as an excuse for not reporting in detail. We will introduce a system of numbers so that names don't need to be mentioned.
12. Candidate Membership. When a branch decides someone is ready to join they should give him an application form on which every item should be completed, including trade union membership and previous political affiliation. The form should be endorsed by two Full members in good standing and sent to the Secretariat. Other information that the Branch thinks relevant should be appended (such as how long you have known the applicant and in what capacity). The Secretariat will then consider the application and, if accepted, will write direct to the applicant. If rejected, the Branch Secretary will be told why. The candidate's membership begins with the first Branch meeting attended after notification of acceptance.
13. Full Membership. After 6 months candidacy the member can be considered by his Branch for Full membership. When the Branch decides to recommend Full membership the Secretary should write to the Secretariat explaining briefly the grounds. The Secretariat will consider the request and inform the Secretary of its decision. The Branch's request is not automatically agreed to. Other information about the member and the Branch may be sought and taken into account before the Secretariat reaches its decision.
14. Termination of Membership. When a person becomes a member it is by decision of the Party; it is not by decision of the individual. Equally termination of membership is by decision of the Party. Membership does not terminate because a member "drifts away" or "resigns". In such a situation the Branch must make recommendation to the Secretariat and it will be the Party's decision, not the individual's, whether and in what form membership will terminate. A Branch may decide that, in view of the member's past good record and present circumstances, they will not allow him to cease membership even if he so wishes. In such a case they may have to grant leave of absence and keep the situation under review. In other cases they may feel that suspension from membership or expulsion are the only appropriate measures. Whatever the branch decides, however, must be submitted to the Secretariat.

CONGRESS 1976 - PROPAGANDA REPORT

We face a new situation. Congress has been brought forward. Time is not on the side of the working class or the Party.

So it is more and more important that we should get our Party, its line and its knowledge, known as widely, as well and as quickly as possible throughout Britain.

This means more hard work amongst workmates and friends. It also means that we must look to formal, organised propaganda to help us.

Propaganda involves many activities, all of which take a lot of effort and time. It would be very easy to fall into the trap of intensifying our efforts without getting an improved result; to spend so many hours more, say, producing leaflets, without having a clear idea of when or how to use them, what we want out of them, or how to follow up and assess their effect. We can't always measure immediately and exactly the effect of our propaganda, but we must plan and evaluate as scientifically as possible.

Also, such activities must not squeeze out other commitments - branch meetings, branch education, etc.

THE WORKER is the most important propaganda weapon, so important that it has its own committees, staff, etc., and its own report at Congress. When considering what propaganda we need, we must always consider in the context of the existence and importance of the Worker.

Under the general heading of propaganda fall: pamphlets, leaflets, posters, stickers, etc. (i.e. written and visual propaganda) and public meetings, which in turn link up with study sessions and thus flow into the field of education.

Probably the most important of these are pamphlets and public meetings.

PAMPHLETS

The Party has produced 16 pamphlets since it began. The most active committees have produced several related to their fields.

Do we really exploit these pamphlets fully? Do we understand them? Have we read them recently enough even to know what they say? Do they help our arguments and practice? And do we pass them on (sell or give) to others?

"London Murder" is an investigation of the capital which is a microcosm of the country, and also a response to the call to "know your area". One branch has already followed suit with its own successful regional pamphlet; others are thinking along these lines. Some branches may not need a pamphlet about their own area as a priority, but do they know the area so well that they could write one?

The Central Committee is committed to five new pamphlets (not necessarily these exact titles):

On Philosophy

On Guerrilla Revolution

On Marxist Economics

On Women

On the subject Save Britain - on the current situation, but also what are we saving, how do we intend to use it, i.e. looking forward to socialism.

The C.C. has firmly set its face against the publication of a pamphlet on unemployment. Of course the problem will be dealt with in the Guerrilla Revolution and Save Britain pamphlets. But only our party can see this crisis clearly, and that unemployment cannot be wrenched away from it and isolated. We are ducking the problem and the solution if we try to set it apart.

This Congress must produce a faithful picture of the current situation, and a strategy for meeting it in a revolutionary way, and must be able to express it clearly to the class.

MEETINGS

Meetings are a most important form of propaganda because:

1. They are alive, dynamic.
2. They enforce participation and involvement of contacts, because even if they don't speak, they have to be there, get themselves there.
3. They provide a chance for explanation and discussion, during or after the meeting.
4. They are flexible, you can choose topic according to needs and level of contacts. (But beware, flexibility can be liberalism - tell them what you want them to know.)

All branches should try to hold public meetings.

Those branches with bookshops must do so; this must be a primary function of Party premises.

Once the branch is ready to take it on, a series of public meetings can be useful. In London we run series of ten weekly meetings, set round a theme, with all the titles decided and speakers discussing together before the series starts.

Comrades in Croydon ran a series of three fortnightly meetings for local contacts.

Size and Attendance

Size is relative. A meeting is only "small" if the number expected don't turn up. A meeting of two or three is fine if the two or three expected turn up and the meeting is well run. Those few will be the basis for larger meetings in the future, and the special people you hope to spend a lot of time on and recruit.

Don't expect the masses to flock in, and don't expect a leaflet or poster to bring them in. Random leafletting seldom attracts anyone to a meeting. People need to be invited, encouraged and dragged - bring them physically.

Format

You will decide on the size, formality and format, whether to allow time for discussion, etc. Always have a chairman (if you are a one-comrade branch be speaker and chairman), run the meeting in a businesslike, disciplined and planned way and keep it firmly under your control.

Whether on the platform or the floor, all comrades have a responsibility to the line and to the success of the meeting.

Usually it is advisable to take a collection. Financial support is a form of commitment.

Time

Don't let meetings ramble on into the night; it is better to close on a high note than to let them degenerate. Know when you intend to stop, and if desirable stop earlier, never much later. Informal discussion can continue afterwards.

Content

Obviously the branch must decide this. But remember all our meetings are called for one single purpose, to put and explain the Party's line. Build the meeting around this aim. Every topic must bear the seal of revolution, especially now.

LEAFLETS, POSTERS, STICKERS ETC.

Meetings and pamphlets serve the detailed, close, one to one contact work and recruitment of the Party. Branches also use leaflets, posters, etc. to reach a wider public and get the Party's name well known. This aim is important, and these methods necessary.

Branches should see such activities in the light of the Worker. Would it be as good - or better - to poster up the paper itself, or to spend an extra hour or so selling it in the street? Or (Worker schedules permitting) during a struggle at a factory to write it up and appear at the factory, with the Worker, article and all, rather than a leaflet?

Always bear in mind the many ways of using existing propaganda.

Posters and leaflets should be concise and sharp.

The main aim of a poster is to register the Party, so make its name stand out LARGE. Lettering with stencil or Letraset can be just as compelling as pictures, and unless you are a very good artist is usually much more so.

Leaflets should whet the appetite, not satiate. You can follow up with more solid material (conversation, meetings, pamphlets, Worker etc.).

Once you have alerted people by these more random methods, try to make the Party more closely available to them, especially by showing the Worker on the streets, in newsagents etc. Once they know of the Party they must be able to find it.

The response from branches to the national publication of the EEC leaflet was excellent, though it is a pity the Party was so late on this. The labour, cost of production and very heavy postage made it impossible to produce in London such large quantities as were needed. But many branches produced many more for themselves, and the Secretariat has gained some useful experience for the future.

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

1. No propaganda should be produced in the name of the Party without prior approval by the Secretariat. (Of course there are exceptions where something has to be produced and written overnight in response to an event, but as Communists we should foresee most things.) Material should be sent in in draft form, and a copy of the finished item sent in later for the files.

2. Under no circumstances may any propaganda on Ireland be issued without Secretariat approval, unless it is a direct reprint (without addition, omission or alteration) of a Worker article issued in or after the issue "Oppose the Act of Terrorism", or of an article in the pamphlet "Ireland, one nation".

3. While the Party is legal, all publications should bear the name of both printer and publisher. The address of the centre may be used rather than a local Party address. Most branches like to state which branch produced it.

4. Any comrade invited to speak at any public function (other than those organised by his Party branch or trade union) must consult with the Secretariat before accepting.

5. Reporting: It would have been interesting to know how many meetings had been by the Party, how many leaflets produced etc., since last Congress. But we can't because a vast amount of hard work goes unreported. For example, how many M-L societies in colleges run meetings under the absolute control of the Party that the Party doesn't know about? Don't deny the Party knowledge of its own achievements.

REPORT TO FOURTH PARTY CONGRESS ON THE WORKER

Prepared by the Editorial Committee

One of the decisions taken by our Party soon after its formation in 1968 was that the main Party organ would be a newspaper, not a theoretical magazine. In this way we would insure that our theory, Marxism-Leninism, was always applied to the concrete conditions of Britain. Theory and practice would not be separated; the theory would be in every news story we printed, determining its selection, guiding its treatment and informing its conclusions.

In the earliest issues of THE WORKER there is a tendency for international items to preponderate because the task of applying Marxism-Leninism to events outside Britain had already been done by others and we had yet to apply ourselves with sufficient insight and urgency to conditions in Britain itself.

The two principles which governed our attempts to grapple adequately with concrete conditions in Britain were drawn from the Party statement, "The British Working Class and Its Party", unanimously adopted by the Party's Second Congress and the supplementary statement, "Burning Questions for Our Party". In the introduction to "The British Working Class and Its Party" the Party Chairman, Reg Birch, says: "The struggle in Britain so constantly denigrated as 'economic' is as organic and necessary to revolution as the gun, just as is the fight for land, bread and liberty for the peasant in other lands. It is corrupting only if it becomes an attempt to live with the opposite class, the capitalist class." That has been the basis of our coverage of class struggle wherever it might occur and whatever forms it might take.

The complementary document, "Burning Questions", set forth the Party's analysis of classes in Britain, the polarisation into capitalist class and working class over several hundred years of capitalist development in what Marx calls the confrontation of "two great hostile camps, two great classes directly facing each other." This "two-class" analysis into working class, all those who sell their labour power for wages, and the capitalist class, those whose ownership and control of the means of production and the places of employment enabling them to traffic in wage slavery, provided the Party's ground for calling on workers to go straight for a working class revolution and the setting up of a dictatorship of the proletariat without any intervening stage.

These two revolutionary principles which the Party had evolved out of class struggle in Britain, the relation of day-to-day struggle over wages and conditions to revolutionary struggle and the solution to the question of who the working class in Britain really is, began to make the coverage of news in THE WORKER distinct from any other paper in Britain addressed to the working class.

At a conference on THE WORKER held at the Party Centre in May, 1970, the following conclusion was reached: "In our perspective for THE WORKER we start where the workers of Britain are now in order to be able to communicate with them at all. We want to get to the dictatorship of the proletariat. But to set up goals without showing how they can be reached through the day-to-day struggle, to use revolutionary language with no intention of beginning our revolutionary practice here and now in relation to the current situation is neo-revisionism. The link between where we are now and where we have to get to is provided by using those day-to-day struggles to change the ideology of the working class to the revolutionary ideology of Marxism-Leninism. The test of leadership is knowing how tomorrow's strike, tomorrow's redundancy battle, tomorrow's phoney 'workers' control' scheme or bogus election can be made to contribute to the revolutionising of the workers involved."

It was this necessary concern with applying our revolutionary theory to concrete conditions in Britain that began to give us a distinctive voice when we turned to events outside Britain. During the period since the last Congress the campaign saying NO TO THE COMMON MARKET is an example of this. The tremendous victory of the Vietnamese people over U.S. imperialism and its puppets not only provided us with encouragement for our own struggles here in Britain but also completely vindicated the principles of Peoples War which became the standard we could apply to all struggles of the world's peoples against imperialism, the struggle of the people of Ireland against British imperialism, the struggle of the peoples of Africa against all the imperialist powers operating there including now that competitor and sharer with the U.S. in imperialist world hegemony, the USSR, or any other liberation struggles.

REVIEW OF EVENTS IN BRITAIN SINCE THE LAST CONGRESS AS REFLECTED BY THE WORKER

In February, 1974, just before the Third Party Congress, the Tory Government was defeated as a result of its confrontation with working class over the Industrial Relations Act and the Phased wage-fixing. This defeat did not occur at the polls but in the mines, the docks and in engineering factories all over the country which were the bases from which engineers had been waging guerilla struggles over wages and conditions. Our own slogan in relation to the general election was TO HELL WITH THE ELECTIONS since massive abstention by workers would not be a negative but a positive act, showing that the working class was breaking with the false ideology of social democracy.

In March we launched an attack on the 'social contract' by which the new Labour Government was trying to exact concessions from the organised labour movement in exchange for the tearing up of the Industrial Relations Act which workers had destroyed themselves. Indeed, the final end of the Industrial Relations Act came in May, 1974, with AUEW strikes against the sequestration of union funds under a leadership provided by our own Party which forced the Government to dream up an 'unknown donor' in the analogy of the 'official solicitor' who had been invented before.

In April it was pointed out that there could be no contract between a capitalist government and a working class so long as that class was acting on its own ideology. What the contract called for was an end to class struggle, hence our slogan CONTRACT OUT! It was the counter attack to end class struggle which was to lead to our deepening the offensive to be launched in turn by warning our working class that class struggle was not enough.

In the May Day issue, under a heading of Revolutionary Progression--the October Revolution, the Cultural Revolution, Revolution in Britain--we began to draw attention to the importance not just for us here but for the working class movement generally of the question of revolution or counter-revolution in Britain. As our Chairman put it in the last issue of 1975: "A social revolution in Britain will transform the world. If this working class of ours achieves power, no other capitalist power anywhere will be safe. But if the British working class is defeated, it will react on the working class everywhere."

In October, 1974, we mounted our second campaign against working class participation in a general election with the slogan DON'T VOTE--PREPARE FOR REVOLUTION. But history never repeats itself in identical terms and in using the same arguments and slogans as before we failed to rise to the occasion of the massive threat to the working class of capitalism's counter-attack channelled through a social democratic government. DON'T VOTE--UNITE TO REPEL COUNTER-REVOLUTION would have suited the situation more exactly. After the election we described the result as one of "no change" but in fact an increase of the mandate, however slight, for the Labour Party, the main vehicle for advancement to the corporate state, was a change for the worse and was part of the same defeat for our class as acquiescence in the social contract.

Earlier in May, 1974, we had hailed as an advance the moving into action of new sections of the working class, nurses, hospital workers, doctors, local and national government employees. But on the whole our working class was not rising to meet the challenge of a situation of our own making, not realising that the social contract had to be smashed not side-stepped. Our only contract, as socialists, was our contract with history to liberate ourselves and all men from wage slavery.

In November we continued to develop the struggle for a working class ideology, THE WAR IN THE MIND, pointing out that capitalism cannot be destroyed until workers, by an intellectual revolution, have broken the grip of social democracy on their thinking.

In June and again in December, 1974, there were major statements by our Party Chairman on Ireland, the first reiterating the demand TROOPS OUT at the time of the reactionary political strike called by the Ulster Workers' Council and the second OPPOSE THIS ACT OF TERRORISM linking Britain's imperialist acts in Ireland with attacks on the working class in Britain.

In the September, 1974, issue our Chairman wrote a critical account of the TUC annual conference, a body to which he was to be elected a year later himself by the vote of representatives of the working class.

In the first issue of 1975 A CRITICAL YEAR FOR THE WORKING CLASS we pointed out that workers must recognise that class struggle, the struggle for wages, while necessary as ever was not enough. We cannot go on fighting in the capitalist arena at a time when the capitalist class has shown THEY CAN'T AFFORD THIS WORKING CLASS. We also began developing the theme that the capitalist ruling class was showing itself willing to destroy Britain in order to destroy the organised working class. The flight to Europe was an expression of this tendency.

This theme of the destruction of Britain, including the de-industrialisation of the big manufacturing centres was developed in such slogans as ONLY SOCIALISM CAN SAVE BRITAIN, NO SOCIALISM WITHOUT REVOLUTION and, putting the alternatives as starkly as they were beginning to appear, SOCIALISM OR FASCISM. This line was summed up in the January issue of this year (1976): The Only Future for Britain A SOCIALIST FUTURE: We Must Save Britain from Capitalism.

This was a development from the position that it is not the working class's responsibility to make capitalism work. We were not saying that we must save capitalism from itself but that we must save Britain from capitalism. This idea could be seen at work in the Crosfield occupation led by our own Party members in April 1975 and developed into the line taken over Chrysler early in 1976.

The reasoning behind this development had been set forth in an editorial in the June, 1975, issue--CPB(ML) FOR AN INDEPENDENT BRITAIN. Growing out of the campaign against Britain's membership of the EEC had come a fuller understanding that "nationality is the essential genius of working people who in a particular place over a considerable period of time have developed their peculiar skills and arts for the enrichment of life both materially and spiritually." Since profits have no nationality the ruling class was willing to write off Britain and it was for the working class to defend it. This led to the November, 1975, headline WE MADE BRITAIN: WE MUST SAVE IT around which the last series of public meetings at the Party Centre took place.

Throughout 1975 we were applying to events the May Day slogan, FROM DEFENCE TO ATTACK. In spite of the promise that, first, the election of a Labour Government, and second, entry into EEC, would prevent unemployment, over a million and a half were out of work. The fight in defence of what has been won in past struggles, because capitalism can no longer afford it, is revolutionary. Whether it's the right to work, the right of collective bargaining or resistance to cuts in health, education or housing, any struggle for what can only be preserved at the expense of destroying the capitalist system is a revolutionary struggle. The culmination up till now of this realisation of the revolutionary character of active defence came in the NO TO THE CUTS issue

of March this year, illustrated by the single vote of absolute rejection of the cuts by our Party Chairman in the TUC.

In a time of such vicious counter-attacks against our working class it was right to draw attention in the January 26th 1976 issue to our revolutionary blessings--the lessons of 200 years of class struggle, the complete polarisation of class forces in this the oldest capitalist country and, most important of all, the embodiment of working class ideology in the Party of the working class the CPB(ML). Lenin has said that the working class is revolutionary or it is nothing. There could be no clearer indication of the task of our Party and its paper.

ALL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORKER HAS TO
BE ON POLITICAL GROUNDS

The main question for those primarily responsible for bringing out the Party paper, as for the Party generally, is getting the line right. A correct political line combining the Party's revolutionary theory and working class practice is for THE WORKER everything. When we have solved that problem (not finally, of course, but for a particular situation) everything else can be got right. If it is not solved then, from a revolutionary point of view, nothing will be right. This is because the correct political line simply is the proper application to the concrete conditions of Britain of the revolutionary theory which ultimately derives from working class experience of struggle. Our line is the mass line.

In the last half of 1975 and the beginning of 1976 there was an improvement in THE WORKER's development of this line based on the fact that a better collective style of work had been established on the editorial side. Inevitably this was reflected in a better overall appearance of the paper and, even, in better work throughout the various production stages.

If we get the line right, if we say the right thing to our class in terms of how to handle the current situation in a revolutionary way, not to believe that we will also find the means of getting the message across and that they will receive and act on it is to have contempt both for our Party and our class. This main task of finding precisely the right thing to say is not easy but it is simplified by the fact based on dialectical materialism that "at any one time there can be only one central task, supplemented by other tasks of a second or third order of importance". It is these questions that we have to be most concerned with and questions of appearance, of including more pictures, more entertaining or attractive material and so forth are subordinate.

Some of those who have been most critical of THE WORKER in respect to purely superficial aspects have made the smallest contribution in terms of answering the important question in the context of working class experience in their area. Indeed their criticisms and their suggestions have themselves been an attack on the

Party line and what, in terms of that line, the Party paper should be. Getting the line right is not the sole charge of those most directly charged with responsibility for the Party paper but rests on every Party member.

THE WORKER has to be seen as a case of democratic centralism. Every member of the Party has the right and duty to submit articles, comments, suggestions and criticisms. That is the democratic aspect. But when the paper actually comes out it has to be read, defended and sold without argument or reservation. That is the centralist aspect. With each issue the democratic centralist process is repeated.

Every time we have made a change in the production of THE WORKER it has been on political grounds. The real reason for changing from dependence on outside firms like Sharmans or Quickstavers for the printing of our paper was that these firms began to exercise censorship on the excuse of avoiding libel charges. The same difficulty could arise in having plates made by an outside firm and this aspect of production, too, we must bring under our direct control.

The question of making THE WORKER a weekly paper is also a political, not a journalistic, production or personnel problem. We would go weekly because the objective situation of the working class demanded it and because it was the only way we could accomodate all the articles, correct in line, which were pouring in from our nationwide branches dealing with that situation, and also because our membership was feeling the need of a new paper after selling so many copies of the old in the first week of its publication. At the Third Party Congress we set ourselves two concrete tasks -- to double Party membership and to double WORKER sales. The second of these two tasks has certainly not been fulfilled.

This failure is connected with the conditions for going weekly. If our Party were so clear on its line and so full of revolutionary zeal that members were, in effect, queuing up to be able to contribute from their own area of struggle to our leadership of the working class through the Party paper, then we would have to go weekly and that same zeal would ensure that our weekly paper got into the hands of more and more of those "skilled class warriors" we have to have with us in our revolutionary mission.

No technical nor personnel problems stand in the way of a weekly paper -- only the level of our revolutionary commitment as Marxist-Leninists. May this Fourth Party Congress see that level raised to the point at which we can get on with the tremendous historic task before us and all that such a task entails.

FROM TEACHERS' COMMITTEE - REPORT TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
IN PREPARATION FOR CONGRESS.

1. STATE OF THE COMMITTEE

Significant advance has been made in the Teachers' Committee since last Congress.

Greater involvement of Party teachers in mass struggle has lead to vigorous debates in the Committee and the outcome has been a high degree of unity and a much higher political level than before.

The Committee, in which all Party teachers are invited to play a part, has increased in size, partly because of recruitment and partly because more Party teachers, both inside London and outside, have been drawn into the work. All Party teachers are now involved, though some a lot more than others and this problem needs attention.

The work of the Committee has enabled THE WORKER to deal regularly and forcefully with all questions involving teachers and education. On the Committee's initiative the Party released a statement on education cuts on 7th June 1975 and subsequently the Committee produced a pamphlet which the Party published ("For Education; A Revolutionary Struggle").

The Committee has improved its coordination of Party work in the NUT and the NATFHE and has sought to use THE WORKER in this regard. It has endeavoured to encourage study of the history of the Unions and the struggle for education as well as keeping abreast of current developments. It reviews the sales of THE WORKER and other literature to teachers.

The Committee has improved its organisation. It meets regularly three times a year. Agenda for and reports of meetings are sent to all Party teachers. The Committee has set up a Steering Committee to organise the practical work, deal with day to day business, and to prepare the meetings of the full Committee.

The Committee has advanced from a narrow concern with the interests of teachers to the question of the education service and the class as a whole. SNAC will be involved in a similar development and so there needs to be more exchange between the two Committees.

2. INVOLVEMENT IN THE UNION

The Committee has always encouraged a broader and deeper involvement in the mass organisations in education.

The Party is now represented at many levels of the NUT throughout England. (As yet we have no contact in Wales and only a tenuous contact with the EIS in Scotland). All are active members to a greater or less extent. We have school representatives, local association committee members, local association officers (including 3 Presidents in 1975), Divisional Council members. In 1973 the Party first made an appearance at national level when two members attended the NUT Annual Conference. In 1974 we again had two delegates. In 1975 we had 7 delegates and we managed to create quite an impact. At the forthcoming '76 Conference 10 Party members will be in attendance. We have made another important advance since last Congress - a Party member is currently standing in election to the National Executive of the Union.

The Committee sees this increasing involvement as imperative in our task of detaching the Union from Social Democracy and making it a conscious force for revolution. There are

nonetheless great dangers. It is easy to become intoxicated by the social democratic climate, swamped by routine Union work, to cease working in a revolutionary way, and to neglect the task of popularising the Party and its distinctive line. In the latter task, THE WORKER must play a crucial role.

3. THE PARTY AND TEACHERS' STRUGGLE SINCE THIRD CONGRESS

The London Allowance campaign which concluded in September 1974 was a great victory. That victory paved the way for a redress of teachers' salaries nationally. But that salaries redress was bought at the expense of severe political setback. In 1974 the NUT handed over its responsibility for teachers' salaries to a Government Review Committee (the Houghton Committee). In 1975 it referred its salary claim to arbitration, and in 1976 it accepted the Government's £6 limit.

The Union has allowed the Government to drive a wedge between higher salaries and better provision for the education service. While the Houghton Committee was advancing its modest and craftily structured salary increases the Government was imposing and planning further strictures on education. The Union muted its protest on education cuts when salary advances were being offered. Now it offers a sacrifice on salaries on condition that education cuts are not too severe.

The current erosion of British Trade Union democracy has found expression in the NUT. On publication of the Government's £6 pay policy the NUT executive immediately voted to accept in spite of its being in flat contradiction with salary policy as laid down by Conference, supreme body of the Union. The NUT delegation subsequently voted for the policy at the TUC Congress and the Executive with little protest from the mass proceeded with a £6 claim and settled in Burnham, ignoring Union rule which required such action to be endorsed by Special Conference of the Union.

Our Party was alone amongst political organisations in hailing the London Allowance settlement as a victory. The mass agreed with us. Our Party was the only organisation to call for a rejection of Houghton. In this we were completely isolated from the mass, most of whom wanted to take the money and run. The Union had surrendered the initiative and slid into a passivity from which it has yet to fully recover. Only in Scotland was any spirit displayed over Houghton.

Despite this clarity the Teachers' Committee began to suffer from a malaise which had been contracted during the London Allowance campaign. We saw that issue almost exclusively as a salaries question and ignored the wider question of the education service. Because of our preoccupation with a wages struggle we were slow to appreciate the rapidly developing new situation in Britain. We had not comprehended the strategy of the capitalist class, we had not appreciated the gravity of the situation, we had not appreciated the full significance of the current series of education cuts, and so had failed to emphasise the most significant component of the London Allowance struggle.

Because of this uncertainty the production of a new pamphlet was delayed, but with help from the secretariat the Committee managed to rectify its errors. Through the Committee the Party issued the statement on education cuts which met the new situation. With its line now clear the Committee was able to proceed with a pamphlet.

When the Government announced its £6 pay policy the Party was the only organisation to immediately denounce it before the teaching profession. While others floundered in assessing its monetary terms we were able to point out its real political significance - the imposition of a pay policy from without. The question of the £6 limit was elevated to a defence

of Union democracy and sovereignty. The importance of this question, however, has not been appreciated by all Party teachers and the protests arriving at Union head-quarters have been too few.

Our line in education has been "opposition to all cuts". This line has thwarted those who would have us discuss priorities and thereby impose cuts on "expendable" areas. Our line has united all. There have been encouraging signs of protest parents, pupils, trade unionists have all been involved and, more significantly, in this new situation, so too have local authorities, business communities and now even the employers are beginning to show concern. The Party can play a leading role in this development. So long as the unity is principled there are many we can encourage to join us.

4. LABOUR PARTY, REVISIONISTS, TROTSKYISTS.

The NUT has succumbed, though not convincingly to the overtures of the Labour Government. It has accepted the social contract and the £6 limit, and in its opposition to education cuts has generally reserved its vehemence for those "Conservative" authorities who have flown kites for the Government and attempted to implement particularly vicious cuts. The Union has chased the hare of "Comprehensivisation" and fallen for the policy of "positive discrimination". Although such subservience is due primarily to the ideological weakness of the mass of teachers we have seen increasingly cavalier activity amongst those "generals" who owe a misplaced allegiance to the Labour Party.

Meanwhile, Trotskyists and Revisionists have played a leading role in attempts to curtail guerrilla struggle. New disciplinary measures, which include immediate suspension from the Union, are proposed for those who undertake "industrial action" without the prior approval of the Executive. The proposals are the offspring of the incestuous liaison between Trotskyists and Revisionists. The Trotskyists deliberately create an atmosphere of internecine strife and engage in deliberately ill-conceived action. The Revisionists immediately pose as guardians of "collective discipline". The outcome is an erosion of Union democracy and local initiative but is relished by the Trotskyists because they can then claim of their Executive, "see how bad they are". The outcome is also relished by the Revisionists because it gives added credibility to their strategy of lying low, ingratiating themselves with social democrats, and surreptitiously electing a "left" to the generalship. And then "hey presto" all will be changed. Ironically, all attempts to stamp out guerrilla struggle only make it more appropriate.

In the struggle for education the Council for Educational Advance and other bodies of liaison have shown some initiative in involving the whole working class. This is good and we should support it. However, we should beware of social democratic (particularly revisionist) attempts to refer all to the CEA. Their aim is to foster a division between the immediate interests of teachers and the wider interest in education, and further, to deny the place of work as a key arena of combat.

5. ROOTS OF OUR LINE.

There were three teachings of "The British Working Class and its Party" which have been the focus of struggle within the Committee and which have proved to be crucial to our work.

(i) Teachers are part of the working class. This has now been well accepted although it is sometimes applied in a mechanical way. More attention must now be given to the particular characteristics of this section of the working class and to

the particular characteristics of their tasks. The two class analysis assumes a particular current importance when the Labour Government is trying to drive a wedge between "productive" workers and "public" employees, such as teachers.

(ii) The struggle for education is organic to revolution. Our understanding that education is a right and a weapon for the working class and that the provision of education has always entailed a struggle enabled us to declare, "opposition to all education cuts". The line, now seldom aired, that education is "bourgeois" would have led us to applaud the Government cuts.

The struggle for education is now taking on, more and more, the characteristics of a revolutionary struggle. The ruling class cannot afford to live with it; the working class cannot afford to live without it.

(iii) The Trade Unions belong to the working class. The NUT and NATFHE are basically democratic and sovereign bodies. Their fortunes rest ultimately with the mass. A major task is to defend and promote the democracy and sovereignty of the Unions. Our strength lies in the mass base we build. If "leaders" attempt to thwart genuine advance we will have to learn how to outwit and to outgun them. We must make use of every contradiction, and be infinitely flexible in our tactics.

6. OUR PRESENT TASKS.

In the present situation where the working class has apparently retreated from struggle it is tempting to muffle our call for revolution and choose an objective much more modest. This would be disastrous. The situation today is marked by great fluidity and rapid change. Today there are only two roads; revolution or counter-revolution and they stand out in stark contrast. There is no room for the gradualist, short-sighted, self-effacing approach. If we condescend to the working class then we follow in the wake of the revisionists and assist the gathering counter-revolution.

The working class, and teachers therein, have the experience, the wisdom, and the capacity for revolution. The Party's task is to convince them of it, and to urge them to seize the opportunity.

Feb. '76.

CPBML FOURTH CONGRESS 1976.

WORLD CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

Marx constantly predicted continual and absolute decline. Many said this was wrong since capitalism 'recovered' from one crisis after another. The recovery was always relative not absolute. Capitalism never expanded in an overall form, the triumph in one area is the decline in another to the dismay of those national capitalist suffering.

Always at all times the decline was at the expense of the people, be they peasant or proletarian. Never in 'upsurge' (always only relative never absolute) no advantage accrued to the people once the ascendancy of capitalist forces over feudal forces was absolute. From this moment of peak capitalism began its decline. The struggle of the proletariat and the dialectical development of the force for socialism commenced. From this moment in capitalist history their capitalist troubles assumed a fundamental nature unresolvable in co'existence, their death was rung.

That this is a piece of obvious history is known. That it is a time of some length in the past is also known. That it has prolonged the longevity of the capitalist system is a fact; what is not accepted is that the longevity of this, an anachronist system sustained, was because of the backwardness of the opposing force, the proletariat.

It is precisely because this backwardness has been overcome in some areas, particularly Albania and China, and the shaping toward absolute dictatorship of the proletariat, an essential for socialism, that now the crisis of world capitalism is absolute-the decline absolute.

The crisis is now as sharp because of the growing strength of socialist countries.

The most devastating setback to the working class in struggle in all their weakness was the new revisionist 'Power' of a former socialist country USSR. It was in its coming a necessary shot of adrenalin to a dying capitalism prolonging and postponing its expiration date.

It also not only created great confusion among political parties purporting to serve workers, but comforted in its confusion the indecision and downright political cowardice within the ranks of the working class in the old world Europe and especially in Britain.

This lives with us today and we are a part of it.

Such a phenomenon, development, did not deter all the forces, viz Albania and China, though it created for them great difficulties, slowed the speed of their development and still represents an ideological threat within and military without.

The emergence of true Marxist forces elsewhere was and is slow especially in Britain. We should not be dismayed, but know the cause; in Britain an especial landmark in reaction here was 'The British Road' preceeding the showing, disclosure of New Revisionism in the USSR.

cont/

Europe is a specially complex circumstance. It requires special study, for within it there are remnants of feudalism, a mixture of peasantry, proletariat, capitalism, monarchy, in parts feudal monarchy, and dictatorship. An uneven development industrially and in agriculture, and an uneven decline. An uneven force of working class. And an especially potent dangerous force of Revisionism.

The forces of Marxism-Leninism in Europe are woefully weak.

This must be appreciated. As the capitalist crisis develops there will yet be a perceiving of the force of socialism which is accelerating and exacerbating this decline.

This phenomenon once perceived will create even greater problems in these socialist countries, and may even create internal difficulties as well as external, only to be relieved by a developing force for socialism elsewhere.

Our duty as a party is clear. For our party there is but one world.

The divisive force is class. The division in Britain; working class- capitalist class, the expropriated and the expropriator, the exploited and the exploited.

THE DEBATE ON DETENTE

Is detente a sham? Is it some perfidious plot by the New Revisionists, the more easily to seize Europe and perhaps the world?

No. It does not exist. US imperialism has no detente with anyone. Neither has the USSR, not even in Comecon. The sham detente from within the USSR is as much to do with the collapse of the building of socialism within the USSR and the internal contradictions because of it as for any external pressures and external contradictions. Those who say, if they do, beware of the imperialist designs of the USSR state the obvious.

Great vigilance must be used by our party to guard against the promulgation of a philosophy of co-existence in order to save Britain and Europe from the USSR. To save it for the bourgeoisie. It is the reverse of Krushchev revisionism, hence it is the same- revisionism. Just as Krushchev brandished the Yankee atom bomb as a fear so can be the atom bomb of so called 'social' imperialism.

In Britain the working class has no bourgeois ally nor is it likely, whatever the contradictions among the bourgeoisie, to have a force from within the bourgeoisie as a progressive breakaway. In this matter the progressive force we have is the working class, it is the only force, it stands alone. When as must be the Russian mass make a new revolution then shall you see no detente.

At present the New Imperialist of USSR and USA Imperialism stand poised as cut throats waiting on the other to be off guard. The meantime they drive to pastures new and old as before. This with the connivance of each national bourgeoisie.

cont/

The division of the world into 1,2,3, is artificial and mechanistic, and there are especial dangers inherent within the so-called developing countries and within the liberation struggles today; no true liberation can be achieved within this one world without the strong development of Marxist forces. Internationally is this so but even more nationally.

No emancipation and true liberation can be completed in alliances alone of shifting class forces; in finality only the peasant and proletariat can achieve liberation for it is they who are slave.

I believe our party is still a school for revolutionaries, a nursery school with too few pupils. With education and conviction we shall produce revolutionaries separately and together capable, a great Marxist force to lead to Revolution for Britain.

WHAT SHOULD AN INDUSTRIAL BUREAU DO?

How should it be made up? It must provide the political context of the two class exposition, so it is required that there shall be representatives of manual, clerical, and technical and professional cadres i.e. tradesmen, medical, white collar, teachers, students.

It should meet monthly of smaller numbers and bimonthly of the whole. It is not its function to advise on trade union working and rectification of injustices within these bodies in connection with economic struggles and the indifference to such within the unions locally.

It is not to be an information bureau or a Who's Who of the labour movement. It must seek at all times to direct all struggle to political action, to Revolution.

As we have said before we have little to teach the working class on struggle with the employer or within the unions, yet we have much to learn. Further new forms are emerging and less struggle also. As the struggle diminishes in its elementary wage form new forces emerge, with a theory pragmatic of different ways to fight, potentially reactionary and basically by-passing real struggle.

The industrial bureau must not qualify in political need of struggle and leadership thereof yet must caution against sectarianism and take in its stride the superficial and contemporary struggle.

We lack conviction that in all places of work, be it shipyard or office, if we be as far as possible the leaders in the daily battle then the mass will come to accept us and our communism. We must say today what the mass will come to do tomorrow.

The bureau has so far failed for many reasons. First its narrow base. The concept of veteran leaders, old trusted shop stewards, whose medals have been won in this and that strike. All strikes end, and old soldiers fade away.

To look for new action as a claim for political place and leadership is false, and this period becomes more local, more parish pump, smaller and petty, not national leadership.

cont/

The bureau must raise the question what is the direction of mass struggle where it exists and change the direction. The bureau must discern the present policy of unions separately and as a whole labour movement and change it. The bureau must assist and advise on caretakerships of the machinery of the working class, the trade unions, a dying machinery.

It must discuss in detail how to advise about and implement the line, how shall it be done? This is not worked out but must be if it is to be real.

It must marry all the party force in all the separate spheres of industry to one common direction. The direction of struggle within industry, all of it, is the working class- for good or ill presently sick; fragmented and divided.

There is the question to be answered of the nationalised industry, of 'private' and 'mixed' economy, of worker participation, All of this is the problem for the bureau.

It is not a trade union recruiting centre or an advisory body on labour legislation. It should not seek to do the work of a trade union but assist those within the union to make the union do its work: very primitive and elementary work it is too.

We shall not accumulate a series of "stars" who shall win or lose an Upper Clyde fight and become famous or infamous.

We are a party involved in one sole task, to make revolution. It is a long, hard thankless, unglamorous task, and we shall lose some and gain better. All its advice shall be available to The Worker and the C.C. conversely.

It has initially certain elementary administrative tasks which should be undertaken without fuss or great labour lest it become a substitute for a political role. There must be on this point a compilation of all the separate pieces of the labour movement, a calendar of the events which fall in regularity, i.e. the national and local meetings, conferences, committees. It must compile a divination of the contemporary policy and direction of the unions, of the TUC, of the Labour Party nationally, of the Parliamentary Party also. Understand it, and warn.

THE PARTY.

The party is still in a very formative stage. It is not yet mature. It was not until the Second Congress that a true programme emerged. This in itself is indicative of immaturity.

The background of the emergence of the party was against a furor of international and internal polemic. Here in Britain it was late beginning mostly because of a long improper understanding of the meaning of Leninist democracy, of democratic centralism.

The acceptance of our party, in some circles is still rejected, for this reason alone; it is regarded as an heretic, as a break-away.

In its embryo beginning it took on an artificial characteristic, a debating forum. This is still with us in an infantile form.

There is a symptom of not belonging, it is very evident from time to time in expression, "the party should", seldom we.

cont/..

It is also accompanied by an absolute lack of what we are doing in our branches, in our parish etc. No plan, no expression of experience in work of gain and setback, and no forward planning. Frequently criticism is used as a substitute for work and is in itself a diversion from task, a deviation and by its very nature dishonest. It is noticeable that in cases the most vocal labour the least.

Some most ardent in correcting the line, in stating the obvious deficiency and demanding it be put right, pass by without acknowledgement the unequal labouring of others, especially so when the task undertaken is considered in bourgeois description. We still carry on the debating forum part of our beginning, now in a safe society form and the less sincere because of it.

This manifestation is disturbing, for it causes us to think, is our party treated as a debating club, is our political interest a hobby because we give the time to it? Do we have fun, do we form cliques to observe the discomfiture of the party by our artificial opposition, for the party is always guilty because always inadequate? It is as though we are not in it, the party, but if of it detached, that we are the policeman, keeping order on a recalcitrant party.

The party must demand self sufficiency, self reliance within the line in all localities in all branches. The caretaker, the director of the whole, the C.C.

The labour movement is in process of awesome dangerous change. The disaffection within the parliamentary parties is the nucleus of a new fascist force which will no doubt take on a very subtle and sophisticated character, not a vulgar symptom of a new fascist party and new leaders though we shall also see this form as well most probably as a feint. What is now being enacted is the transformation of the establishment of a bourgeois democracy.. well directed, well planned and it will find many allies. The working class is assisting this process. We see the development of a parallelism in trade union machinery of ad hoc and self appointed committees and leaders, a neglect of the machinery and its by passing, and a dangerous development of company style unionism. This is not a progressive phenomenon but a dangerous one.

It comes from a design and is being adopted by the workers consciously and unconsciously. It comes also because of the unions having begun to outlive their usefulness as a defensive weapon and having adopted the role of collaborators or policemen to the bourgeois state.

We must perhaps find ourselves as a caretaker of a fast emptying house; the more easily shall we seize the property and destroy it. We want not a "save the unions" campaign but seizing of the assets material and human.

In this new fast developing period we must expect to see greater and greater inroads of normal civil liberties, the necessary apparatus and ingredient which makes up a bourgeois state.

We will be harried and hunted as subversives, will be made illegal so long as we adhere to our task, revolution, Marxism Leninism. (See Robert Mark on soldiers and terrorism- he does not mean Irishmen, he means us, the revolutionaries.)

That is why the party must be educated, dedicated, disciplined, monolithic. Without we shall not survive.

Cont/..

There must be established now regional bodies whether they be termed Districts or otherwise. The leadership of such must be the representatives of the C.C. Where more than one is available then one representative shall be the secretary. One the chairman.

The new C.C. must demand a report at each session of The Worker editorial body, its political direction and its discussion, especially its variants. The Worker committee shall render account of its personnel, of its labours, of its numbers and division of work. The C.C. shall remove if they exist the time servers, non-labourers.

The C.C. shall meet six times at least annually. It shall not tolerate absenteeism or deviation once a decision is made (not even in silence). It shall put down gossip and any member of the C.C. participating shall be removed.

It shall make a tally of its numbers and of the separate labours of its personnel. No member shall remain who has no given task or fails to labour.

The Secretariat shall be appointed by the C.C. the numbers also decided by C.C. No member shall be appointed except the comrade shall have an actual task for the party not confined to the Secretariat, such a task not alone to be one of intellect, an actual task. No absentee shall remain.

The time and frequency of its meeting to be determined by the members of the Secretariat but not less than fortnightly. It shall report its work decisions and proposals to the C.C.

It shall also report to the C.C. any divisions within its committee.

"Man's dearest possession is life, it is given to him but once, and he must live it so as to feel no torturing regrets for wasted years, never know the burning shame of a mean and petty past; so live that, dying, he might say: all my life, all my strength were given to the finest cause in all the world - the fight for the Liberation of Mankind."

Nikolai Ostrovsky

"HOW THE STEEL WAS TEMPERED"

The triumph of the industrial revolution in Britain heralded the birth of a new world order, the epoch of capitalism for where we led others were compelled to follow. But having reached its zenith capitalism may advance in one area only to the detriment of another, the triumph of one national bourgeoisie means always the discomfiture of its rivals, and in all places at all times it is at the expense of the people. With the final victory over feudalism the battle with the emerging proletarian forces comes to the fore, the struggle for socialism begins. The capitalist star is everywhere in decline, and most apparently in this the oldest of industrial countries. 'The workshop of the world' is an industrial graveyard. Britain, which Marx could once describe as 'the demiurge of the bourgeois cosmos' is now 'the sick man' of world capitalism, providing us with the clearest demonstration obtaining anywhere of 'the fatal stranglehold which capitalist property relations place upon the social forces of production.

The long long stagnation of Britain must surely, of dialectical necessity, presage the end of the existing order and the emergence of a new. It is apparent that our rulers are unfit to govern, that social distress is the goal of their economic system, that their sole palliative for suffering is greater suffering, that they will certainly destroy us if we stay our hand.

Nowhere are the class lines more starkly drawn than in Britain.

The division of society into two as it has developed here has no parallel. This is the most proletarian of countries; here it has been most clearly shown that the prosperity of a nation rests upon the skill and ingenuity of its people, for Britain has few resources; fertile soils and a benign climate, fossil fuels, and above all a highly skilled populace. But all of these are subject to the use and abuse of our ruling class, to be squandered or destroyed at the behest of capital.

We are nothing and we should be everything!

The old world has nothing further to offer, its possibilities are totally exhausted, the new world beckons. All the contradictions of the global crisis of capitalism find their focus here in Britain, the place of their birth.

We were the first modern proletariat, once again we must lead: the opportunity is ours, if we only seize it others will follow as before.

The proposition of the ruling class is that British cannot survive economically as an island. In other words cannot produce full employment, economic growth and profit except as a part of a larger economic bloc- Europe. But the crisis of Britain is also the crisis of Europe, in fact the whole capitalist world. There is no economic ill that is peculiar to Britain and does not effect every other capitalist country to a greater or lesser degree, unemployment, inflation, reduced living standards- the lot.

No amount of juggling can affect this. So long as capitalism remains its effects will be seen and felt both by nations separate or organised into economic blocs.

Why cannot Britain sustain itself as an island. ? What is lacking ? There is no lack of anything necessary to provide the workers with full employment and improved standards of living. There is seemingly too much of everything including workers. Hence cuts.

Every basic industry is shedding manpower. Iron and steel, and every energy producing industry as well as transport and communication. In no instance is this because of any shortage of raw materials.

So we have an abundance of the most highly skilled manpower in the world, so much so that there are probably as many skilled people in unskilled occupations as in skilled.

In terms of raw materials there is no overall shortage, Such raw materials as we lack are available in the world in exchange for the products that we are best at producing.

In terms of agriculture we are the best mechanised. There are also resources of land which allied to advanced agricultural technique could assure all the food requirement of the country. So all the conditions exist to provide all that is needed without any surrender of independence. Except one. That is the condition in which all resources of all kinds can be organised in the interest of the working class. They cannot be so organised while they are the property of those who have no interest in the working class other than to exploit them for profit when it suits them or when they are able to do so. It follows therefore, that ownership of all our resources must pass from these hands to the workers who have no possible interest in unused economic resources.

Such an organisation of resources with its social implications is Socialism. It follows that we must get across to our class these two things. First that capitalism doesn't work and that socialism does.

It is a view, widely held, that the present economic and social distress will be short-lived, is but the uncomfortable prelude to another period of prosperity and well-being. No doubt the wish was father to the thought, no doubt that within our class there is a yearning to live in peace with our exploiters, for a quiet life, but it is a dangerous thought. 'Let him who desires peace prepare for war.' The very means of our existence is being destroyed, the sheer scale and speed of the razing of British industry beggars all description. We are a manufacturing nation; the working up of raw materials into finished goods, has long been the basis of our cultural identity and material welfare, there is no other course compatible with life in Britain; we cannot revert to a peasant existence. The unchecked and wanton destruction of manufacturing capacity is the destruction of our class, for we are industry.

Between the years 1963 and 73 the number of locomotives was cut by a third, the number of freight and steel carrying wagons by more than 40% and the track shrank from 17,500 miles to 11,300 miles. The government have now decreed that only 4,000 miles are to exist in the future and that of 265,000 now employed 170,000 must find other work. Can anyone conceive of a modern industrial country without railways?

Let us turn to shipbuilding. Once more than half the worlds ships were launched in British yards. In 1955 the proportion was still more than a quarter. By 1973, however, the figure was just 3.6%

In textiles, another staple British industry the number of spindles fell, between 1963 and 1973, from 13M to less than 6M. Imports of woven cloth and synthetic fibre in 1970 were almost 40% by volume of the materials for home use. The comparable figure for 1974 was 57.3%

Steel presents an equally alarming picture. Production has been cut since 1970 by 8,191 tonnes; nearly a third. Imports stand now at 4.5M tonnes and plans are afoot to cut production further.

Next coal, so much a part of our history. Coal is being imported at prices greater than those obtaining at our own pitheads while many of our mines are filling with water. 221M tonnes were mined in Britain in 1955. In 1964, 184M. Today, with rising demand, output is only 126M tonnes. The present rate of exhaustion of mines will allow a mere 80M tonnes to be produced by 1980.

Unless we do something about it!

Britain is being destroyed and we should not suppose that this is in anyway the result of ignorance on the part of our rulers. Nor can it honestly be said that we, the working class, are unaware of the present position! But only from us can come the necessary action to redeem the present desperate situation.

We made Britain. We alone can save it.

(Or more for less)

A more competitive industry has long been the call of the economic managers of British capitalism. Our goods, they said, were too expensive because the workers demanded too much in wages. But had the capitalist class been less greedy they might well have invested the revenue from production in more advanced machinery to enhance output. Had they been more far-sighted they might well have cut their dividend to this end, but in reality they have not even replaced the capital equipment consumed in the production process. This capital has been withdrawn from the reproductive cycle for investment abroad or in the 'candyfloss' industries where a higher rate of profit might appertain.

Too often the seed corn has merely been consumed and irretrievably lost.

Investment in the private sector in 1970 amounted to 3½% of the gross national product. This proportion is declining. In 1972 it was a mere 2½%. Because so little has been invested over an extended period it is estimated that at least 10% of manufacturing output must now be re-invested every year simply to make good the annual wear and tear.

Yet, investment fell once again last year, in real terms, by 13%. Further, a recent Department of Industry survey showed that manufacturing industry was planning to cut its investment in plant, machinery, buildings and vehicles next year by another 5 to 8%.

Every year dividends rise and investment falls.

.....

GOVERNMENT POLICY

On the basis that 'bigger equates with better', government policy has been the promotion of amalgamation of capitals as in the formation of A.E.I. and British Leyland, for example. In practice, far from strengthening industry this has meant easy pickings for the pariahs of modern society, the asset-strippers and property speculators. It has meant the destruction of skills, of productive capacity and of jobs. And, of course, to ease the process the government produced such socially advanced legislation as the Redundancy Payment Act (1965), designed to make being redundant very acceptable indeed. (Needless to say, a Labour Administration was the first to revert to talk about an 'acceptable' level of unemployment; Yet equally we must condemn those of our class who connived at the destruction of jobs by their readiness to accept cash-in-hand.)

Far from 'rationalising' industry and creating the efficient, competitive units of which they boasted, they have husbanded absurdity and irrationality, enabling the financial Cain to slaughter his manufacturing brother or to force him into an even more slavish dependence.

continued over..

The policy of fewer, bigger and more ramshackle organisations, which are at best a drain upon the public purse (our purse!) and at worst licensed bandits, is now formalised in the National Enterprise Board which will pursue the grafting and weeding process with vigour. How little deserves the proud title industry!

To illustrate the concentration of capital: in 1958 the 50 biggest firms in manufacture employed 21.2% of the working population and were responsible for 24.7% of the net output of Britain. The corresponding figures for 1968 were 29.4% and 32.4%. The figures for the share of the top 200 firms in employment and net output were, in 1958 35.5% and 41% respectively, and in 1968 47.1% and 52.5%.

What of our future? our children?

How few of those leaving school will have jobs to go to? How few of the very young will have any substantial schooling? The demand for labour governs the supply of labour. Skill is to be a thing of the past so an end to education! An end too to apprenticeships! Even today many skilled workers are in unskilled occupations and tomorrow the proportion will be greater.

In 1964 880,450 skilled men were employed in the shipbuilding, ship repairing and engineering sector. There were then 140,450 apprentices in training: three apprentices for every nineteen skilled men. Ten years later there were but 740,290 skilled men employed and 79,940 apprentices: three apprentices for every twentyeight skilled workers.

In the construction industry over the identical period the number of craftsmen in employment fell from 835,000 to 653,100; 182,200 jobs had evaporated. Similarly, the number of apprentices in training fell from 129,700 to 93,400.

The picture for school leavers is equally bleak. In December 1975 more than 40,000 were registered as having no job and the true figure may be more than twice as high.

Modern industry demands high investment in human beings as well as plant. The destruction of educational establishments and of craft training belies the promise of a better tomorrow in a capitalist Britain. Not only are they clearing the ground, they are sterilising it.

Will the immense human capital which is embodied in our working class soon be crossing national boundaries in the service of a French or German bourgeoisie! ?

Since 1940 everyman has come to expect (and why should he not?) a rising standard of life. The war brought security of employment, a greatly strengthened Trade Union movement and rising wage levels. Further, the National Government pledged itself (white paper 'Employment Policy' May 1944) to maintain a high, stable level of employment at the end of hostilities, a promise which none of the successors cared to repudiate for almost a generation.

During this period the working class proved equal to the task of wresting from its adversary an increasing share of the national product, and corresponding to the movement of wages has been the inexorable rise of prices whereby the employing class have sought to protect their profit margins. By way of response, ruling class policy has been to generate redundancy; the prime objective being to strengthen their bargaining position. 'Full employment' may, for a brief summer, have been a sacred cow, but nothing approaches the sanctity of capital. This, of course, is to ignore the loss to the economy as a result of under utilisation of human resources and the welfare costs of the unemployed and their dependents; but though the rationale may have been couched in economic terms, i.e. 'the control of inflation' and 'putting Britain back on its feet,' the motive was social and political. Suffice it to say that each prescription dose has brought with it higher and more persistent unemployment, higher prices and an increased balance of trade deficit.

Two years after the 1957 squeeze unemployment stood at 512,000. Two years after the 1961 squeeze it was 612,000. Two years after the 1966 squeeze it was 601,000. By the beginning of 1972 unemployment had topped 1 million and four years later it stands (!) at one and a half million. During the late fifties and the beginning of the sixties, a period in which the average rate of unemployment was 1.7%, it was widely believed that a rate of 2½% would 'bring about stable prices!

Unemployment now is nearing 6% and prices.....!

What the facts clearly show is that until very recently, no level of unemployment was sufficient to prevent workers from acting in defence of their wages against the encroachment of prices, remembering only that the inevitably delayed response has always given the Government an initial measure of success. Why then do workers now accept meekly the spurious arguments and appeals to national interest that were so ruthlessly brushed aside two years ago? Why the social contract? And particularly now when every instance of self-deception, hesitation or resignation is seized upon by the enemy for what it is, weakness, and gives them the singleness of mind to pursue their destructive policies, devices which even from the bourgeois standpoint betray a wretched narrowness of vision; once again the Geddies Axe, once again a May committee.

And we, the workers, have we not learned? Though it was graced with no decorous title was there not a social contract under Stafford Cripps?

Have there not been other periods of "Voluntary restraint"?

In furthering its purposes the ruling class has also turned its attention to the fundamental organisations of our class.

The Donovan Commission made great play of the anarchy of British Industrial Relations (for us a major strength as well as a weakness) Its recommendations were for the promotion of company unionism and inter-union mergers; in brief, for more discipline. These proposals were taken further by 'In Place of Strife' and finally brought to the statute book with the Industrial Relations Act. In the euphoria surrounding the belated defeat of the Act it was possible to forget how very close to acceptance the Labour Movement came. At the present juncture when we as a Party have less influence, direct and indirect, upon the class, are less able to influence the course of events as a result of the destruction of the industrial base, it cannot surely be so surprising that the class has accepted the social contract, that in practice they have accepted the lie that inflation is the cause of the present crisis and that wage increases are the root of inflation.

And all the while the class repudiates its own heritage. Scabs are found to act against their unions and the membership is mute. The development of company unionism, if not actively connived at, proceeds unchecked; more officials are appointed to union posts; sheer apathy allows the ruling class to call the tune. At present their approach is still largely persuasive. But how long before persuasion gives way to coercion as the full horror of their policy becomes more apparent and as our resistance becomes weaker? How soon before another reign of terror, when 'in conspiracy' becomes once more a feature of working class resistance? The attack on the civil liberties of the individual and on the most rooted and democratic of our institutions go hand in hand. And when the very independence of these institutions is at stake, those that would willingly submit would surely be fit instruments to enslave their brothers. It is for us to impress upon the class the need to make real (not token) sacrifices, purely in order to retain the capacity to fight and therefore ultimately to preserve ourselves, let alone go forward and win the war.

A General Staff would like to join battle under conditions the most favourable for its own forces but sadly we have been outmanoeuvred, though not yet overwhelmed, and our ability to fight is ebbing away. As a class we appear to be stricken with impotence. Historically, a great strength of the labour movement has been its flexibility, its ability and readiness to advance on one front when baulked on another. To give battle, for example, on the political front when it met obstruction in the economic sphere.

Defensive though they be, trade unions have shown themselves capable of carrying the fight to the enemy, of counter-attacking rather than passively awaiting the next onslaught.

But today? The situation is fraught as never before. Affrighted by circumstance, chary of combat and in dreadful disarray is the army of labour. It is difficult indeed to discern any battle formation at all.

Which way to the front?

Meanwhile the master class prepares a truly dreadful peace.

But by far the most calculated measure taken by the Governing class was entry into the Common Market, a huddling together for warmth in a thieves kitchen where beggar-my-neighbour is the game and winner takes all.

It is a capitalist game played by capitalists in which the only certain loser is the working class.

The destruction of our advanced agriculture, the exultant flight of capital, increased taxation, prices and unemployment; these facts are so well attested as to need no further elaboration.

We should remember also the limitations on production, the quota system which was a part of the high price of entry; the loss of national sovereignty, and the present menace of reactionary European labour laws.

Before entry the annual investment overseas by private companies was running at about half that invested in new plant and machinery in domestic manufacture. The two figures are now comparable in magnitude.

By contrast, the movement of capital from the E.E.C. member states to Britain is less than one fifth of the outward flow, and it is most certainly not being invested in any major manufacturing industry.

Put together the evidence points to the conclusion that the ruling class seeks our destruction because they have proved incapable of living with us. Fear impels them to act and out of fear we are reluctant to take the most elementary defensive measures. But act we must; and in a radically new way.

For the working class to aspire to an improvement in its general condition within the present framework is little short of utopian. Indeed, such aspirations expressed in an active form will be represented as criminal attacks upon the interests of society at large, for as certain as the governing class is turning Britain into a wasteland, so their ideologues and lawyers are drawing up an indictment to lay the responsibility at our feet.

We have said loudly and often that revolution is on the agenda, that it is the key to an understanding of the times. Can we really proclaim it theoretically and shrink from it practically as we seem to have been doing? Our difficulty will not be one of convincing the class that change is desirable or even necessary but that they must be the instrument and initiator, that in being so they will offend against constitutionality.

The working class must now accept the mantle of responsibility. It alone can claim to represent the interests of society and must surely use that authority to condemn our rulers who have placed themselves beyond the pale of social morality and justice. It matters not what attorneys say we may do but what reason and humanity demand that we do, compel us to do. We must present our own impeachment.

The direction of society must be wrested from capital. No other form of defence is capable of providing us with any future at all.

The bedrock of capitalism appears more and more to be sand. The foundations have never appeared so shaky, but in the course of things i.e. two centuries and more, the Bourgeois economic mode comes to have the appearance of an eternal form of organisation; necessity. Traditional modes of thought are not readily abandoned, there can be no question of overnight success, the desperate situation must not be allowed to obscure the protracted nature of the struggle.

It is for us to break the moral and intellectual ascendancy of social democracy, which, once the expression of resistance, can only become a philosophy of subjection, part of the corporate mechanism of control. We do this only by posing the alternative course, the which we posit most clearly and correctly only by uniting the greatest number in the struggle against the aggressor and finally for socialism. Recrimination and division within the class is a constant danger. Disunity is the high road to further defeat.

Continued over...

Finally, it is for us to convince our class that the capitalists, in Marx's words, '....are lords of the earth only in the sense that they fill it with their presence as worms fill a corpse.'

That they represent only death and decay.

Will we allow 'might,' 'perhaps,' and 'soon' to be the delayers and appeasers?

Must our battle scarred class after all its toil-worn history be left to starve among a pile of ruins. The "now" of the revolution must be put more sharply.

Our clarity and the obduracy of the working class so consistently displayed in the past are our chief strengths at this time. The ignorance and social democracy of the class are the chief negatives, indeed the only reason for the continued existence of capitalism.

If it be now, tis not to come;

If it be not to come, it will be now;

If it be not now, yet it will come-

The readiness is all.

" Dare to struggle,
Dare to win."