AT THE FOCAL POINT OF WORLD-WIDE NATIONAL
LIBERATION STRUGGLE...

THE VIETNAMESE PEOPLE ADVANCE
TOWARDS FINAL VICTORY!

THE FOCAL POINT OF THE WORLD-WIDE
STRUGGLES OF THE PEOPLES AGAINST
IMPERIALISM LIES AT PRESENT IN VIETNAM.

This year, 1968, the Vietnamese people - and,
indeed, progressive people of all lands - celebrate
the 7th, anniversary of the founding of the National
Liberation Front - the national, democratic organi-
sation formed by the people of south Vietnam to
co-ordinate their heroic struggle for liberation
from the most vicious enemy of the peoples of the
world: United States imperialism.

The U.S. aggressors have been sidec in their
van efforts to subjugate the Vietnamese people by
the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union and
their agents in the leadership of the Communist
Parties of many countries, including Britain. While
condemning the U.S. aggression in words, these
renegades stress the cruel losses and suffering
inflicted on the people of Vietnam by this aggre-
sion not in order to stiffen resistance to it, but
in order to boost their calls for "Peace in Vietnam!

But, in the present circumstances, this "human-
itarian" slogan of "Peace in Vietnam" is in fact a
call for the Vietnamese people to lay down their
arms and surrender to the occupation of their
country by the U.S. forces and the fascist puppet
regime propped up by those forces. This kind of
"Peace in Vietnam" is precisely the war aim of
Johnson and the Pentagon. And it would not even
bring peace, for one of the cardinal aims of the
U.S. Imperialists is to make an occupied Vietnam
into a base for the expansion of their aggression
into other countries of south-east Asia.

In the seven years of existence of the National
Liberation Front of South Vietnam, the resistance
of the Vietnamese people has, however, grown ever
stronger. During this period the Liberation Armed
Forces of South Vietnam have wiped out:
nearly 1½ million enemy troops, including 181
battalions and 952 companies;
6,990 enemy planes;
15,835 military vehicles; and
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THE MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN  
CENTRAL COMMITTEE

In order to reflect the increased membership of the organisation, the Political Bureau recommended in January that the Central Committee should be enlarged to ten members.

At its meeting on Sunday, February 26th, in London, the Central Committee heard, discussed and approved the report "Proletarian Internationalism: the Key to Victory in Anti-Imperialist Struggle and Socialist Revolution" and a resolution of self-criticism in connection with the situation in the People's Republic of China (these are published in the current edition of RED FRONT), together with a financial report and a report on the reorganisation of the M.I.O.B. press.

As a result of this last report, RED FRONT will continue as the main organ of the M.I.O.B., but will be orientated primarily towards the militants of the working class movement and in the mass organisations. In addition to RED FRONT, a separate theoretical journal will be published devoted to the theory and practice of socialist revolution and problems of Marxism-Leninism in Britain and the world. This theoretical journal will appear quarterly.

RESOLUTION

At its foundation Conference in September 1967, the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain consciously adopted a revolutionary characterising: "by which time the lesson of the counter-revolutionary excesses lying beneath the deep-seated mass of "the great proletarian cultural revolution" headed by Mao Tse-tung far earlier than we did.

Why was such a Marxist-Leninist analysis of "the thought of Mao Tse-tung" just not until many years after it should have been made? The roots of the answer lie in the revisionist habits of thought and practice which all of us have brought with us to some extent into the new, developing Marxist-Leninist movement even though we have formally broken with the revisionist party machine. For in the revisionist party - for obvious reasons - independent, objective Marxist-Leninist analysis is strongly discouraged. In the revisionist party a "good comrade" is one who accepts uncritically "the line" which emanates from the world leading revisionist centre in Moscow.

"It is not without significance that the great majority of people who constitute the so-called "anti-revisionist movement" in Britain had their eyes opened to the character of Khrushchevite revisionism not in 1960 but in the 1950s when the actions had clearly exceeded their tremendous, remorseless character - but in the 1960s, after the Chinese Marxist-Leninists had begun publicly to expose it. Even then many of these people tended to see the "Great Debate" between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism primarily as a struggle between the lines emanating from rival world leading centres in Peking and Moscow. The uncritical acceptance of the line emanating from a world leading centre was carried into the so-called "anti-revisionist movement"; only the leading centre was changed, and this led the anti-revisionist movement into a new revisionism.

The uncritical acceptance of "the line from Peking" in place of independent objective Marxist-Leninist analysis blinded us to the fact that in 1946 "the line from Peking" changed from a Marxist-Leninist line to a revisionist one as a result of the development of the "Left" revisionists headed by Mao Tse-tung, then central control of the "Central Committee" of the Communist Party of China and of the armed forces. It blinded us to the fact that the "Party" revisionists headed by Mao Tse-tung has gradually transformed the socialist cultural revolution in China into a counter-revolutionary assault on the interests of the Chinese capitalism class upon the Party and the new-democratic state. It carried us to the point where we found ourselves repeating - albeit with some unsteadiness - the same absurd phrases from "Peking Papers" concerning the personal attitudes of Mao Tse-tung. It inverted our revolutionary vigilance.

Now, then, did the M.I.O.B. come to recognise the erroneous path it had been to tread?

Just as failure to make independent, Marxist-Leninist analysis was responsible for our error, so it was responsible of independent Marxist-Leninist analysis which forced us to recognise the error.

From the outset it was set up last autumn, the M.I.O.B. began to elaborate a Marxist-Leninist programme for the achievement of socialism in Britain. This compelled us to make an independent, objective Marxist-Leninist analysis of the various aspects of the situation in Britain, Europe and the world. By the beginning of December 1967 it had become clear that this analysis was bringing us into irreconcilable contradiction with the line emanating from Peking. For example, our own analysis had led us incontrovertibly to the conclusion that the movement of "Black Nationalism" and the slogan of "Black Power" were reactionary and harmful, yet it became clear in November 1967 that Peking was giving this movement and this slogan full support. It was such contradictions which forced the Political Bureau to undertake what should have been undertaken long before - the initiation of an objective Marxist-Leninist analysis of "the thought of Mao Tse-tung" and of the situation in the People's Republic of China. The end result of that analysis was the report of the Central Committee issued last month.

What are the lessons to be drawn from this grave error? In order to ensure as far as we can that we do not ever again make such an error?

We must try and remaining active against the revisionist habits of thought and practice which all of us have brought in some extent into the new, developing Marxist-Leninist movement. We must never again substitute blind faith for independent, objective Marxist-Leninist analysis. We must strive to raise the political level of our members at all levels so that they may nip any future errors in the bud immediately.

The fact that the M.I.O.B. has published the truth as soon as it became aware of it, being the first of any of the developing Marxist-Leninist Parties and organisations in the world to do so, presents a great opportunity for the overcoming of the obstacles which lie ahead.
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The Unity Theatre Swindle

Unity Theatre has, for as long as most of us can remember, been a beacon of progressive and working class culture in London. Today it is fighting for its life against enemies who would destroy it and everything for which it stands.

Some years ago the Unity Theatre Society raised a fund from friends and supporters for the purpose of buying the freehold of its site in Goldington Street, N.W.1, and of rebuilding the theatre. A trust was set up to administer the money raised on behalf of the Unity Theatre Society, this trust consisting of actor Alfe Bass, composer Alan Bush, lawyer John Platts-Mills and one other member who has since died.

The land on which the theatre stands was duly purchased for £5,000, leaving a balance in the fund of £15,000 out of the £20,000 raised through this appeal. Then, with the connivance of the former Management Committee of the Society, the theatre was closed "for rebuilding".

But as the weeks and months went by without any sign of activity, members became reluctantly to the conclusion that the intention was not to rebuild the theatre at all, but to allow it to become a derelict shell, fit only for demolition. And so in March 1967 the irate membership of Unity Theatre Society threw out the old Management Committee and elected a new one pledged to reopen the theatre at the earliest possible moment and to raise to new heights the progressive traditions of the theatre.

The new committee found the theatre a shambles, the accounts unintelligible. They found that over £1,000 of box-office receipts and bar takings had mysteriously found its way into the bank account of the trust instead of that of the society, leaving a huge debt outstanding. By almost superhuman efforts on the part of the activists associated with the theatre, these obstacles were sufficiently overcome to permit the re-opening of the theatre.

After the election of the new committee at the A.G.M. of the society, Alan Bush shouted: "The members will be sorry they voted you in. You will not get a penny of the trust fund!". It must be said that he has done his best to keep his word. Documents appeared purporting to show that the society was no more than an insecure tenant of the trust, which had the absolute right to use the money in the fund in many ways other than that for which it was raised. In fact, the balance of £15,000 remaining after the purchase of the land has shrunk to £7,000 (£5,000 having been expended by the trust on "administration" with only a single nail being driven. And the society has been engaged in battle with the trust for almost a year in an effort to secure money for essential repairs.

The aims of the hard-faced businessmen on the trust are quite simple. They wish to demolish Unity Theatre and use the site for the more profitable purpose of the erection - by a group of developers associated with Phil Piratin, himself co-opted to the trust as a "building expert" - of a block of luxury flats. A small theatre in the basement or on some other site is mentioned vaguely as a possible substitute for Unity Theatre.

The revisionist-led Communist Party has now been called in and has, as might have been expected, thrown its weight on to the side of the trust. Their plan is to hold off adverse publicity or legal action until the party can mobilise its voting strength to force the A.G.M. of the society and secure the election of a new Management Committee which will consent to the "peaceful transition" of Unity into the hands of Piratin and his knackers.

No doubt lawyers can argue long and expensive on the legality of the trust's actions. But the workers, trade unions, and supporters of Unity who gave their hard-earned cash - as well as the talented band of artists who are determined to revive this historic theatre - will characterise Bass, Bush, Piratin and Platts-Mills in no uncertain terms - as swindlers who have robbed Unity Theatre of its funds and who are bent on destroying Unity and everything for which it stands in the "sacred" cause of profit!

The future of Unity Theatre depends on the exposure and rout of this gang of unscrupulous swindlers.
"BLACK NATIONALISM": THE BETRAYAL OF THE NEGRO STRUGGLE

In the United States of America Negro people constitute an oppressed nation in the South, while Negro workers in the North form part of a national minority within the American nation and one of the most exploited strata of the working class.

American Marxist-Leninists understand that the road to self-determination of the Negro nation in the South and to the social liberation of the Negro workers in the North lies in the revolutionary destruction of the common enemy of the working class and of the Negro nation in the South - and, indeed, of the peoples of the world: United States imperialism. And they understand that this revolution can only be brought about as a result of the building of a united struggle against U.S. imperialism, led by a Marxist-Leninist Party and embracing the working class - black and white - in the North together with the Negro people in the South.

However, historical factors have enabled the struggle of the Negro people in the United States to be influenced by anti-Marxist-Leninist political trends, and to be the happy hunting ground for various kinds of demagogy, chauvinism and disarray.

THE BLACK NATIONALIST

In the early years of this century an American negro by the name of Timothy Drex became acquainted with certain facts of the Mormon religion. He convinced himself that Christianity was "the white man's religion" and that Dorothea was the instrument for Negro salvation. He adopted the name of "Dorothea Alli".

In 1913 he founded the first North American Negro peoples in Texas, New Jersey, and later similar temples were established in other United States cities. During the last 20 years Drex's leadership of the movement has been challenged by Black Claude Greene, who was murdered in his Chicago office in March 1971. Drex was arrested, and charged under mysterious circumstances while released on bail.

A new leader immediately appeared on the scene in the person of one Wallace Ford, who claimed to be the reincarnation of "Dorothea Alli". He founded a temple in Detroit in 1939 and in the next few years many of the constituent organizations were established, including the "University of Islam" for the training of Black Muslims.

In 1939 Ford suddenly and mysteriously disappeared and a split occurred in the movement on the question of whether or not he had been Allah (God). Those who supported his delusion eventually set up headquarters in Chicago under "Eliah Muhammad", the present leader of the movement.

Eliah Muhammad was born in Georgia in 1897 and has lived in Chicago since 1946. He occupies a well-furnished, eighteen-room house in one of the "better" neighbourhoods of the city and is known as "The Messenger".

The by the Black Muslims portrays the American Negro people as the "Nation of Islam", the chosen people of Allah, and their origin as Morocon. They form part of the larger "Black Nation", which includes all non-white peoples, and the "Black Nation" is seen as

created by Allah. The white race consists of Jews, created by the genetic experiment of an early scientist by the name of Tahiti. Some will come the "Last Judgement" when Allah will destroy all excess populace members and return black Muslims to power, and they will then rule the earth for ever in peace and happiness.

The Black Muslims movement once a matter of business enterprises, the employees of which receive no wages but what is called "Charity" and are subject to collective bargaining.

Until the 1950s the Black Muslims movement remained a small, authenticated sect with a membership - nearly nonexistent, and closely-estimated in the hundreds. However, with the rise of national liberation movements on the African continent and of Negro militancy in the United States, tens of thousands of new adherents, most of them young people, came into the movement.

The movement played a certain progressive role in breaking down the myth of the inferiority of the Negro people. As one of its leading figures, Malcolm X, said after breaking with the movement:

"I had helped Mr. Muhammad and his other ministers to revolutionize the American black man's thinking, opening his eyes with the knowledge that the white man would never make love to the same harmful, degrading way as the white man. I had participated in spreading the truth that had done so much to help the American black man rid himself of the stigma that the white race was made up of 'inferior' beings."


However, the Black Muslims movement was a religious movement, the principal objective role of which was to divert the American Negro people from political activity to passive waiting for the solution of their problems by Allah's Last Judgement. The only political consciousness made to the growing impotence of the road-out, was the Last Judgement failed to substantiate as quickly as had been hoped for, was set up small business enterprises for the employment and service of members, and to put forward the demand for a "national home" for the American Negro people. As Malcolm X expressed in his last public speech before he broke with the movement, in October 1965:

"The Honorable Elijah Muhammad teaches us that the race problem can easily be solved, just by sending these 75 million souls back to our own ancestral homes where we can live in peace and harmony with our own kind. But this government should provide the transportation, just like everything else we need to get started again in our own country. If the white government in America is afraid to let us 75 million souls go back to our own country and to our own people, then America must set aside some new territory here in the Western Hemisphere, where the two races can live apart from each other, since we cannot get along peacefully while we are here together. But if America wants for Almighty God himself to step in and force her into a 'just settlement', God will take this entire continent away from her, and she will come to exist as a nation."


This political distortion of the Black Muslims movement towards the reactionary and utopian demand for a "National Home" was associated with the firm prohibition of members' participation in political activity along any other lines or in association with non-Muslims. After Malcolm X had broken with the movement he expressed the frustration felt by many members when he telegraphed to George Lincoln Rockwell, head of the American Nazi Party:
"This is to warn you that I am no longer held in check from fighting white supremacy by Eliajah Mhahadu's separatist Black Muslim movement."

(Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks"; New York; 1965; p.217.)

MALCOLM X SPEAKS AGAIN
Malcolm X, convert to the Black Muslim faith in 1952 while in prison, rose to be Elijah Mhahadu's chief minister. In the 1960s, however, he became convinced that the movement was corrupt and that the leaders were not conforming to the strict moral code binding on all members. Eliajah Mhahadu repudiated with a campaign of slander against Malcolm and the latter severed his connection with the orthodox movement in March 1964. He made it clear at the time that his reasons for breaking away were primarily personal:

"Mr. Mhahadu and I are not together today only because of envy and jealousy," (Malcolm X; "The Autobiography of Malcolm X"); New York; 1965; p.201.

At a press conference he announced his intention of forming a rival religious movement to that of Elijah Mhahadu:

"I am going to Typhon and head a new mosque in New York City, known as the Muslim Mosque, Inc. This gives it a religious base, and the spiritual force necessary to aid our people of the vision that destroy the moral fibres of our community."

(Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks"; New York; 1965; p.217.)

He renamed the philosophy of the new movement "black nationalism".

"The political philosophy of the Muslim Mosque will be black nationalism, the economic philosophy will be black capitalism, and the social philosophy will be black anarchism," (Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks").

On June 14, 1964, Malcolm X was assassinated.

BLACK NATIONALISM
At first a central point of Malcolm's conception of "black nationalism" remained that of "a National Home":

"The political philosophy of the Muslim Mosque will be black nationalism... and by political philosophy I mean we still believe in the Honorable Elijah Mhahadu's solution as complete separation. The 22,000,000 so-called negroes should be separated completely from America and should be permitted to go back home to our African homeland."

(Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks"; New York; 1965; p.201.)

And yet this was seen as:

"...still a long-range programme, and while it is yet to materialize, 27 million of our people who are still here in America need better food, clothing, housing, education and jobs right now."

(Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks"; New York; 1965; p.201.)

But, as an immediate programme:

The political philosophy of black nationalism means: we must control the politics and politicians of our communities."

(Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks"; New York; 1965; p.201.)

By the end of 1964 Malcolm X had renounced the idea of physical migration to Africa in favor of a purely symbolic "migration":

"...if we migrated back to Africa culturally, philosophically and psychologically, while remaining here physically, the spiritual bond that would develop between us and Africa... would enhance our position here..."

And this was what he meant by a migration or going back to Africa - going back in the sense that we reach out to them and they reach out to us."(Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks"; New York; 1965; p.201.)

During the same year he abandoned the "religious base" of black nationalism and proceeded to found a purely secular instrument: the Organization of Afro-American Unity (OAAU).

Chairman. He also began to express the view that Negro freedom could be attained only by revolution, by the destruction of capitalist society, holding up the state capitalist systems of certain newly independent African states as "models of socialism":

"...it is impossible for this system, this economic system, this political system, this social system... to produce freedom right now for the black man in this country."

(Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks"; New York; 1965; p.201.)

"...As our people begin to wake up, they're going to realize they've been talking about Negro revolt, Negro revolution."

(Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks"; New York; 1965; p.201.)

"While I was travelling I noticed that most of the countries that have recently emerged from independence have turned away from the so-called capitalist system in the direction of socialism."

(Malcolm X; "Malcolm X Speaks").

That Malcolm X had, in the last year of his life, reached a political position identical to all the central features with that of international Trotskyism was not, as we shall see, a coincidence.

MALCOLM X AND THE TROTSKYISTS
George Breitman, himself a Trotskyist, has recorded the comparatively close relations between Malcolm X and the Trotskyist Socialist Workers' Party in the last years of his life:

"The exception was Malcolm's attitude to 'The Militant', the weekly newspaper expressing the views of the Socialist Workers' Party. While he was still a Black Muslim, Malcolm used to buy this paper when it was sold outside meetings where he spoke. Even at that time, he said after the split, he used to tell Regus it was a good paper and they ought to read it. Initially he was attracted to 'The Militant' because he sought to explain the Black Muslims and black nationalism and defended them against reactionary distortion and attack..."

Malcolm continued, at GTA rallies, to urge the audience to buy 'The Militant' and, in opening his speech before the (Trotskyite-Ed.) Militant Labor Forum on January 7, 1963, he noted that this was the third time that he had spoken under its auspices:

"...I always feel that it is an honour and every time that they open the door to me to do so, I will be right here. 'The Militant' newspaper is one of the best newspapers in New York City. In fact, it is one of the best anywhere you go today..."

...Another speaker at this May 29 meeting was Clinton DeBerry, the Socialist Workers' Party's presidential candidate in 1964. In the discussion Malcolm praised DeBerry's formulation of the need for a combination of forces in principle with flexibility in tactic. A few weeks later, in a private discussion with DeBerry, Malcolm said that he sympathized with DeBerry's candidacy..." For various reasons, however, he felt that he could not openly endorse DeBerry. What he could do, he said, was 'to open some doors' for DeBerry in Harlem, so that he would get a better hearing for his programme and greater circulation of his literature. Malcolm did make such arrangements before his second trip to Africa in July, and before leaving he urged his closest workers to cooperate wherever possible with the Socialist Workers' Party's campaign..."

Malcolm's friendly relations with the Socialist Workers' Party... continued throughout Malcolm's last year, and were closer at the end than at the beginning."

(George Breitman; "The Last Year of Malcolm X"); New York; 1970; p.27,31,34, 30.)

REVOLUTION
The imperialists seek to hold back the building of a united movement of struggle against these by adopting a policy of "divide and rule". One aspect of this policy is the encouragement of factionalism. That is, the incitement of one race against another. They seek to instill white anger against black, and black against white... ""Repressed-and-oppressed all forms of racism. They seek to unite all oppressed peoples against their oppressors..."”

"Black nationalism" leaders strive to build an "ethnically pure" black movement. As the "Militant Party Program" of Malcolm X's Organization of Afro-American Unity put it:

"The exclusive ethnic quality of our unity is necessary for self-preservation."

"...They hold that if inter-racial unity with white workers were ever possible, it could be only in the distant indefinite future and must be actively resisted in the meantime. In an interview in March 1964, Malcolm X was asked: 'Can Negroes do it alone?'

"The Imperialists seek to hold back the building of a united movement of struggle against these by adopting a policy of "divide and rule". One aspect of this policy is the encouragement of factionalism. That is, the incitement of one race against another. They seek to instill white anger against black, and black against white..."

Repressed-and-oppressed all forms of racism. They seek to unite all oppressed peoples against their oppressors...

"Black nationalism" leaders strive to build an "ethnically pure" black movement. As the "Militant Party Program" of Malcolm X's Organization of Afro-American Unity put it:

"The exclusive ethnic quality of our unity is necessary for self-preservation.

"...They hold that if inter-racial unity with white workers were ever possible, it could be only in the distant indefinite future and must be actively resisted in the meantime. In an interview in March 1964, Malcolm X was asked: 'Can Negroes do it alone?'

"The Imperialists seek to hold back the building of a united movement of struggle against these by adopting a policy of "divide and rule". One aspect of this policy is the encouragement of factionalism. That is, the incitement of one race against another. They seek to instill white anger against black, and black against white..."
"Yes, they'll never do it with working class whites. The history of America is that working class whites have just been as much against not only working Negroes, but all Negroes, period. There can be no worker solidarity until there's first some black solidarity. There can be no white/black solidarity until there's some black solidarity. One of the mistakes Reagan made in this worker solidarity thing. There's no such thing." (A.R. Spelman: "Intervista with Malcolm X" in Monthly Review, May 1964.)

In practice, of course, the building of an "ethnically pure" black movement which would resist solidarity with white workers involves the surmounting of anti-white racism.

Avedon in 1965 to comment on police brutality towards whites, Malcolm X said:

"We're not interested in the holl that whites shout from whites. ... That's your problem - we're not interested in it." (Malcolm X: "The Origins of Racism", cited in Breitman's "The Last Year of Malcolm X", p.67.)

In December 1965 he expressed this anti-white racism in orthodox Black Muslim terms:

"We want no integration with this wicked race that enslaved us. We want complete separation from this race of devils." (Cited in O. Breitman: 1984, p.98.)

And, asked in April 1964 to pay tribute to a white minister killed during a demonstration in Cleveland against segregaiton in schools, he replied:

"The day is not out when you'll find black people who are going to stand up and apply the contributions of whites at this late date, ... Don't you even think that I would use my energies appealing to the sentiments of individual white man." (Cited in Breitman: 1984, p.78.)

The "black nationalists" Robert Williams writes:

"The gap between black and white is becoming ever more wide. ... The white man's relations with the black man in America is governed by an imperialist mentality. He sees no need to respond humanly to the black man's cry of anguish. His response is the club and the bullet. ... Why should the black man in racist America trust the white man? Is not the white man the one who created the hate barriers? Is he not the one who has destroyed and sham the black man?" (Robert F. Williams: "The Potential of a Minority Revolution", in "The Crusader", Sept/Oct 1967, p.3, 14.)

The Trotskyists - who function as agents of imperialism within the progressive movement but pose as "revolutionaries" and "Marxists" - not only give full support to black racism, but provide a spurious "Marxist" theoretical basis to justify it. They put forward the view that only white racism is reactionary, but that black racism is progressive. The Trotskyist Ken Coates expresses this view in the London Bulletin of the (Trotskyite) "Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation":

"No equation can be made between the offensive racism of ruling groups, which is profoundly irrational and reactionary, ... and the defensive reactions of communities which are persecuted and oppressed." (Ken Coates: "Sticky Carcassal at IALF", in "Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation London Bulletin", September 1968, p.6-9.)

Under the aliases:

"race becomes class" (Ken Coates: 1964, p.10) and "class questions are often expressed in racial terms" (O.Breitman: 1984, p.146)

They justify the intensification of black racism on the grounds that black people form a "proletarian class" of white people (and particularly Jewish people form a "bourgeois class").

"The black people of the U.S.A. are a basically proletarian formation, ... the black people, class....

The Jews have preserved themselves as a social class. ... The Jews ... are a class, or more precisely a people-class." (Ken Coates: 1964, p.9.)

An identical formulation on the Jews appears in "The Communist", organ of a Trotskyist group calling itself the "Communist Workers' Group (anti-revisionist)", composed of former members of the (Trotskyite) "Irish Workers' Group" now reorganizing as "Marxist-Leninists".

"When Jews immigrate into a country they tend to form themselves into a socially tight group and by efficient capitalist methods, although starting penniless, manage to extract money from the working classes, manage to build themselves into a social elite. ...This is just another example of Marx's theory: the history of the world is the history of class struggle, the Jews are the class. (The Communist, September 30th, 1967, p.11.)"

If it is pointed out that there are white workers as well as black workers, and that both have a common interest, objectively, in the overthrow of the exploiting class, the Trotskyists reply that it is white workers alone who are in the exploitation of black workers and must be counted with the exploiting class. The economic essence of this view was put forward in Britain in 1966 by the "Finbury Communist Association" in its pamphlet "Class and Party in Britain". It was expressed in its full clarity at the 1967 IALF Conference in Harrow by the "black nationalist" Stanely Carmichael, who has taken over the mantle of Malcolm X since his assassination in 1966, and who calls non-white people the "Third World".

"The American worker class enjoys the fruits of the labour of the Third World workers," (Stanley Carmichael: "Black Power and the Third World", in "B.R.P. London Bulletin", p.34.)

The United States imperialists, like their South African counterparts, have strived to hold back the inter-racial unity of those they oppress by adopting a policy of segregation, of stirring to keep black and white apart in public transport, in places of entertainment, in places of residence, and above all in schools and colleges.

Progressive people have always fought segregation and have seen significant victories in the fight against it, while Marxist-Leninists have understood the value of this struggle, not only for its immediate aims, but for the building of a movement of struggle with the wider aim of eventually destroying U.S.imperialism.

The "black nationalists", however, urge the Negro people not merely to accept segregation, but to demand it! As the statement of basic aims and objectives of Malcolm X's Organization of Afro-American Unity puts it:

"A first step in the programme to end the existing system of racial education is to demand that ten per cent of the schools ... be turned over to and run by the Afro-American community. We want Afro-American principals to head these schools. We want Afro-American teachers in these schools, ... If these proposals are not met, we will ask Afro-American parents to keep their children out of the present inferior schools they attend. When these schools in our neighbourhood are controlled by Afro-Americans, we will return to them." (Cited in Breitman: "The Last Year of Malcolm X", p.107-108.)

The Trotskyists endeavor to distinguish the "black nationalist" policy of "separation" from the imperialists' policy of segregation:

"Separation... should not under any circumstances be confused with 'segregation', a system that is imposed upon blacks by whites." (O. Breitman: 1984, p.53.)

There is no doubt, a discernible difference between a way out that is imposed upon workers by their employers and one which is demanded by the workers themselves - but the effort is precisely the same. And the efforts of segregation and apartheid are precisely the same: both assist the imperialists to "divide and rule".

The Trotskyists "justify" the "black nationalist" policy of "separation" not only in the case of "black unity" but in that of "reducing inequality":

"When, in England, liberal authorities decide to 'integrate' the schools, by admitting from the black ghettos those children who make up a black majority in the classrooms and sending white children to a black majority in the classrooms and sending white suburban schools to new immigrant quotas, they do not oppose inequality: far from it, they augment it." (Ken Coates: "Sticky Carcassal at IALF", in "B.R.P. London Bulletin", September 1967, p.7.)

As the last quotation shows, the "black nationalists" and their trots...
'NATIONAL SOCIALISM'

ON THE SO-CALLED 'WORKERS' PARTY OF SCOTLAND (M.L.)'

When, in the period of the general crisis of capitalism, the rights enjoyed by the working class under "parliamentary democracy" become a threat to the wealth and power of the ruling monopoly capitalists, they seek to destroy both those rights and "parliamentary democracy" itself.

"Fascism in power is the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital." (G. Dimitrov: "The Working Class Against Fascism"; London; 1935; p.6).

Fascism is not, however, simple capitalist dictatorship. It is capitalist dictatorship in which the powers of the capitalist state machinery of force are strengthened by means of a counter-revolutionary mass movement, composed mainly of reactionary petty-bourgeois elements and lumpenproletarian thugs.

A fascist party generally has its origin in a small group which puts forward a programme designed to deceive the working people and lower their vigilance, a programme designed at the same time to appeal to finance capital and secure its backing - just as Hitler's "German Workers' Party" was taken over by the finance capitalists of Germany as the instrument of their fascist dictatorship.

Among the more important points in the programme of such a fascist party are the following:

1) It presents itself as a "revolutionary workers' party";
2) It takes up a national or racial antagonism (real or invented) within the country and strives to intensify this in order to assist the monopoly capitalists to "divide and rule";
3) It opposes the strike weapon ("in the interests of the working class") and urges the workers to work harder (so increasing the profits of the capitalist class);
4) It denounces democratic voting and demands that policy decisions should be made by "a leader";
5) It denies that women are equal to men, it denounces demands for equal economic and political rights for women and calls for women to be allotted a "special role" in society - centred primarily on the home and the family.

All these points of a fascist programme have now been put forward in the programmatic statements of the so-called "Workers' Party of Scotland (Marxist-Leninist)."

"THE SCOTTISH NATION"

Seeking to capitalize on the present upsurge of Scottish petty bourgeoisie "nationalism", the "Workers' Party of Scotland" puts forward the view that Scotland, Wales and England are separate nations.

"Scotland is a nation". ("The Manifesto of the Workers' Party of Scotland (Marxist-Leninist); in: "Scottish Vanguard", Vol.1, No.2, p.11).

But Marxist-Leninists have always understood that, despite declining survivals of pre-national languages and cultures in Scotland and Wales, these regions of Britain do not possess the characteristics of nations, but, on the contrary, that Scotland, Wales and England form a single British nation.

"The British, the Germans and others... were formed into nations from people of diverse races and tribes." (J.V. Stalin: "Marxism and the National Question", in: "Works", Vol.2, Moscow: 1953; p.303).

"The British, French, Germans, Italians and others were formed into nations at the time of the victorious advance of capitalism and its triumph over feudal disunity." (J.V. Stalin: ibid; p.313-14).

"The formation of people into nations occurred during this period. I am referring to such countries as Great Britain (without Ireland), France and Italy." (J.V. Stalin: "Theses on the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Connection with the National Problem", in: "Marxism and the National and Colonial Question"; London 1936; p.99).

Basing themselves on the anti-Marxist-Leninist concept of the "Scottish nation", the journal of the "Workers' Party of Scotland" publishes demands that Gaelic (which is spoken only by some 77,000 people in Scotland - mainly in the Hebrides - out of a total population of over five millions) be

"allowed to regain its rightful place as the national language of all Scotland". (Scottish Vanguard, Vol.1, No.2, p.15).

More important, the "Workers' Party of Scotland" portrays the ruling class of Scotland not as British imperialists (who in fact control the state machine and the economic resources throughout the whole of Britain) but as

"English imperialists" and "the ENGLISH CAPITALIST ESTABLISHMENT". ("The
"NATIONAL SOCIALISM"


This false, anti-Marxist-Leninist picture of Scotland as "a nation oppressed by England" opens the door for the publication of chauvinist attacks on English workers - attacks which serve the interests of British imperialism (the existence of which is denied by the W.P.S.) by seeking to divide the British working class, the unity of which is an essential precondition for socialist revolution.

"How many English NALGO members supported the efforts of their Scots counterparts for, and right to, parity in wages with their English 'comrades' and 'fellow-workers'. How many English miners supported demands by their Scots 'mates' for enquiries into Scots pit closures... "Solidarity" with such as these I find unbearable," ("Scottish Vanguard", Vol.I, No.2; p.5).

"DOWN WITH STRIKES"

Recently the programme of the "Workers' Party of Scotland" has been developed much further along fascist lines in a book entitled "POLITICAL POWER: A CLASS ANALYSIS", by Dr. S.W. Taylor (Edinburgh, 1967). The book is published by the W.P.S. and is endorsed by Ken Houlston, Val Sutherland and Tom Murphy (on behalf of the Central Committee of the W.P.S.) as a book which...

"must be widely read for its fundamental challenge to pedestrian and all too often, if perhaps subconscious, conventional thinking." (Preface, p.1.)

Militant workers have long been under the impression that the strike was an invaluable weapon by which to defend or improve their economic conditions. This, says the W.P.S. (in company with the Federation of British Industries and the extreme right-wing trade union leaders) is a delusion.

"The effect of the economic strike upon the economy is in the direction of depression. The very scramble for a bigger slice of the cake cuts down the amount of cake to go around anyway. Such strikes therefore exacerbate the very state of poverty which they claim as their cause and this is their Luddite-like characteristic... Strikes directed against the employers hit the people,... What value is a weapon which cuts savagely at one's friends,... but which merely brings a sense of vicarious delight to the class enemy and gives him the opportunity to introduce anti-working class laws in the march towards fascism? ...

Economic strikes against the employers which force up wages play into the hands of monopoly capital enterprises which alone can afford to stand up against the economic blows of the costs and the losses of production involved,... The end of this road can only be, for the worker, to create a new status for himself and stripped of the freedom he yet enjoys, be tied by Laws to his workbench as an industrial serf on a bare subsistence wage... For capitalism the economic strike is the blow which refreshes.... Economic strikes do not serve to bring economic gains to the working people in the long run, but rather to bind them ever more firmly to wage servitude... Inflation can swallow rises as quickly as they are given." (p.119-121).

Yet just over a hundred years ago, in 1865, Karl Marx disposed of these reactionary arguments in his famous address to the General Council of the International Working Men's Association.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 6

MORE ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

BRENDAN CLIFFORD'S RESEARCHES

In an effort to give some 'theoretical' support to the reactionary 'Scottish' nationalism and Welsh 'nationalism' that is at present being pedled by certain sections 'Marxist-Leninist' groups, Brendan Clifford has been producing the Marxist classical. The results of his twelve month's researches are published in a long article in the November 1967 issue of the Monthly Review (proletariat Communist Workers' Organization (anti-revisionist),...

In 1993, cries Mr. Clifford triumphantly, Engels referred to the British Isles... "where the two islands are peopled by four nations" while Mr. Clifford 'corrects', however, that Marxist-Leninists do not regard the classics of Marxists as 'Holy writ', every word of which must be taken as inspired by heaven. In 1993 the Marxist definition of the concept 'nation' had not yet been developed. Although the fundamentals of this definition were laid by Stalins in 1912 in his famous work "Marxism and the National Question", it was not until 1950 that even Stalin came to differentiate clearly between 'nation' on the one hand, and the former of a nation - 'nationality' or 'pre-nation' - on the other. Today, having the benefit of seventy-five years development of Marxism alone Engels wrote that sentence in 1993, Marxist-Leninists are able to foresee the British Isles more correctly as being more correctly "peopled by two nations". These two nations are the Irish and the British nationalities, the latter being composed of three nationalities: Scottish, Welsh and English.

Stalin 're-asserted' himself...

Mr. Clifford goes on to claim that in 1935 Stalins 're-assessed' the national question as it had been put forward in his 1912 work. Consequently, there - such as that to the effect that Britain constitutes a single nation - based on 'Marxism and the National Question' are not valid.

But did Stalin amend his definition of the "nation" as given in the 1912 work? Did he amend his definition of the British people as constituting a single nation? Not at all.

In fact, Stalin did not 'amend' the 1912 work, he developed it into the conditions of a new historical period, the period of the general crisis of capitalism. He refers to a sentence from the earlier work:

"The national struggle under the conditions of capitalist proletariat in a struggle of the bourgeois classes among themselves" (J. Stalin: "The National Question Once
the 1930s.

Stalin and the National Question

The attacks upon Stalin made by the modern revisionists since 1956—attacks following precisely the same lines as those of the Trotskyist "left" revisionists which date from an earlier period—served in reality attacks upon Marxist-Leninism made under the false cloak of "Marxist-Leninism".

At the present time in Britain, where Marxist-Leninists are working for the reconstitution of a Marxist-Leninist Party of the working class, an assortment of groups has appeared calling themselves "anti-revisionist" and "Marxist-Leninist" but with a policy which is diametrically opposed to the Marxist-Leninist movement and the working class on national and racial lines.

Elsewhere in this issue we illustrate how the so-called "Workers' Party of Scotland (Marxist-Leninist)", which began by recreating Scottish "nationalism", has degenerated into an open purveyor of Trotskyite and even fascist ideology, and has attacked not only Stalin but Lenin. We also show how the Trotskyite groups calling themselves the "London Workers' Committee" and the "Communist Workers' Group (anti-revisionist)", which have endorsed the reactionary pseudo-nationalist views put forward by the S.W.P., have now begun to purvey precisely "black nationalism" and anti-Semitic racism, so antagonizing the imperialists to divide the working class along racial lines.

WELSH "NATIONALISM"

In this situation it could not be long before some hopeful opportunist would expose, in the name of "Welsh nationalismo the cause of Welsh "nationalism". This dishonour has fallen to A.H. Evans in his pamphlet "The National Problem in the Light of the Teachings of Lenin and Mao Tse-tung" (London: 1967). Evans will be remembered as an early member of the Committee to Defeat Revisionism, for Communist Unity who resigned from that body when, under the leadership of Comrade Michael McInerney, it refused to publish an anti-Maoist-Leninist article by him.

This remnant follows in the footsteps of the "Workers' Party of Scotland" in seeking to stir up hostility on the part of Welsh workers towards their English comrades:

"The English maer at 'lloet Tâyr', 'lloet pride', 'Welsh shiftiness', 'the Welsh unskilled language'. The English people, including its working class, has been completely indifferent to the totality of the Welsh language. In fact, they have condemned the acts of barbarism of the English state against the Welsh people and a language that we civilised long before English came into being." (p.18-19).

Evans, of course, gives its support to the anti-Marxist-Leninist concept that Scotland, Wales and England constitute separate national units, along with the "Workers' Party of Scotland", acronym of "English chauvinists" those who, like the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain, hold that Britain — Scotland, Wales and England together — forms a single nation:

"There are a small minority of English people whose chauvinism is so deeply embossed as to completely blind them to British history:
They have brought into being a monstrous, "British National," (p.32-33).

EVANS ATTACKS STALIN

Unlike some of his fellow "nationalists," Evans does not evade the dilemma that the viewpoint of the N.C.O.S. on the national question in Britain is identical with that put forward implicitly and explicitly by Stalin, the greatest Marxist-Leninist of his era and one whose special field was the Marxist-Leninist relationship to the national question. Evans "revisited" this dilemma very simply. He declares not only that "Stalin grossly over-stated the national problem" (p.17), but that "we must emphasize that Stalin limited the position of great race discriminators to this attitude" in his allegiance that Stalin was a "fanatical" and a "mysticalist".

In his allegation that Stalin was a "fanatical" and a "mysticalist",

Evans is at one with the most vicious enemies of the working class - the modern revisionists and the Trotskyites. Furthermore, like them, he calls in Lenin to "support" his views:

"Stalin's 1953 Thesis on the National Question came to be regarded as the last word on the problem, yet the fact is that Lenin was sharply critical of Stalin's views on the National question," (p.9).

However, least of all Stalin, would claim that his writings constitute the "last word" on any subject. Yet it is true that Stalin's classic work "Marxism and the National Question" has always been regarded as laying more than the fundamentals of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of this question. In this light, while Evans seeks to deep, Stalin goes further than this. He argues that, with a stark weapon of the Trotskyite propaganda arsenal which was taken over by the modern revisionists in 1936 - the so-called "Lenin's Testament":

"Lenin's justified creation of certain weaknesses in the psychological make-up of Stalin was not brought forcibly enough to the attention of Soviet people," (p.18).

Let us look at these allegations in bold detail.

STALIN: LENIN'S DENIAL-GENE

First of all, did Lenin regard Stalin as an outstanding Marxist revolutionary leader and an authority on the national question?

In February 1919, while Stalin was still working on "Marxism and the National Question," Lenin wrote to Stalin:

"We have a marvelous Georgian who has now written a big article for "Proletkhoz" for which he has collected all the Russian and other materials." (T.Lenin: Collected Works, Vol.39, Moscow: 1964, p.94).

Learning that it was proposed to print the article with the reservation that it was for discussion only, Lenin vigorously objected:

"Of course, we are absolutely against. The article is a GOOD one," (T.Lenin: 1966, p.90).

Soon after Stalin's arrest, in March 1935, Lenin wrote to the editors of "Iskra-demokrat":

"We had time to write a big article on the nationalities question (for three issues of "Proletkhoz")!

Good, We must fight for the truth. (T.Lenin: 1966, p.94)."

Lenin further commented:

"The situation now and the fundamentals of a national programme for Social-Democracy have recently been dealt with in Marxist theoretical literature (the most probable place being taken by Stalin's article)" (T.Lenin: "The National Programme of the R.S.F.S.R."


After the events of July 1917, when Lenin was forced to go into hiding, it was Stalin who was entrusted with guiding the work of the Central Committee and the central Party organs, and with steering the 6th Party Congress in July-August 1917.

Then, on October 16th, 1917, the Central Committee elected a Party Centre to direct the revolution, it was headed by Stalin.

With the victory of the October Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet Government, Stalin was appointed People's Commissar for the Affairs of the Nationalities, a position which he held until 1924. It was on his advice of Lenin that, in November 1917, the Soviet Government awarded Stalin the Order of the Red Banner in recognition of his services during the Civil War.

At the 6th Congress of the Party, in March-April 1921, it was Stalin who was entrusted with analyzing the report on "The Immediate Tasks of the Party in connection with the National Problem."

And it was on the motion of Lenin that, in April 1923, the Central Committee elected Stalin to the supreme position of the General Secretary.

Then, therefore, did Lenin criticize Stalin's views on the national question and Stalin's "psychological make-up" as Evans claims?

In fact no documents written by Lenin expressing such views are known to exist. Evans, one must presume, is referring to the letters alleged to have been dictated by Lenin in December 1921 and January 1923.

In order to assess the significance of these letters, it is necessary to know that for a considerable time before they were written, Lenin had been suffering from severe attacks of the brain, and that his first two strokes - in May and December 1922 - had already permanently incapacitated him.

In addition, they relate primarily to the policy of the Russian Communist Party with regard to Transcaucasia. It is necessary to look in some detail at the situation existing there immediately after the civil war.

THE FIGHT FOR FEDERATION IN TRANSCAUCASIA

The three Transcaucasian nations - Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan - had a long history of bitter national conflicts, reaching the level of persecution of national minorities and open war.

As Stalin told the 12th Party Congress in April 1923:

"From very early times Transcaucasia has been an arena of massacre and strife and, under the Mensheviks and Kadet's, it was an arena of war. You know of the Caucasian-Armenian war. You also know of the massacres in Armenia at the beginning and at the end of 1920. I could mention a whole list of districts where the Armenian majority massacred all the rest of the population, conserving their Tatars, Jews, for instance, I could mention another province - Nakhichevan. There the Tatars predominated, and they massacred all the Armenians that was just before the liberation of Armenia and Georgia from the yoke of imperialism." (T.Stalin: "Report on National Factors in Party and State Affairs", 12th Congress of the R.S.F.S.R. (1923), Works, Vol.10, Moscow: 1939, p.756).

In these circumstances, the Central Committee of the Party decided that for a certain period the three Transcaucasian Republics should be united in a Federation:

"To put an end to that strife an organ of national peace was needed,..., a supreme authority whose word would carry weight." (T.Stalin: "Reply to the Discussion on the Central Committee's Organizational Report", 12th Congress of the R.S.F.S.R. (1923), Works, Vol.10, Moscow: 1939, p.757).

Thus, on November 25th, 1921 Lenin wrote to Stalin proposing that the Political Bureau of the Central Committee should resolve
I) to recognize the federation of the Transcaucasian republics as absolutely correct in principle and as a matter of course.

II) to instruct the Central Committee of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan to carry out this decision."

A motion to this effect was adopted unanimously at the next meeting of the Political Bureau, attended by both Lenin and Stalin. Two conditions — one headed by Krasnov, the other by Kamenev and Eshov — reported that federation was indispensable, and this was confirmed by a vote of 6 to 1. The motion was referred to the Central Committee. In accordance with this policy, the Federative Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of Transcausasia was brought into being in March 1917.

**THE TRANSCAUCASIAN DEPUTIES**

However, federation of the Transcausiasian Republics was actively opposed, both before and after its establishment, by a minority group of Georgian communists, headed by Kamenev, who was found guilty in 1918 of treason against the Transcausiasian Federation. They opposed federation as a move inspired by "Great-Russian chauvinism, attacking especially Stalin — himself a Georgian — under this label. Stalin pointed out to the 12th Congress of the Party that the facts showed that fear of Great-Russian chauvinism was an motive for the opposition of the Georgian 'deputies':

"There has been and is still a group of Georgian Communists who do not object to Georgia uniting with the Union of Republics, but who do object to this union being affected through the Caucasian Federation."

These statements indicate that in the national question the attitude towards the Transcausiasian is of secondary importance in Georgia, for those congresses, the deputies (that is what they are called), had no objection to Georgia joining the Union directly; that is, they do not fear Great-Russian chauvinism, believing that its roots have been cut out in one way or another, or, at any rate, that it is not of decisive importance. Firstly, what they fear most is the federation of Transcausasia. Why? (J. Stalin: Report on National Factors in Party and State Affairs, 12th Congress of the R.C.P. (B.).""

"Reports, Vol. 1, Moscow 1953, p.274.

Stalin proceeded to demonstrate that the real motive behind the opposition of the Georgian 'deputies' to federation was, in fact, Georgia chauvinism:

"The point is that the heads of the Transcausiasian Federation, in spite of their somewhat privileged position which they enjoy under the pretext of their geographical position and by virtue of which Georgia may be considered a part of the Transcausiasian Federation, are in fact, Georgia chauvinists. Georgia has her own part in the Transcausiasian Federation through her geographical position. Her geographical position makes her important, and her geographical position gives her a certain influence in the Transcausiasian Federation."

On his arrival in Moscow, Kamenev made contact with opposition leaders there and through the agency of Lenin's wife, Nadezhda Krupskaya, who was at that time very sympathetic to the opposition, was given facilities to explain to Lenin, who was seriously ill and isolated from the Party leadership (he was unable to attend the October and December plenums of the Central Committee in 1917). In December, Lenin received a letter written by Krupskaya, allegedly at Lenin's dictation, conveying the opposition charges that Stalin and Kamenev was forced to resign under the pressure of the Transcausiasian Federation. When Stalin asked by telephone that representatives of the Political Bureau should be permitted to see Lenin and report the true facts of the situation to him, Krupskaya refused on the grounds that "this health would not permit it." Stalin protested strongly at this situation, and on December 23rd, 1917, Krupskaya wrote a personal letter to the opposition leader Lev Kamenev (later, in 1918, found guilty of treason against the Soviet state) complaining of Stalin's "rudeness" and of his "threat" to refer his conduct to the Central Committee of the Party.

**LENIN'S TESTAMENT**

On the following day, December 24th, Maria Volozhina, a Kremlin secretary, allegedly at the dictation of Lenin, wrote a letter addressed to the Congress of the Party. This purported to reverse Lenin's life-long experience — that of fighting shoulder-to-shoulder with Stalin against the counter-revolutionary anti-Menshevik stand of Trotsky — by designating Stalin and praising Trotsky.

"Comrade Stalin, having become Secretary-General, has unlimited authority concentrated in his hands, and I am not sure whether he
will always be capable of using that authority with sufficient caution. Comrade Trotsky, on the other hand, as his struggle against the C.C. on the question of the People's Commissariat for Communications has already proved, is distinguished by outstanding ability. He is personally perhaps the most capable man in the present C.C."


Six days later, on December 10th, 1922, Yudichev wrote a letter on the national question, again allegedly at the dictation of Lenin, in which the charges of Stalin and Bukharin made by the opposition leaders were supported:

"Stalin's haste and his infatuation with pure administration, together with his spirit against the notorious 'nationalist-sociologist', played a fatal role here."

The German... was carelessly flinging about accusations of 'nationalist-socialism' (where he himself is a real and true 'nationalist-socialist' and even a vulgar Great-Russian bully) violations, in substance, the interests of proletarian class struggle... The political responsibility for all this truly Great-Russian nationalist campaign must, of course, be laid on Stalin and Bukharin." (T.L. Lenin: Collected Works, Vol.36, Moscow, 1946, p.660, 661).

On January 40, 1923, Lydia Fejerskov, a Kremlin secretary sympathetic to the opposition, added a protocol to the letter of December 24th, again allegedly at the dictation of Lenin, calling for the removal of Stalin as Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Party:

"Stalin is too rude and this defect, although quite tolerable in our midst and in dealings among us Communists, becomes intolerable in a Secretary-General. That is why I suggest that the Comrades think about a way of reviving Stalin from that post and appointing another man to his stead who in all other respects differs from Stalin in having only one advantage, namely, that of being more tolerant, more loyal, more polite and more considerate to the comrades, less capricious, etc." (T.L. Lenin: Collected Works, Vol.36, Moscow, 1946, p.596).

The letters were addressed to "The Congress", but when the 17th Party Congress took place in April 1923 they were not presented. Lenin, although very seriously ill after a third stroke, was still alive and while he lived the danger to the opposition existed that he might repudiate them.

But on January 24, 1924 Lenin died, and the letters were, as the revisionist editors of the latest edition of Lenin's Collected Works mistakenly:

"read out to the delegates of the Thirteenth Congress which was held from May 9-30, 1924." (T.L. Lenin: Collected Works, Vol.36, p.712)."

The Congress rejected the allegations made in the letter by condemning Stalin in the post of Secretary-General and, as the revisionist editors of "The Collected Works" say:

"The Congress unanimously decided not to publish the letter, because it was addressed to the Congress and had not been intended for the press." (T.L. Lenin: Collected Works, Vol.36, p.712).

However, after the Congress, the opposition began to use the letters much as they referred to as "Lenin's testament" - in a campaign to remove Stalin from his position. And in 1924 they were published in the United States by the Trotskyite Max Eastman, who obtained them from opposition elements in the Soviet Union.

Following their coming to power after Stalin's death, the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union circulated the letters at the Innsbruck 20th Congress and later:

"in accordance with the instruction of the Central Committees of the C.P.C., the letters were published in the magazine 'Kommunist' No. 9 in 1926." (T.L. Lenin: Collected Works, Vol.36, p.712).

It is not accidental that, in support of his reactionary 'nationality' views, even stuck up the blunted weapons of the trotskyite and revisionist propaganda arsenal in order to attack Stalin. As in 1922 and 1926, the attack upon Stalin centers on attack upon Marxism-Leninism.

STALIN: SECONDS BEFORE EXECUTION

It is clear that the inexhaustible political ingenuity of the leaders of Marxism-Leninism, whether in 1922 or in 1946, give not the slightest support to Engels's claim that Stalin inclined to 'great race chauvinism'. On the contrary, Stalin's chauvinism is all its force consistently throughout his life."


"The principal factor impeding the unity of the republics into a single union is that which exists, as I have said, in growing in our country under the conditions of the W.K.F. Great-Russian chauvinism." (J.V. Stalin: Report on National Factors in Party and State Affairs, 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U., in: Works, Vol.5, p.385).

"As we can achieve success only by fighting on two fronts - on the one hand, against Great-Russian chauvinism, which is the chief danger in our work of construction, and, on the other hand, against local chauvinisms; unless we wage this double fight there will be no solidarity between the Russian workers and peasants and the workers and peasants of the other nationalities." (J.V. Stalin, 1944, p.273).

LENI AND 'NATIONALISM' IN THE USSR

Was there, in fact, as Evans claims, some difference between Lenin and Stalin on the national question in relation to Britain? Dobb, unlike Lenin, believe that 'Scottish nationalism' and Welsh 'nationalism' were progressive movements of genuine nationalism.

On the contrary, speaking of 'the advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe', Lenin says:


"In those advanced countries... the national problem has been solved for a long time... objectively, there are no 'national tasks' to be fulfilled." (T.L. Lenin: 'A Critique of Marxism and Imperialist Economism', in: Selected Works, Vol.5, London, undated, p.295).

"In the western countries the national movement is a thing of the past... In Britain, France, Germany, etc. ... it has played its historical role, i.e., the national movement cannot yield here anything progressive, anything that will elevate new masses to a new economic and political life." (T.L. Lenin: ibid., p.395).

The truth of Lenin's analysis in this respect is borne out a hundredfold by the brief history of most of these groups calling themselves 'Marxist-Leninist' who have embraced 'nationalism' in Britain. They have quickly degenerated into abolitionists of Lenin and Stalin, and into purveyors of reactionary Trotskyite, social-Chauvinist, and even fascist ideology.

YOU CAN HELP RED FRONT
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* by persuading your militant workmates to take out a subscription;

* by sending a donation or, better still, a monthly guarantee;

* by assisting in the sale of the paper outside factories and in public places in your locality (for details and copies on sale or return, write to: M. Scott, 34 Upper Tollington Park, London N4.)
THE AMERICAN BATTLEFIELD
AN INTERVIEW WITH COMRADE MICHAEL LASKI, General Secretary of the
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (MARXIST-LENINIST)

QUESTION: Could you outline for our readers the history of the development of the Marxist-Leninist movement in the United States of America.

COMRADE LASKI: There are, apart from the C.P.U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist), four groups in the United States which call themselves "Marxist-Leninist".

In 1946, at the 6th Convention of the revisionist C.P.U.S.A., a split occurred around a leading individual, Kennedy Rowan, who was a member of the New York State Central Committee of the Party. This split occurred over certain central questions, namely, the role of Comrade Stalin, the analysis of the Hungarian counter-revolution (to which the C.P.U.S.A. took an attitude of partial support), the national question in the United States, the attitude towards the trade union movement and, of course, the basic questions of the transition to socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The right-wing revisionists - Dennis, Elizabeth Hurley Fynes, One Hall - were able to gain effective control of the party, while Foster played a central, conciliatory role of "trying to hold the Party together".

There had been a tremendous influx of petty bourgeois and intellectual elements into the party in the thirties and forties, and these had provided the basis for revisionism. This had led to 1944, to the triumph of bureaucracies and the complete dissolution of the party, which was transformed into the "Centrist Political Association". The subsequent "reconstitution" was mere window-dressing: the elements that had adopted bureaucracies merely used him as a respectable and then proceeded to carry through the same policies in a less obvious way.

When the 16th Convention was over, the right-wing moved to expel the small, minority opposition, which was centered mainly among the Negro and Puerto Rican workers and the remnants of the party's working class base on the waterfront of New York City, in Cleveland and Chicago, together with a small scattering on the West Coast. These anti-revisionist elements formed in 1948 the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party (known as the P.O.O.C) and began to publish the "Marxist-Leninist Vanguard". This was the first group to emerge and it still is in existence.

In 1967, after the Chinese and Albanian Parties had begun to oppose international revisionism publicly, the Progressive Labor Movement (later the Progressive Labor Party) was formed mainly from elements who had come out of the revisionist party; its leading elements had been expelled from the party as trotskyites. Rosen, the leading figure in Progressive Labor, actually capitalized on the situation brought about by the policies in the International Communist Movement to muster whatever support he could across the country among those who had dissociated themselves from the revisionist party.

About the same time, New Front was expelled from the Central Committee of the Communist Party and, with a number of collaborators set up "Newman and Steel" and the new defiant, "New England Party of Labor". The paper still exists but it and the movement around it has made no growth.

In the winter of 1960-61 an organization called the "Ad Hoc Committee to Reconstitute a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party" came into existence. This has an eponymous leadership and is allegedly formed of members of the Communist Party who are in opposition to its revisionist line and believe that it is possible to transform the party by means of inner-party struggle.

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) developed out of the P.O.O.C. in 1965, because, as a result of the Watts uprising at this time, it became clear that the P.O.O.C. was adopting a sectarian stand, refusing to wage a political struggle, to give any political leadership, to expand its forces or to give any lead on the formation of a Marxist-Leninist Party.

The founding conference of the C.P.U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) was held on September 4-5th, 1965. Its general organ is "The People's Voice" (established shortly before the founding conference, in August 1965). Its theoretical organ is the journal "Red Flag".

QUESTION: On what organizational principles is the C.P.U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) constructed?

COMRADE LASKI: On the organizational principles of the "party of a new type" elaborated by Lenin and Stalin. It is democratically-centralized, capable of forming the leading force of the working class movement. Its Central Committee is the leading organ of the Party, apart from the Congress which elected it.

QUESTION: What is the basic policy of the C.P.U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) towards the trade union movement?

COMRADE LASKI: We hold that our main task in the trade union field must be to break what we call "the fascist labour front", which is actually the incorporation of the bureaucratic organs of the trade unions into the monopoly-capitalist state. We do not believe that the bureaucratic leaderships can be replaced merely by seeking election to official positions in shop stewards' committees or trade unions. Our policy is to concentrate on the political education of the rank-and-file primarily by leading them in struggle, only then will the trade union elections have a firm, stable basis.

QUESTION: How does the C.P.U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) view the national question in the United States?

COMRADE LASKI: The U.S.A. is a multi-nation state, made up of three nations: the American nation, the Negro nation in the south, and the Puerto Rican nation. Our viewpoint is based on Stalin's teachings on the national question embodied in his classics "Marxism and the National Question".

The existence of the Negro nation was settled in 1868 by the C.P.U.S.A. as a result of a decision of the Third International. Stalin pointed out that the Negro nation did exist, and that the demand for its right of self-determination was an obligation for American Communists to fight for in order to solve the national antagonisms within the United States.

Our current position is liquidated by the revisionists in 1956, and in its place was put support for "civil rights"; the policy of equal rights within the American nation and of self-determination for the Negro nation was discarded.

Our Party takes the following stand on this matter: that there is in fact a Negro nation in the south and that it has the right of self-determination. The question of the relationship of the Negro nation to the American nation - whether the former should form an independent socialist republic, an autonomous section of a unitary socialist American republic, or a republic of a federated American state, or whether it should fuse with the American nation - this question is a matter for the working people of the Negro nation to determine. Marxist-Leninists in the American nation fight for the right of self-determination for the Negro nation, while those in the Negro nation (who are part of the same Party) fight for fusion with the American nation.

This Marxist-Leninist position on the national question is a powerful weapon against revisionist nationalists. Revisionary Negro nationalism is the complement of revisionist Anglo-American nationalism put forward by the most reactionary sections of the U.S. imperialists.

QUESTION: What is the attitude of the C.P.U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) towards the slogan "Black Power"?

COMRADE LASKI: We do not advocate "Black Power" in any sense of the
THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

LACOS

In December and January liberation forces in less gained momentum successes against the U.S.-supported government forces. In January, after a long siege, liberation forces occupied the heavily fortified town of Ban Nai, only 60 miles from the capital city of Luang Prabang. A government commandeered 7,000 of its troops are missing in Ban Nai. Another government commandeered on the same day admitted a heavy attack upon the U.S. air base near Luang Prabang itself.

NOTE FROM

After 120 years of British rule, the people of South Yemen—formerly the Aden protectorate—won their independence after four years of armed struggle which began with the British revolt in 1963. Inspired by the national-democratic idea of the Guerrillas and the National Liberation Front, the National Front was able to push aside the royal organization A20, which was equipped and directed by the newly-arrested Egyptian corporate class headed by Nasser. In November 1963, 1967 British imperialism handed over power to the National Liberation Front and the People's Republic of South Yemen was established.

NOTE FROM

Further north, in Yemen itself, armed revolutionary struggle continues against the forces of the reactionary feudal monarchy, which is financed and armed by feudal Saudi Arabia and by the U.S. forces in that country. In November 1967 the United States imperialists, the United Arab emirates and Saudi Arabia successfully pressured the 80,000-strong Egyptian army in Yemen to withdraw from the country. Hoping that this measure would force the republican revolutionaries to lay down their arms. The move has failed dismally and, despite the continued ado of the Royalist forces from South Yemen, the National Liberation Front—faced with this oppressive restrictions of the Egyptian occupation—is fighting with new strength.
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WE ACCUSE... YOUNG COMMUNISTS DENOUNCE LEADERSHIP

The following statement was adopted unanimously at the end of November by a meeting of leaders from various London branches of the Young Communist League.

At a time of crisis for capitalism, when bourgeois ideology is obviously out of keeping with the requirements of the age, when it is becoming increasingly apparent that the upshot of the capitalist economic crisis is currently being written by the revolutionary peoples of the world — at such a time it is of supreme importance that we Communists have a thorough understanding of Marxism-Leninism. In Lenin's words:

"Without a revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement."

In that they have failed to present the need for such a theory, the Communist Party of Great Britain and its youth movement, the Young Communist League, have both proved to be no longer capable of uniting the working class of this country under the banner of scientific socialism and of leading it in revolution. The C.P.U.K. and the Y.C.L. have deliberately neglected to educate the masses of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, neglected the role of the working masses in changing society, neglected the need to smash the capitalist state machine, and instead have shifted the emphasis to propaganda to their members a belief in social-democracy in the establishment of socialists by the use of peaceful means, suggesting that the ruling classes would take their place as "parliamentary democrats" at its face value and permit the masses of the people to vote away their wealth and power.

DEGENERAZE POLITICAL ATMOSPHERE

This is the essence of the degenerate political atmosphere that pervades the C.P.U.K. and the Y.C.L. today. Obviously, such organizations are dangerous to the movement — for social-democratic parties serve the interests of the capitalists, not those of the working class. But past events and recent analyses have proved that it is virtually impossible to change the policies of such organizations. What must be done is to expose them, while at the same time building a new Communist Party based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, a Communist Party that is truly dedicated to the revolutionary overthrow of the existing social order and to the construction of a Socialist Britain. Unless such a Party is built along correct lines, with a correct leadership and with a programme for the seizure of power — all future struggles on the part of the working class of Britain will inevitably be doomed to failure.

A TOTAL FAILURE TO STAND BY PRINCIPLES

Within the Young Communist League a situation now exists where many members have openly come out in opposition to the leadership's approach to the class struggle, an approach that is anti-Marxist-Leninist, as is evidenced by their journal "Challenge", by their attitude to recruiting, by their methods of work, by their "appraisal" of the Labour Government, by their approach to broad-front organizations, notably the C.P.U.K. and the Y.C.L. — in all, a total failure to stand by principles and a policy that rarely shows a trace of working class consciousness. The leadership has launched vile, slanderous attacks on the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of China and Albania, which show its tendency to reply to the attacks levied at them by the Soviet revisionists — attacks which, coupled with the remarks of Dr. Zhukov's denunciation of the great political leader J.V. Stalin, brought about the rift in the International Communist movement.

The National Committee of the Young Communist League, instead of using the Y.C.L. journal "Challenge" as a means of promoting healthy discussion on the many major issues facing the Communist movement, such as the split mentioned above, has given over the pages of the journal to commentaries on present-day political issues of minor importance, such as the "Hippies" and the Pirate Radio Stations, in order to try and win support from the middle class.

A CALL FOR WORKING CLASS UNITED ACTION

This leaflet is available for the use of Cells, T.U. factions, industrial and tenants groups, etc., from:

M.L.O.B., Literature Dept.,

Price: 2/6d. per 100 carriage paid.
"NATIONAL SOCIALISM": CONTINUED FROM PAGE 8

(published as a pamphlet under the title "Value, Price and Profit"). He concludes his lengthy analysis with the conclusion that a "general rise in the rate of wages would result in a fall of the general rate of profit, but, broadly speaking, not affect the prices of commodities." (E.Menzel & P.Engels: "Selected Works", Vol.1; Moscow 1956, p.447)

and asks rhetorically if the working class... ought to renounce their resistance against the encroachments of capital, and abandon their attempts at making the best of the occasional chances for their temporary improvements? If they did, they would be degraded to the level mass of broken rehashed past salvation." (E.Menzel & P.Engels: ibid., p.446).

Marxist-Leninists have long been under the impression that economic crises were important in raising the class and political consciousness of the working class in preparation for their emancipation from capitalism. This too, says the W.P.S., is a delusion:

"This is a short-sighted argument and does little justice to the intelligence of the working people. It is on a par with the type of military leadership which, for the sake of motion, sends men 'over the top' into senseless suicide battles... Only the organised economic struggle will result in the filling up of the reservoirs of mass organisation and working class political power." (p.210).

Here again the "Workers' Party of Scotland" stands Marxists on their head, for, as Marx pointed out in that same address of 1865:

"My codrding way in my everyday conflict with capital, they would certainly dispose themselves for the initiation of any larger movement." (E.Menzel & P.Engels: ibid., p.446).

What alternative does the W.P.S. propose to the working class in place of the economic struggle? Again it is one which will enrol the party to the Federation of British Industries. The workers should follow, in our capitalist society, the example of the socialists in a socialist society. They should work "as if possessed." (p.222).

"The political party of the working class must be the centre from which eradication of the Luddite mentality will spread throughout the movement... There is need to suspend the theory and spirit of Socialism in industry for the sake of the working class political movement itself." (p.210-1).

THE NATURE OF FASCISM

As has been said, fascists present their movement as one of "socialist revolution". The "Workers' Party of Scotland" applies this principle not only in relation to the cause of the party, but to German fascists in particular:

"The views of the bourgeois capitalists... who seek to bury the truth in lies, especially that Hitler was merely the paid agent of a monopoly capital, must be rejected... Fascism is the socialist revolutionary movement in the era of transition..." The essential prerequisite of communist participation in bourgeois-parliamentary... is that the party be totally free of corruption itself... Hitler, and the National Socialists, justified this... The power Hitler released in his "National Socialism" was the power of the organised proletariat, the same power as had been released across the border in the Soviet Union." (p.21,22).59

In fact, says the W.P.S., the ideology and organizational structure of the German fascist movement were essentially that of the German "Left Communist" - which (as will be shown later) they regard as the "correct trend" within the German communist movement.

"Broadly speaking, the political and organizational planning and ideas of the German 'Left' communists and Hitler's National Socialist Movement were on parallel lines..." (p.33).

It is true, admits the W.P.S., that the German fascist movement in its later stages came to serve the interests of the capitalist class, but this was because of the "error" of the leadership:

"The tragedy of the German National Socialist Workers' Movement was precisely in the nature of its leadership... The power Hitler released in his 'National Socialism' was the power of the organised proletariat,... and not the power of the bourgeois, as an instrument for the secret service of bourgeois purposes. It thus proved too big a power for him to handle... Fascism is capitalist ideology grafted onto a working-class organisation... It is in the socialist revolutionary movement in the era of transition when leadership is usurped by the bourgeoisie..." (p.16, 5, 53).

And she was responsible for the victory of the "opportunist-led" faction "socialist revolutionary movement" over the "correctly-led" "parallel" "Left Communist" movement... Apart from that Lenin, says the W.P.S.,

LENDIN PARLIAMENT

It was Lenin above all who exposed "parliamentary democracy" as a sham facade to the machinery of forces which forms the essential structure of the capitalist state. At the same time Lenin, in particular in his book "Left Wing Communism", an Infantile Disorder", that it was essential for Communists to participate, were possible, in "parliamentary democracy" in order to expose the true character of parliament as a bulking-head to deceive the working people.

A harmful error on Lenin's part, says the W.P.S.,111 "a class break with parliamentarians and with the slogan 'parliamentarism as a tactic' is the order of the day... Participation as a tactic is seen to be wrong in all circumstances and the most dangerous form of opportunism. It is not just a question of a Marxist-Leninist Party not standing candidates, but of forcing the working people to keep away from the polling booths," (pp.111).

Lenin cited the experience of the Bolsheviks to illustrate the necessity for Communists to participate in "parliamentary democracy" and the Communist International, under Lenin's leadership, made acceptance of this principle a condition of affiliation to it.1, "A prime error", comments the "Workers' Party of Scotland", the Communist International was "based on false internationalism, on his nation duellism, on the belief and the myth in the relationship within and between the world communist parties... Its policy of domination and interference in the affairs of fraternal parties was in breach of proletarian internationalism. This is the key to the mistakes of the period... Lenin was to make the mistake of insisting on the universality of this particular experience, making its acceptance a condition of affiliation to the Communist International... By overriding considerations of 'ravage national' tactics and demanding 'international conformity' the Comintern was precisely overriding proletarian internationalism which it failed to understand correctly... Lenin should not have entered into the struggle as a participant, but confused his advice to a theoretical evaluation of the problem involved... The world has gone through many of struggles for this truth to crystallise and to emerge... The Soviet Communist Party stepped off on the wrong foot in its relations with fraternal parties, beginning with the publication of 'Left Wing Communism', an Infantile Disorder' and going on to the policy of dialect which became the policy of the Cominform and whose consequence was the failure of communist policy first in Yugoslavia, Germany, and later in all the other communist parties of the West," (p.17, 65, 54, 59, 59).

The particular "error" on the part of Lenin which led, the W.P.S., asserts, to the victory of Fascism in Germany was the opposition by the Communist International, under Lenin's leadership, of the "Leftist" Communist Workers' Party of Germany in 1921 for failing to carry out C.I. directives. The W.P.S. comments on this action as follows:
The leadership principle

The "Workers' Party of Scotland" holds that a third course of the rise of modern revolutionism in the international communist movement was the practice of tactical vote as policy:

"A policy vote is not the vehicle of true democracy as it is the means of overriding the view of the minority.... True proletarian democracy is expressed through the system of democratic centralism which incorporates the principle of unanimity.... The policy vote reduces all decisions to the mediocrity of the average.... The policy vote is the instrument of stupidity.... Through the policy vote the organisation fails to visit opportunism.... It is up to every individual who does not consider himself a bourgeois to see that he does not sell his hands by participating in a policy vote.... In working class organisation he should swallow himself of the right of discussion to challenge, not the resolution but the legality of the vote itself.... From the proletarian point of view the policy vote is illegal and any decision reached through it is invalid." (p.77, 81, 82, 84).

The bizarre distortion of "democratic centralism" which is recommended by the "Workers' Party of Scotland" bears a certain similarity to the fascist principle of obedience to an 'elite leader:

"Many tasks, and the making of wise decisions is one, can best be carried out by a single person.... 'Iron discipline'-demands that the decisions of elected leaders are always right; they may be overridden neither from above nor below." (p.75, 78).

Home and children

Marxist-Leninists—along with all progressive—have always fought for equal rights for women and men. "Women," says the "Workers Party of Scotland":

"The bourgeois communist attitude is that men and women should mix together and be treated as equals, which amounts in practice to the violent policy of male chauvinism.... Men and women are not 'political equals'.... Economically women should not aim for 'equal pay for equal work'...." (p.136).

As a "reward" for dropping the demand for equal pay and equal rights, the "Workers' Party of Scotland" offers certain spheres of special life which will be reserved for women under Scottish "National Socialism". "In the socialist reorganisation of society certain fields must be recognised as women's spheres of interest. These spheres of interest would embrace those related to domestic and family life, and, in particular, civil law, medicine and basic education." (p.136).

Conclusion

The "Workers' Party of Scotland" (Marxist-Leninist) is no more a Marxist-Leninist Party, a party serving the interests of the working class, than was Hitler's "German Workers' Party". It is a reflection of the generally low level of political under-
THE DRIVE TO MONOPOLY IN BRITAIN

In reply to a Parliamentary question on November 3rd, 1967, the President of the Board of Trade estimated that there were about 1,460 companies in Britain owned or controlled by U.S. firms. These companies had book assets of about £1,960 million.

The Revisionist World

DOMINANTS

Of all the former socialist countries of eastern Europe, Yugoslavia has to date gone furthest along the road of the “true social reform” which signals the restoration of capitalist relations of production and economic principles and practices.

The Belgrade newspaper “Politika” recently published an article on the desirability of Yugoslav enterprises entering into joint production agreements with British commercial firms, and Mr. Charles Clare has been tasked to build a new hotel.

Meanwhile the press reports numbers of cases of the bankruptcy of enterprises under “workers’ control,” revealing that the workers in “socialist” Yugoslavia are no more secure than in capitalist Britain.

The last official figures reveal a total of 14,000 unemployed workers in Belgrade alone, of whom 3,000 are young skilled workers. As the Belgrade newspaper “Politika” expressed the situation:

“Only unemployment or emigration lies in store for young people who have not left school. They are left to their fate. ... Thus, an engineer begins to sell lottery tickets, a highly trained electrician is catching and selling fish, a doctor has become a photographer, a young agricultural scientist earns his living by singing in the street.”

SOVIET UNION

Among the “cultural events” to celebrate the 10th Anniversary of the Russian Revolution was the release of a new film “Slogging Stalin.” The film is entitled “If You Treasure your Homeland...” and is composed of film material from the archives of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the German Democratic Republic “edited” to mirror Stalin’s leadership during the war against German Fascism.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

During the latter part of 1967, an alliance was formed between right-wing liberals and representatives of the Omega bourgeoisie, which has for a long time presented the subordinate position allotted to it by the nationalist representatives of the Czech bourgeoisie who have long dominated the central apparatus of the revisionist party.

In December 1967 this alliance was successful in forcing the replacement of the Czech revisionist leader Antonin Novy as First Secretary of the Party by the Slovak revisionist leader Alexander Urban. Novy retains his position as President.

The change of leadership heralds further moves along the road to the restoration of capitalism in Czechoslovakia.

Meanwhile Czechoslovakia took a further step away from “Stalinism” (i.e., Marxist-Leninist) cultural values when Miss Alberta Stewenkov became the first girl from eastern Europe to enter the Miss World contest.

A statistician at the Czech Embassy in London characterized Miss Stewenkov as the 37-54-37.

AFRICAN REVOLUTION GROUP ARRIVING IN U.S.

In January the “left” revisionist Cuban leadership announced the arrest and forthcoming trial, on charges of plotting against the state, of 13 members of an alleged conspiratorial faction headed by Left revisionist Animal Robalenc. Two members of the Central Committee - Jose Molina and Raoul Colmades - were among those charged. It was claimed that the group’s aim was to secure the repudiation by the Cuban party of its support for armed revolution in Latin America in favor of the line of “peaceful transition” put forward by the Soviet revisionists.

PEOPLE’S CHINA

The Chinese counter-revolutionary faction headed by Mao Tsung-tung is making arrangements to hold a “Congress” of the “Chinese Communist Party” this summer in order to “realize” the faction’s song d’etat.

Reliah Pasha, Minister of Public Security and head of the Farina “Revolutionary Committee” has announced that delegates will be selected and not elected.
LETTERS FROM READERS
A MORE POPULAR STYLE

"Having read the first two issues of RED FRONT, I must congratulate the M.I.C. on the very high standard of its paper. The issue on the events in China was fascinating and was made even more so by the position of no longer having to try and justify the nonsense that is now appearing in FORKING POINTS.

My only criticism is that I find it rather difficult to sell the paper to workers on the factory floor, since they tend to find it rather dear and somewhat 'above their heads' at the moment. What the movement needs, in my opinion, is a paper which, while not 'talking down' to workers, is written in a more populist style which they can understand without a dictionary.

Commutist greetings.

I agree with the point you make, as you will see from the report of the meeting of the Central Committee on page 2, BEACON.

"THE NEW CHALLENGE"

"If a new "sit-down" CHALLENGE has now been issued by the revisionist National Committee of the Young Communist League, it shows that there has been a further turning away from working class politics by the National Committee along a road of bourgeois "pop" and liberalism.

Opening the "pop" cover one finds a shallow, sentimental, classless "pop" analysis of the October Revolution, asserting that in the lifetime of CHALLENGE readers there will be Communism in the Soviet Union.

The opposite page is splattered with "hippy" drawings, which have now become synonymous with CHALLENGE, and then follows a two-page spread on Greece, undoubtedly a good theme, and one could write quite a pointed article on two pages, but the editor succeeds in making the content quite inedible from something which might have been termed by the Young Forward, but perhaps that is in accordance with the peculiar form of "united front" policy of the T.C.L.

Following this comes a pointless full-page article, simply written in "hippy" language, on "pop" records, which makes no attempt even to touch upon any sort of class analysis of the subject. Then comes a page of adverts - almost all devoted to an advert for "Christian Aid".

One has to wade through a further two pages on the obsession of CHALLENGE - drugs - to come to a tedious report on the Vienna demonstration of the 14/10th October. This is the only mention of Vietnam, apart from three incidental remarks, in the whole journal. Considering that T.C.L. political activity centre almost solely around the Vietnam war, surely we should expect more.

Then again back to the "hippies" and drugs. There is an "unbiased selection" of letters for and against the "hippy" movement - some of the letters criticising Stan Beacro's article in the previous edition of CHALLENGE which fully supported the "hippy" movement.

And so it goes on, ending up with a full page caricature of Prince Charles with the slogan "Workers of the World Unite!"

Either the National Committee of the T.C.L. really thinks that working class youth are of very low intelligence or they are deliberately trying to divert the attention of their readers from working class politics. I think that both are probably the case, but they will be doomed to failure on the latter point.

The new-style CHALLENGE is helping more and more rank-and-file members of the T.C.L. to see clearly the reactionary role of its revisionist leaders.

D.C., Ilford.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

"Today in the lunch break at the factory where I work the talk gotround to foreign exchange and devaluation, but we found that nobody was ever really clear as how they worked. Can you explain?"

R. H. Coventry.

If a T.C.L. capitalist wishes to buy British goods, he must buy pounds with his dollars in order to pay the British exporter. Similarly, if a British capitalist wishes to buy U.S. goods, he must buy dollars with his pounds. The exchange of the currency of one state for that of another is called foreign exchange and is carried out through the medium of what is called the foreign exchange market.

The rate of exchange of a currency is the number of units of another currency for which a unit of the first currency can be exchanged on the foreign exchange market. More simply, it is the price of a unit of the first currency on the foreign exchange market in terms of the units of another currency. Thus, before devaluation, the exchange rate of British currency with U.S. currency was around $2.80 dollars to the pound.

The price of something on a market varies according to supply and demand. Consequently, if more people wish to buy dollars with pounds than wish to buy pounds with dollars - if, that is, Britain has a payments deficit with the United States - the exchange rate of the pound to terms of dollars goes down. On the other hand, if more people wish to buy pounds with dollars than wish to buy dollars with pounds - if, that is, Britain has a payments surplus with the United States - the exchange rate of the pound to terms of dollars goes up.

By international agreement the Bank of England must not allow fluctuations in the rate of exchange of the pound to exceed 10 above or below the fixed parity of (before devaluation) 1.25 dollars to the pound. That is, it must not allow the exchange rate of the pound to exceed 2.80 dollars to the pound or to fall below 2.77 dollars to the pound. If, for example, the rate falls towards the lower limit of 2.77 dollars to the pound, the Bank of England buys as many pounds as may be offered for sale at a rate just above this lower limit. It does this by means of its reserves of gold and foreign currency.

If Britain has a considerable payments deficit with the outside world as a whole over a considerable period - if, that is, it has a long-term adverse balance of payments - the Bank's reserves of gold and foreign currency may be seriously depleted.

The Government, of course, to correct this adverse balance of payments by stimulating exports, cutting imports, imposing restrictions on the purchase of foreign currency with pounds, etc. But it may have to borrow foreign currency from international financial sources to make up its reserves. And it may have to alter the exchange rate to a lower level i.e., to devalue the pound.

Britain has had for many years an adverse balance of payments averaging several hundred million pounds each year. This reflects Britain's adverse balance of trade (the excess of imports over exports) and the parasitic nature of British imperialism in general; the stagnation of production and technical backwardness of British industry which makes it difficult for British exports to compete on the world market with those from other imperialist countries; the heavy overseas military expenditure to try and hold on by force to its foreign sources of wealth against the rising national liberation movements, etc.

The unstable position of the pound in such a situation is all the more vulnerable by the fact that foreign and Communist capitalists hold large balances in London in sterling; in mid-1967 these balances totalled some £4,200 million. If the pound is devalued, the holders of these balances suffer heavy losses overnight. If, therefore, the exchange rate of the pound falls and the holders of these sterling balances fear that devaluation may be under consideration, they may hasten to change these sterling balances into other currencies - so greatly aggravating the "run on the pound" and the threat of devaluation. At the same time speculators step in and sell sterling in the hope of making a profit by buying it back later at a lower price, increasing still further the "pressure on the pound".

All these forces operate in the exchange of 1967 to cause the British government in November to devalue the pound by 14.5% from 2.80 to 2.40 dollars to the pound.

Devaluation enables British exporters to reduce the prices of their goods abroad without lowering their profit margins. It also increases the price of goods imported in Britain (by 16.7% in the case of the devaluation of November 1967).

The object of devaluation is to achieve a shift from home consumption to exports. To the extent that the latter is brought about, it will assist in correcting the adverse balance of payments. For this reason the government accompanied devaluation with deflationary measures to freeze wages, restrict bank credit and raise interest rates, stiffen hire-purchase terms, and cut state expenditure. The rise in interest rates is also intended to attract foreign money to London. But this object can only be achieved if it is possible to shift still more of the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of Britain's working people.
States between employed and employers, only a struggle between the black races and the white races:

"Thus did the United States anticipate the prophecy of Marx and avoid the inevitable class struggle within the country by expand-
ing into the Third World and exploiting the resources and slave labour of people of colour." (Stokely Carmichael: 1964, p.14)

In this false picture of the United States, the state is not the machinery of power of the monopoly capitalism, but that of the white race; it represents what Carmichael calls "White power".

"White power makes the laws and enforces them with guns and night-sticks." (Stokely Carmichael: 1964, p.9)

The revolutionary force in the United States is thus the black race and the revolution will be a "Black Revolution":

"The black power movement has been the catalyst for the bringing together of these young bloods: the real revolutionary proletariat..."

We must use our colour as a weapon of liberation...

The true potential revolutionary forces in this country are the black youths of the ghettos." (Stokely Carmichael: 1964, p.13, 14)

"Can a minority revolution succeed in racist America? It most certainly can... All degrees of white supracritics and their Uncle Tommes and some honest, but retarding thinkers, are more than realises in pointing out that a Black Revolution in racist America can never succeed because of the commercial expediency of the white Establish and the concentration of state power in the hands of the majority." (Robert F. Williams: 1964, p.1, 11)

This revolution can succeed without the need for the leadership of a Communist-Leninist Party of the working class, just as one - the opinion of the Castroites and Trotskyites - the revolutions in Latin America:

"a high quality leadership would have to be developed. It must be wholly committed and devoted, selfless, devoid of ego, mentally alert, imaginative, fearless servants of the people, setting as an instrument responding to the desires, necessities and aspirations of the revolutionary masses." (Robert F. Williams: 1964, p.28)

The black revolutionary forces will not be strong enough to over-

"White power" by direct force, but they will do so by means of sabotage and terror directed against the white population.

"We survey our numbers realistically and know that it is not possible for black people to take over the entire country militarily and to hold large areas of land...

We are in the cities. With our rebellions we have become a dis-
ruptive force in the flow of servitudes, grades and capital."

"The most aggressive and irresistible arm of the overall organi-
"The fire team's mission would be sabotage... African American, however, able to allow its rich teacher resources and ideas to go unheeded. "Fire is the black man in racist America's most effective means. No hand of terror or destruction against the oppressor should be overlooked. "These small portable sets can be used to remain directed against gas mains, oil pipe lines, gas and oil storage tanks to effect exploitations.... Any all-out minority revolution must create a state of crisis within almost all of the white male population would be forced to remain in their homes to protect their property and families... America could be brought to her knees in 90 days." (Robert F. Williams: 1964, p.7, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)

The 'Black Revolution' will establish, not the political power of the working class - the dictatorship of the proletariat - but the political power of the black race: "Black Power":

"How can such a small minority aspect to control and reconstruct a vast nation wherein the oppressors constitute such a great..."
BLACK NATIONALISM

The strategy and tactics of revolution embodied in Marxis-Leninism - in the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin - are the sum of the experience of all peoples who have engaged, successfully and temporarily unsuccessfuily, in revolutionary struggle.

The modern "black nationalism" is not fundamentally different from "revolution" which contradicts Marxis-Leninism on almost all central issues. This programme is based on a completely false analysis of the class structure of United States society, an analysis which concludes "рабы" with "рабы".

It does not distinguish between the Negro nation in the South and the Negro national minority in the North.

It seeks to isolate the Negro people in the South and the Negro workers in the North from their essential objective allies - the white workers of the North.

It directs the struggle of the Negro people away from their real enemy, the U.S. monopoly capitalists, the U.S. imperialists, towards the white population in general.

It calls on the Negro people to undertake destruction of resources under the Negro people and the working class will need when they have established a socialist America, and to carry out a revolution against the white population in general: such a course will not destroy the political power of the T.A. imperialists but, on the contrary, will assist them by isolating the Negro people still further from their essential allies - the white workers of the North.

It promises the foreboding of "black supremacy", thus setting itself still further in alienating the white workers from the black people.

It proceeds that revolution can be successful without the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist Party of the working class. The "black nationalism" seeks, in other words, to isolate the Negro people from the leadership of a genuine revolutionary force: the Negro people have isolated revolution when it cannot destroy the power of the U.S. imperialists, but can only lead to the defeat of this revolution, to the bloody slaughter of the best, most skilled sons and daughters of the Negro people and to the perpetuation of the revolutionary ferment in the United States for many years.

Eventually the Negro people in the South, together with the working class - black and white - of the North and under the leadership of the growing Marxist-Leninist Party of the United States of America, destroy the actual of world imperialism, United States imperialism.

A set unimportant part of the task of preparing for that socialist revolution in the United States is that of organizing the programme of the "black nationalist" demagogues for what it is: treachery to and preparation against the Negro people which place into the hands of their greatest enemy - the greatest enemy of the peoples of the world - United States imperialism.

Black Nationalism in Britain

In Britain, as in the northern United States, coloured workers form one of the most exploited strata of the working class. And here, as there, the task of Marxist-Leninists is to build a united movement of struggle covering all working people, white and coloured, who alone can destroy imperialism.

Here too "black nationalist" demagogues are striving to disrupt the building of such a movement and to exploit it along racial lines.

At the present time "black nationalists" in Britain are organized in two main "social adjustment" societies: (P.A.A.B.)

The Black National Society, founded in 1965, originally a religious body, it has recently moved along more secular paths.

The leader was, until his recent imprisonment under the Race Relations Act, West Indian born Michael De Pont ... ("Malcolm X"), a former ponce, dope-push and hunting racist, its new leader is Franklyn Dymo ("Franklyn IV").

The Universal Coloured Peoples' Association (U.C.P.A.)

This body has for its symbol a black panther and the slogan "Black Power". Established in July 1967, it regards itself as the British counterpart of B.O.R.C. It claims several hundred members in London and many more in other parts of the country. It is led by West African playwright O.B. Ayton.

The "Black Nationalist" Bid for Power

The Campaign against Racial Discrimination (C.A.R.D.) was founded in 1964 as an inter-racial organization with the aim of its title. Despite certain "liberal" weaknesses, there can be no doubt of the usefulness of the work it has carried out against racism and racial discrimination in Britain.

This year, at the organization's 3rd Convention in London on the weekend of November 4-5th, an attempt was made jointly by "black nationalists" and Trotskyists to transform it into an instrument of "black nationalism".

A resolution - moved by the "London Workers' Committee", a Trotskyist group which poses as "Marxist-Leninist", and supported by delegates of the C.A.R.D. - was put to the Convention that all officers of C.A.R.D. should be coloured. It was supported by a considerable majority, said anti-white, anti-Semitic and anti-Asian racist ficlility, but failed to attain the two-thirds majority required to alter the Constitution.

Following allegations that Assistant Secretary Johnny Jones, a prominent member of the "London Workers' Committee", had starred in some twenty bogus organizations into the conference, a committee was set up to investigate the allegations and the convention ended in confusion and disorder.
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Standing among the so-called anti-racist movement of Britain that a group putting forward such a reactionary, pseudo-nationalist, anti- socialist programme could have been accepted for a moment as "Marxist-Leninists".

Yet the fact that some honest Communists have accepted the W.P.S. as a "Marxist-Leninist group" has obscured those Communists to be influenced by the W.P.S. in favour of the formation of a loose federation of autonomous groups in various parts of Britain.

"Socialist Federation: Do not surrender power! ... The triumph of socialism is not a bad thing, May it multiply a millionfold ... Keep power in your hands and unite in a great Federal organization ... We say, a Federated Party for Wales, Ireland, Scotland and for England!" ("Party Building: Two Essays", a W.P.S. pamphlet, London, Oct. 1967, p.14).

Even were they genuine Marxist-Leninist Groups, such a federation of autonomous groups would have nothing in common with Marxist-Leninist principles of organization. Lenin, Stalin and the Bolsheviks fought against all forms of nationalism, and for the principle of a single, democratically centralized Party, (V.I. Stalin: "Workers", Vol.1, Moscow, 1975, p.61, 36-40).

But, of course, the "Workers' Party of Scotland" is not interested in the formation of Marxist-Leninist Parties. The parties which it wishes to see established are reactionary, pro-fascist parties, the demagogic programmes of which are adapted to local requirements. But all these demagogic demagogues will be swept from the scene in the course of building a centralized Marxist-Leninist Party of Britain.
"The prevalence of unofficial strikes indicates a state of insubordi-
nation in the industry of this country." —

Minister of Labour Ray Gunter.

THE DOCKS

The six-week Liverpool dock strike, in which 9,000 workers substituted the greatest solidarity and held more than 300 ships idle, ended in October with a 7:6 victory for the workers' demands. The main demand — retention of the 75-year-old "continuity agreement" (which banned the transfer of workers from a shift until it had ended) — was won, together with:

- an increase in loading and discharging pay of 2s. an hour (equivalent to 64 a week);
- parity with London on sick pay;
- a pledge of "no redundancy";
- a promise of revision of the new working rules; and
- agreement on the supply of protective clothing.

Still outstanding were claims for parity with London on "fallowback" pay; a further increase in loading and discharging rates; on deckers' and crane-drivers' rates; on work-starting time; and on changes in the system of payment for many jobs.

In Liverpool the strike involved 1,000 men but was not so solid as in London. It failed to achieve retention of the "continuity agreement", but did win the concession that this would be operated "somewhere practicable" and under the joint supervision of representatives of the employers and workers.

The strikes have further opposed to the dockers the character of the right-wing leadership of the Transport and General Workers' Union and have stimulated the development of the shop stewards' movement in the docks.

SCOTLAND ARMS

In our October issue we reported on the apparent settlement of the then ten-month-old dispute at the B.S. A. — owned Roberts Armal works at Stockport. At a conference held in Tork on September 14th, the company agreed to recognize trade unions, shop stewards and collective bargaining, and to re-entry all the workers without loss of service. The company agreed to take back 26 workers immediately, another 15 within ten working days, and the remainder within two months. The workers accepted the settlement, despite their reluctance to Work alongside blacklegs and strikers.

However, by September 25th, Powernum, the American head of the company, had torn up the Tork agreement. On this day he told a press conference that the company was prepared to take 15 workers back immediately, a further 30 in two weeks and the rest as rapidly as new orders are "developed". Stockport engineering employers stepped in with a proposal that was accepted by the unions: this was that Roberts Armal would take back all 86 men, giving work to 45 as promised by Powernum on September 30th, while the remaining workers would be invited to enter Stockport firms until work was available. Powernum rejected this out of hand.

Even the President of the Manchester Engineering Employers, Charles Berry, was compelled to say: "I am now convinced that this company does not want a settlement. They are just stalling." Later, at a meeting with national union officials, Powernum took back even his promise of September 30th, offering to re-entry only 12 strikers and the rest at the rate of 12 a month.

By November a total of 41 workers had been arrested, and a massacre brutally beaten up inside the police station.

In December Powernum announced that the Stockport works would be closed in January, but workers (non-union) are still being taken on. The fight goes on at the time of writing.

OLUTION BAIL

After guards had refused to perform "second men" duties on diesel trains since August, in October British Rail announced that guards who refused such duties would be sent home without pay. This was followed by a threat by Minister of Railways Gunter to bring troops on to the roll-

wars, and on October 29th the National Union of Railwaymen executive called off the ban.

At the end of the month the executive accepted an offer of payment of a bonus of 3s. 7d. per day to all 12,400 guards in return for acceptance of "second men" duties.

THE MILITARY

The eight-month dispute at the O.P. Harry Mills & Co. in Brighton, where male machinists were expected to work a nine-hour working week of 6 days and 72 hours, formally ended in December when the employers agreed to recognize the right of the workers to join a union and of the union to negotiate an overall deal of the settlement. The right-wing leadership of the National Union of Railway and Lighter Workers accepted the em-

employers' demand that the 117 workers dismissed in April 1967 for joining the union need not be re-instated, Secretary of Brighton Trade Council Denis Bill described the agreement as "a triumph."

INTERPOL

In June 1967 the unions submitted to Vanguard Motor a claim for a new simplified wage structure which would bring the car workers in the company's lutton, Denzil and Ellesmere Port plants into parity with car workers in the Midlands.

In July the company submitted a "Proposed Revised Wage Structure" coupled with a so-called "productivity plan" which amounted to a surrender of conditions and practices won over many years. The company issued this proposal to all hourly-paid employees against union objections, and it was desistently rejected by the shop stewards of the three plants.

In September the company offered pay increases based on the existing wage structure varying between 7d. and 8d. an hour, but these were still linked with the unacceptable "productivity plan," and the offer was rejected by the workers of the three plants. and the joint liaison com-

mittee issued instructions for working to rule and the hanging of over-

times. The company retaliated by shutting down production in the lutton and Denzil factories.

In October the company offered to begin negotiations on terms put forward by a Coventry mass meeting of 15,000 workers, with no victimization and a speedy re-opening of the plants. On that basis the joint liaison committee approved the lifting of work restrictions and negoti-

ations began. Later the right-wing leadership of the National Union of Tubeless Builders unanimously dismissed Arthur Lanyon, the local officer who had been handling the dispute and who had sided with the workers.

TEACHERS

In November local authorities presented an ultimatum to the National Union of Teachers that if the union's ban on school meal supervision in 18 selected areas was not called off by December 1st, teachers operating the ban would not be paid.

The R.N.T. rejected the ultimatum and decided to press on with the ex-

tection of the sanctions to 6 further areas. It added that if any R.N.T. member was suspended, all its 250,000 members would be instructed to withdraw from non-statutory meal supervision.

At the end of the month the union called off the ban in return for an agreement that working parties would be set up to devise another system of meal supervision and the phasing out of unfurlmised workers from teaching. Until then teachers would supervise meals on a voluntary basis.

THE NAVY

In November the 56-week strike at Royal's construction site in the Harwich was called off by the strike committee. Despite the solidarity of the building workers involved, the strike ended without achieving the removal of the ban on employment at any Taylor Woodsides site of the six


THE BANKS

The strike which began in 1967 at British banking history, now 3,700 bank clerks in 350 British banking offices held a two-day strike in November to back the demands of the National Union of Bank Employees for national recog-

nition by the clearing banks.
TRADE UNION NEWS

"UNION JACK" SOCIETY

Members of the Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial staffs at Harlow have sent a resolution to the national executive of their union denouncing the\nexclusion from the union of Prime Minister\nEisenhower, for "activities prejudicial to the trade union movement".

VILE INSULTS "BEFORE THEY REACH THE POLICE"

In November the right-wing General Council of the Trade Union Congress overwhelmingly accepted the government's appeal for a further\nperiod of govern wage restraint. Only three members of the council -\nBill Jones, Richard Grimeham and Leo Maloney - opposed a statement\nwhich made it clear that the cost of living would go up by 25% as a\nresult of devaluation and that no compensatory wage increases would be\napproved. In addition, the council decided that no claims for wage\nincreases would be allowed if they were due to take effect within\x92twelve months of a previous settlement.

"THE ABBREVIATED SOCIETY"

The official "National Income and Expenditure Blue Book", published in September, reveals that 9 million families in Britain had incomes\nbelow £200 a year.

In September it was announced that electricity prices would be\nincreased by an average of 10.5% (adding £46 million a year to the\nrolls of domestic costumers.

The Association of Public Health Inspectors in its annual report\npublished in September, disclosed that there were 132,450 houses in Britain\nsuffering water-closets.

According to the "Guardian" of Sept. 20th, "gas prices were slated by an\naverage of 10.5%.

The 1967 Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories reports that\nin 1967 709 workers were killed in industrial accidents (74 more\nthan in 1966). The total number of industrial accidents rose to 396,000.

The Air Transport Licensing Board approved in September increases in\ndomestic air force varying between 19 and 19.8.

The 'Building Societies' Gazette' pointed out in September that since\n1960 house prices and mortgage repayments have risen faster than incomes.
In the 30 years to 1966 repayments on a £500 loan over 30 years have\nalmost doubled.

Officials of the National Federation of Wholesale Grocers estimate\nthat by the end of March grocery prices will have risen by 1s. 3d. in the\npound since devaluation.

The Grocer lists 1,400 grocery price increases since December.

December official figures showed a rise in unemployment in Great\nBritain and Northern Ireland to 620,779. Highest rate was in Northern\nIreland, where more than 7% of the labour force is unemployed.

In January Ever Ready Batteries announced an increase in the price of\nhearing aid batteries from 1.34d. to 2s. 9d., or more at 50s.

The 1967 Report of the Chief Inspector of Mines records that 150\nminders were killed and 1,061 injured in pit accidents last year.

A government report, "The Week End", reports that the emigration of\nbritish scientists, technologists and engineers rose from a net loss of\nil in 1961 to use of 2,700 in 1966. It estimates that 930 of engi\ners who qualify this year will emigrate.

STUDENTS 'CONGRATULATE' PRINCE CHARLES

A resolution on the agenda of the National Union of Students con\nference at Margate in November read:

"Council congratulates the Prince of Wales on his exceptional per\nfomance in the ODE A-level examinations and on his rare good\nfortune in getting a place at Cambridge University with two A-levels.\nCouncil would be interested to know how many other candidates with\nsimilar qualifications have gained places at universities, and partic\nsularly how many candidates with similar qualifications have been\nawarded the University of Cambridge to study for a period of less\nthan the normal three years and thereby not qualifying for a degree.

Council at the same time commiserates with the 50,000 similarly\nqualified students who will not get a place at any university."

The Welsh Committee of the National Union of Students also passed a\nresolution concerning Prince Charles, declaring the terms of his ad\nmision in 1969 to the University College of Wales in Aberystwyth, as\nresolving as follows:

"the abandonment by the University of Wales of the principle of\nacademic ability as being the only criterion for university admis\nsion."

EUROPE

STATE

On October 27th, 1967 workers throughout Spain staged a one-day strike\nagainst the economic policies of the Franco-Fascist dictatorship,\nsupported by students of Madrid university.

CIVILS

An attempt on the part of the Greek monarchist-Fascist regime to expel\nCypriots in Greece began in November with attacks on several villages in\nwhich 24 Turkish Cypriots were killed. As a result of an ultimatum from the Turkish government, a naval\nuniting its forces in readiness to defend their compatriots, the United\nStates imperialists - who had instigated the aggression - were forced to\ninspect Syrian forces to call off the plan and persuade the Greek government to\nexchange, first General Drosas and then the 12,000 Greek troops under his\ncommand, from the island.

In December the Turkish community in Cyprus set up a "transnational ad\nministration" to control their affairs, under the Presidency of Turkish\nCypriot leader Dr. Ekindol.
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Faced with the continuing and intensifying crisis of British capital\nsociety, an influential section of Britain's monopoly capitalists is\ntrying to turn away from former dependence on United States impe\nlars, seeking a new lease of life for their deposing system in\nalliance with the monopoly capitalists of western Europe. But there can be no solution for the working people except the establishment of a soc\nialist society in which political and economic power is held by the\nworking class.

J.Y. Stalin [1879-1953]

Fifteen years ago this Month - on March 15th, 1933 - there died in\nMoscow Joseph Vissarionovich Dzhamashvili - JOSEF STALIN.

A revolutionary and a Marxist from his boyhood, Stalin became the\ncomrade-in-arms and the successor of Lenin. A political and military\nstrategist of unparalleled ability, his writings are among the clearest\nexpositions of Marxism-Leninist theory. Throughout his life he fought\nunswervingly for the working class and against its enemies. That\nthe modern revisionists - who have betrayed every principle of Marxism-Leninism - should have slandered Stalin after his death and dragged\nhis body from its resting place, is the highest testimony to his revol\ntuonary stature and his unshakeable loyalty to what he lived his lifetime\nstruggle to restore Stalin to his rightful place of honour in the inter\nnational Communist movement is a not insignificant part of the strug\ngle to restore that movement to the Principles of Marxism-Leninism.
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463 war vessels.

And in North Vietnam in 1967 alone 1,064 enemy aircraft have been shot down and 65 enemy ships damaged or sunk.

All the varied offensive manoeuvres of the invaders have been beaten back, and today the war of national liberation has entered its final and decisive phase. Four-fifths of the territory and two-thirds of the people of south Vietnam have been liberated. In Khe Sanh brilliant military strategy and tactics have cut off the U.S. forces, which face another Dien Bien Phu - the battle which forced the French imperialists in an earlier war of national liberation to decide to withdraw from the country. The Vietnamese forces are hammering at the gates of, and even within, the urban fortresses that alone are left under enemy occupation, and U.S. planes have been forced into the position of bombing the very capital they are supposed to be "defending". The capture of the U.S. warship "Pueblo" by Korean forces has been a timely measure of fraternal aid against the common enemy.

Faced with this desperate situation, Johnson has ordered another 10,000 U.S. troops to Vietnam and begged for further aid from Washington's increasingly reluctant allies, but this cannot save him from defeat. On the contrary, it can only stimulate the mounting opposition of the working people of the United States to their government's "dirty war".

For the enemies of the Vietnamese people are the enemies of the working people of all countries. Their battles are our battles, their victories our victories. One of the most important and urgent tasks in Britain is to organise the class-conscious militants of the working class movement in anti-imperialist solidarity committees, which will awaken the independent class initiative and the organised might of our British working class in order to bring it to bear in support of the just cause of the Vietnamese people and the oppressed and exploited people of all lands who are developing world-wide struggle against their main enemy, world imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism.

Once these most advanced sections of our British working class movement have been won for independent action in the cause of solidarity with the fighting people of Vietnam and their allies in the other colonial and neo-colonial lands - through such actions as the blocking of war supplies and other aid to the U.S. aggressors, including supplies to their bases in Britain - their initiative will lay the basis for building a broad and overwhelmingly powerful anti-imperialist solidarity front embracing all peace-loving and progressive forces of the British people.

Such a united front of militant solidarity with the fighting people of Vietnam would bring about a significant sharpening of the already developing contradictions between that section of monopoly-capital which is orientated towards subservience to U.S. imperialism and the rival section - the strength and influence of which is even now rapidly increasing - which sees in the building of an imperialist alliance with the remaining major powers of western Europe the most effective policy promoting the future interests of British imperialism. The building of an increasingly powerful and influential united front of militant anti-imperialist solidarity, linked with the mass united front struggles of the working class and working people of Britain to extend and deepen the revolutionary scope and character of their own class struggles and to promote and defend their own working class rights and liberties, could ultimately force the British government to withdraw its reactionary support for the United States aggression.

Such a step, in conjunction with the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people themselves, could well be decisive in bringing about the only acceptable "Peace in Vietnam": the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Vietnamese soil, leaving the people of Vietnam to determine their own destiny.

The Vietnamese people are advancing towards victory - and their victory will be a victory for all the oppressed peoples of the world, for the working people of all lands who seek their liberation from imperialism.