WORKERS BROAD SHEET

SPECIAL ISSUE VOL 2 NO 9 1/6D
OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 1967

CONTENTS

	Page:
CHE	2
A REVOLUTIONARY GREAT ALLIANCE	3
ON POWER	7
VAUXHALL MOTORS	10
NINE MONTHS. Poem by John Muller	17
CULTURAL REVOLUTION IN HARBIN	18
BRITISH IMPERIALISM	20
A CLASS ANALYSIS	34
THE WORKERS' NATIONAL PLAN	43
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE OCTOBER ORGANISING CTTEE FOR A WORKING PEOPLES' PARTY OF ENGLAND	47

ZD.9.a.593
Z005359767
BOSTON SPA LS237BQ

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!

PUBLISHED BY THE LONDON WORKERS CTTE.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM

As Marx pointed out in "Capital". the capitalist era in Bri tain dates from the 16th century. The Tudor monarchy, "itself a product of bourgeois development", aided the break-up of the feudal estates of the feudal nobility and the monasteries and centralised all authority under king and parliament. The peasantry was driven forcibly from the land and cast on the labour market as a proletariat. The common lands were usurped and enclosed for wool production. The wool amd other commodities produced on the great estates were sold in the market for a profit; or alternatively rents were extracted from tenants whose incomes were derived from wool production.
The Tudor monarchy not only broke up the feudal estates but also united the seperate countries of England and Wales under a common state apparatus. In 1603 the accession of the Stuart King James marked the striking of a deal between the 'new nobilities' of England and Wales and Scotland, although full legislation and economic union (proposed by the King and his Chancellor Francis Bacon in 1604) was not finally achieved till 1707 and the Act of Union. Thus the British state was formed by the union of the three separate nations - the English, Welsh and Scottish - under bourgeois rule - the English bourgeiosie easily predominating. Ireland too was added to this state and even today is completely tied up economically with it; the Northern part of Ireland still constituting a part of the British state directly.

RISE OF MERCANTILE CAPITALISTS

In the Civil War of the 1640's and the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688, the rising merchant capitalists established their political supremacy over the 'new nobility' of great landlords, who through the monarchy had controlled the state since the Tudors.
These revolutions were directed NOT against a feudal mode of production nor against a feudal nobility. Feudalism had already been destroyed for 100 years before the outbreak of the Civil War.
The first stage in the development of capitalism, called the "manufacturing period" by Marx (the "domestic" or "putting out" system by bourgeois historians) extended from "the middle of the 16th Century to the last third of the 18th Century." The capitalist "manufacturer" bought wool in bulk from the lanlord or tenant farmer and put it out to be made into cloth by spinners, weavers etc, who worked in their own homes and were paid by the piece.
The manufacturer then sold the finished products to merchants who organised its sales at home and abroad.
Both landlords, who produced (or rather owned the means of production of) the raw materials and the manufacturers and merchants were part and parcel of the same capitalist mode of production - members of the same exploiting class. During the 16th Century it was the landlords who were the decisive force making for economic advance as they broke up the old feudal order. But, as the 17th Century advanced, they and the monarchy became a retarding force - pursuing

policies which held back trade and industry, preventing capital accumulated by merchants and manufacturers from being reinvested in commerce and manufacture.
Cromwell, from the disaffected petty-gentry, was the leader of the revolutionary forces (predominant among which were the great merchants of London, Bristol, Liverpool, Hull and Glasgow) which overthrew the political hegmony of the great landlords. To achieve this end, Cromwell rallied the great masses of the people - small traders, artisans, yeoman farmers - to support the cause of Republicanism and provide the backbone of his New Model Army - the like of which Europe had never seen before. But immediately victory was won, Cromwell turned on his radical allies - the egalitarian Levellers - and crushed them by force. He returned to be feasted by the merchants of the City of London.
Cromwell's armies also occupied Scotland, Wales and Ireland, imposing economic unity and extending the power of the English bourgeoisie in alliance with the quisling merchants of those countries.
In 1660 a tamed monarchy was installed and parliament remained the decisive institution of state. An aggressive imperial policy led to a series of wars against foreign rivals from which the British capitalists emerged in the main victorious and by the late 18th Century, Britain's mercantile empire was the largest in the world.

CAPITAL ACCUMULATION.

Already in the 16th Century British colonists had invaded the eastern seaboard of North America and further settlements and invasions were made in the Caribbean, in India and Africa.
The African Slave Trade was monopolised by British merchants on the triangular run, from Bristol or Liverpool to Africa with armed men, textiles, trinkets etc. Then across to the New World with slaves and finally home again with sugar, rum etc. At a conservative estimate, between 1441 and the 19th Century the Slave Trade cost Africa 50m. African civilisations like those of Ghana, Mali, Songhay, the Congo and Zimbabwe were brought to ruin and the philosophy and attitudes of racialism assiduously built up over the centuries to excuse this enslavement of a race. The same racialist explanations were invoked to 'excuse' the oppression and exploitation of all colonial peoples - Indians, Chinese, Malays, Arabs etc. Imperialism of necessity spawns racialism in its ideology and culture.
Many a fortune was made by English merchants from this trade in men and the plantations of the New World, owned by British colonialists were built up on slave labour.
The other great source of capital for the British merchants came from the looting of India. In the 16th Centuries India was a prosperous civilisation on the brink of a capitalistic transformation of its economy and political-cultural superstructure. The East India Company started in 1600 but did not reach its main period of domination of India until the 2nd half of the 18th Century; and in 1858 it was merged with the crown.
The company started with the aim of supplying Britain with the

(E.Williams. "Capitalism and Slavery".)

The British Library

products of India - spices, silks and cottons goods. The initial trouble was in being able to offer the Indians anything which they might want in return for such trading - as all British textiles and manufactures at that time were inferior in quality. At first therefore, the plunder of Africa and the New World were used to buy goods in India to sell in Britain for a high profit. But as British military and economic strength increased so the nature of Anglo-Indian trade altered.
The conquests of that soldier of fortune, Clive, - glamourised in all school history books - laid the way open for the naked plundering of Indian wealth - as tribute and unequal 'trade'. Clive, starting penniless, returned home with £¼ million and an Indian estate yielding £27,000 per annum. Between 1766-8 alone the East India company exported £6,311,250 worth of goods from India and imported £624,375 worth. Thus 10 times as much was taken out of the country as was put in. Such was the pattern of colonialism. This reckless looting of India quickly led to ruin and famine for its people - a situation perpetuated and aggravated by continuing imperialist exploitation. In the 18th and 19th centuries British merchants and manufacturers extended their dominion over Canada, Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, the 'Lion's Share' of Africa, Persia, the Arab countries, Malaya, Borneo and parts of China.

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

On the basis of the Slave Trade and the plunder of India, the industrial revolution in Britain was founded. Until the middle of the 18th Century capitalism was still in the manufacturing stage and the woollen industry was the main industry. But initial capital accumulation on a large scale was needed to allow development of industry and to allow full use to be made of the new scientific methods and theories then in the process of development.
The battle of Plassey of 1757 opened the floodgates to the looting of India - in 1764 Hargreaves patented the spinning-jenny, in 1765 came Watt's steam-engine (not the first to be invented; but the first to be exploited practically) in 1769 there was Arkwright's water-frame and in 1779 Crompton's mule; in 1785 Cartwright patented his powerloom and in 1788 the steam engine was applied to blast furnaces.
This was the beginning of the industrial revolution in Britain - made possible through the capital looted from Africa, India and the New World.
The domestic, putting-out system of production was replaced by the factory system - leading to the development of new towns of terrible slums; to the replacement of old skills by the productive power of mass-production techniques; leading to the emigration of cheap labour from the rural areas of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland into these new towns.
There was rapid development of the power, transport and communications industries which in turn stimulated the iron and steel industry.

The chief need of the manufacturers became the provision of markets for selling their goods.
In their demand for 'free-trade' and the provision of cheaper food for their labour force, the industrial manufacturing capitalists - men such as Bright and Cobden - came into increasing conflict with the merchant capitalists and landlords, who insisted on protection of domestic agriculture and on trading monopolies sush as the East India Company.
Adam Smith, Bentham and Stuart Mill were the spokesmen of the manufacturing capitalists.
In the first half of the 19th Century the manufacturing capitalists wrested political control from the landowners and merchants with the bitterly contested Reform Bill of 1832.
The manufacturers' Party was the Liberal Party of Grey, Russell and Gladstone.
For most of the 19th Century, British capitalism reigned supreme - Britain was the 'workshop of the world', behaving as a self-appointed world 'gendarme' in a similar manner to present day US imperialism.
This was the hey-day of 'gun-boat' diplomacy. But in the final quarter of that century rivalry began to grow as the German, French and US capitalists increased in economic power. This rivalry was and remains irreconcilable and led to two world wars: the risk of a third world war arising from inter-imperialist rivalries cannot be dismissed.

THE RISE OF IMPERIALISM - THE FINAL STAGE OF CAPITALISM

The boom-slump nature of capitalism - with its recurrent crises of "overproduction" - plus increasing international competition led to increasing amalgamation and cartelisation of firms and banks - as part of an attempt to give the capitalist greater control over his economic environment - greater power over the market and prices, over sources of raw materials and labour, over distribution and selling of goods. Moreover the big industrialists, landowners and bankers have increasingly fused for the same reasons, to constitute a tightly-knit oligarchy, largely because the industrialists increasingly need supplies of capital from outside their industry to help further expansion and exploitation of resources. To fail to develop allows rivals to intervene in their sphere of influence.
This development of what Lenin calls FINANCE-CAPITAL is the final stage of capitalism - that of monopoly and imperialism.
The various national monopolies have carved up the world into colonies, neo-colonies and spheres of influence where the finance-capitalists own natural resources and exploit abundant cheap raw materials and cheap labour for home-based (and now increasingly overseas-based) manufacturing industries. They also control international markets for the sale of their goods.
Increasingly mergers occur even between firms in separate industries. Thus the chemical giants of today, because of their dependence on oil (for the rapidly expanding petrochemicals industry) are seeking closer links with the oil giants: today ICI and Burmah (BP) are

The British Library

jointly drilling for oil (with the French oil monopoly Total Marine) in the North Sea.
But it is important to grasp what the fundamental character of imperialism is.
It is the EXPORT OF CAPITAL from the metropolitan country to wherever the highest profits are to be made.
This happens chiefly in the colonies and neo-colonies such as South Africa (Azania), S.W. Africa, India, the Middle East etc.
The companies with the biggest return on their capital are the oil, mining and minerals giants such as BP, Shell, RTZ and the Anglo-American group. All of them firmly based on overseas exploitation.
The monopoly-capitalists have taken full control of the economy and of the superstructure of state, governmental institutions and academic and cultural apparatus. They subjugate all other sections of the propertied classes - the domestic capitalists, small landowners, small businessmen etc. Increasingly the monopolists make use the state apparatus to impose their will. Thus basic industries which are not highly profitable are taken under state ownership to provide an efficient base for the big monopolies: the working people and other non-imperialist sections are made to subsidise the monopolists by providing cheap power, transport, coal, postal and other services: at the same time we pay off enormous public 'debts' to them on money they 'lend' us to modernise these basic industries!

BRITISH IMPERIALISM TODAY

Since Lenin's time monopoly control has increased rapidly over all sections of the British imperialist economy. Not only the basic industries of metal manufacture, mining, chemicals etc., have been so affected, but increasingly 'traditionally' free enterprise industries such as civil engineering and textiles. Moreover the consumer goods, retail business fields, communications, newspapers and the like are becoming increasingly controlled by a few monopolies - Unilever, Marks and Spencer, the big brewery and distillers combines (note the recent Bass-Charrington merger), Clore's British Shoe Corporation, the supermarket chains and multiple stores.
The state has been instrumental in achieving many of these mergers - as in the case of the nationalised industries, the aircraft, textiles and shipbuilding-dock industries. Just recently the Elliott Automation and English Electric (machine tools and computers) firms were married with the blessings of the government and a state development loan.
Steel is in the process of nationalisation and rationalisation with the banker Ld. Melchett (Hill-Samuel) in charge. Leylands took over Jaguar and there are plans to merge it with BMC, to constitute one giant British motor firm, rivalling the US and German and Italian (Fiat) monopolies.
At various levels the State supports British monopolies against foreign rivals e.g. B.A.C., B.P., I.C.T., the Shipbuilding, Dock, Railway, Coal, Steel, gas electricity and other industries.

BANKING AND INSURANCE

This is a tightly-knit web of cartels.
Starting at the end of last century there was a rapid formation of large monopolies e.g. the precursor of the Midland Bank took control over 14 large banking companies between 1891 - 1918 and today has what is alleged to be the largest banking business in the world: the Midland controls the Clydesdale, Belfast and Northern Banks and also the Forward Trust Company.
It works overseas in the closest cooperation with the Standard Bank (of South Africa & S.W. Africa), the Commercial Bank of Australia, the Toronto Dominion Bank. Through its Board of Directors it is closely linked with Shell, I.C.I., Dunlop, BICC, RTZ, Rolls-Royce, English Electric, Allied Breweries, Schweppes and a host of insurance and trust companies.
The joint-stock banks have well over £7,000m. at their disposal, the leading merchant banks have an investment portfolio "well in excess of £2,000m." (K.Keith of Hill-Samuel,) the building societies hold over £3,000m. and the insurance companies over £4,000m. The main monopolies of industry, trade and services are represented on their boards as are the great landowners and aristocracy.

SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

The granting of nominal independence to former colonies has to some extent obscured the fact that British imperialism is as active as ever in its spheres of influence, second only to the US imperialists in the scope of its activities. Bourgeois economists and some so-called 'left-wingers' have been going out of their way to deny the existence of British imperialism. They try to make out that it is something of the past or that it is insignificant.
B.P.'s net profits were £217m. according to the Exchange Telegraph Statistics Service, in 1964, a 26% return on capital employed.
According to the Financial Times of 1959 (Jan) 21 British oil firms, subsidiaries of B.P. and Shell, made a total profit of £431m. in 1958, this being bigger than the total profits of 456 firms in iron, steel and engineering and shipbuilding in this country.
While profits were falling at home during the freeze and squeeze of 1965-67, Rio Tinto Zinc made a profit of £23,018,000 in '66 (net), compared with £11,810,000 for '65. De Beers, too, increased its net profits for 1966 by 18.5% to £43,178,500 net.
These examples point out that imperialism is very much alive and very profitable. But more than that - the imperialists are not content and are stepping up investment programmes to intensify their overseas looting. Thus De Beers plan to raise over £35m for further expansion: In 1966 BP invested £224m. in expanding its operations. According to the 'Economist' of Jan. '65 ICI would more than double its total capital between 1963-73 to a figure of £2,000m. Of this half would be invested overseas compared with a ½ of the 1963 figure.
Where do the British imperialists operate?
The simple answer is all over the world where they are allowed to.

The British Library

B.P. and Shell are based on the Arab lands especially in the Arabian gulf, Persia and Libya. But they are also active in Brunei, India,South Africa, Nigeria, Colombia, Trinidad, Surinam etc..
British imperialists control 75% and 65% of the Malayan rubber and tin industries respectively plus 70% of the import-export trade of Malaya and Singapore.
In India, the Far East, Africa etc the engineering and chemical firms have their subsidiaries - ICI operates in over 30 countries. There are also companies specialising in agricultural produce such as bananas, sugar, rum, cocoa, palm oil, tea in the Caribbean, India, Ceylon and Africa.
But pride of place must go to the mining monopolies which as Val Duncan, head RTZ, has pointed out are "by far the most profitable overseas investments" earning "far more on average than industry earns in this country".
RTZ exploits copper, iron, lead, zinc, uranium and aluminium in Canada, Australia, South Africa, Zambia, Rhodesia etc.
The Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa is a complex of firms including De Beers, Charter Consolidated, and over 40 others. Roughly two-thirds of Anglo-Americans total capital is British but there are strong links with Engelhard's Industries Inc. and Mrogan Guaranty Trust of the U.S. This group exploits gold, diamonds, copper, lead, zinc and coal throughout Africa but especially in Azania, Zambia, Zimbabwe and S.W. Africa.
Through Tanganyika Concessions, British imperialists have a large stake in Union Miniere, the copper and uranium giant of Katanga in the Congo.

THE CRISIS OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM.

British imperialism is beset with chronic difficulties expressing themselves as the recurrent BALANCE OF PAYMENTS DEFICIT.
It may seem astonishing that British imperialism should be in reality so weak it cannot solve its balance of payments problem at home. But this is the case.
Imperialism is a reactionary force, preventing development of productive forces in a rational, collective way, not only in the colonies and spheres of influence but also in the metropolitan country. The concentration on export of capital overseas to make the biggest profits prevents rational development of Britain's own resources (why else, e.g. did the oil companies drag their feet over searching for oil in the North Sea?)
When the overseas peoples have risen up in protest at foreign exploitation and have demanded and fought for political and economic independence, the imperialist have through their government here and their stooges in their spheres of influence (e.g Sultan of Muscat, Hastings Banda, Tunku Abdul Rahman, Mr. Vorster, Doc Williams etc.) used armed force, subversion etc to suppress the national liberation struggles. This is why there are over 26,000 heavily armed British troops in the lands of the Arabian gulf; this is

why there are British troops and bases over the world; why Britain is in pacts of aggression such as NATO, CENTO and SEATO.
This massive build up of armed men and weapons by the imperialists is borne out of national (and colonial) taxation of the people and is further reason why the British economy is distorted and irrational.
The continued export of capital coupled with massive arms expenditure is the basis of the balance of payments crisis. According to the conservative estimate of the British Board of Trade Journal of 10.6.66, the outflow of private direct investment overseas in 1964 amounte to over &250m. excluding oil companies. At a very conservative estimate, Shell and BP jointly export in the range of £300-600m per year - as in the period 1956-60 Shell alone invested £2,000m, i.e. £400mn per year, mainly abroad.
On top of this, government 'loans' to stooge governments to pave the way for further imperialist exploitation amounted to £135mn in 1965 ("Economic Trends". Mar.1966.)
Although it is calculated that the balance of payments debit for military expenditure is £300mn. (1963), nevertheless the total arms bill is well in excess of £2,000mn per year. This is largely expended on the maintenance of army, airforce and naval bases overseas and represents a huge loss to the economy of resources, skilled manpower and capital. Thus the outflow of capital for investment and arms etc, calculated from imperialist sources, stands at £800 - £1,200mn per year and is probably much more than that in fact, as veils of secrecy are always drawn over capital export figures. Even this figure is much greater than the record deficit of £700mn on the balance of payments of '64.
But the problem does not end there. In order to bolster up sterling (as an intenational reserve currency - a profitable business for the City) the squeeze and freeze policies are invoked by the Wilson government to shore up the balance of payments deficit. This is meant to stabilise the base for further imperialist export of capital, which the government sponsored Reddaway Report of earlier this year stressed as being of fundamental importance to the 'long-term interests' of 'the economy'.
Thus the home economy languishes in deflationary stagnation, while the imperialist pace-setters RTZ, De Beers, BP and Co hit record profits abroad.
What care they about half a million unemployed in midsummer?

RELATIONS WITH US IMPERIALISM

The British imperialists and their successive governments, Tory and Labour, have been closely allied, subserviently, to the more powerful US imperialists for many decades now, but especially since the 2nd World War and the vast growth of the socialist camp and the national liberation forces. The British imperialists are too weak to stem the forces of progress on their own and so carry on their looting under the protecting wing of the US imperialist eagle.
Moreover, there are many British firms which are closely allied with US banks and firms economically - and this again makes for a

The British Library

political and military alliance. When the British government supports the US actions in Vietnam, it does so not simply because of subservience, but because US actions are felt to be protecting British imperialist interests in S.E. Asia and also because some war contracts are handed out to British companies e.g. the building of Thailand airbases for the US forces.
But this unequal alliance is also disadvantageous to the British imperialists - as they found at Suez in 1956 when they tried to take an independent line; and again as they are finding in terms of economic penetration and competition from US monopolies abroad (as in the Congo) and at home (as in the motor, drugs, detergent, computer and other industries.)
There are basically three main groups of British monopolists.
There are the open quislings of US imperialism - those who hold minority shares in American monopolies such as Rootes (Chryslers); Fords, Vauxhall (General Motors); Hedly Bros. (Proctor & Gamble); I.B.M., ENV (Eaton) Regent, Caltex (Texaco) and Esso.
The second group consists of those British monopolists most in conflict with the US imperialists either in Britain, abroad or both. Its chief political spokesmen in the main are on the Tory right wing. Lord Salisbury (of Westminster Bank and with large interests in central Africa) has long been an outspoken critic of his US rivals, for British imperialism to pursue an 'independent line'. Lord Clitheroe (of Tanganyika Concessions, the John Brown Group, Borax, Union Miniere and Tube Investments) is another of this school. He sits on the board of the National Provincial Bank with J.D. Robarts (the Chairman) and Sir Paul Chambers, who are both on the board of I.C.I. Chambers has recently been the most outspoken critic of US imperialist peneyration of Britain and the most ardent advocate of joining the European Common Market to pursue a Gaullist line. Speaking at the Fremch Institute of Banking and Financial Studies in Jan.1967, he emphasized the danger of "economic and technological domination of Europe by the United States".
This was a danger which he thought "France had been quicker to realise".
He stressed the need for European monopolies to develop a large 'internal market' on the US scale to allow greater monopoly growth, so allowing research and development into new industrial processes. At present the US were using their large internal market as a springboard for economic penetration elsewhere. Chambers called the growing US domination a "menace to the whole economy of Western Europe". He warned that closer ties with the US would be dangerous and that so-called "partnership may in reality be absorption," and that "Britain may become a satellite where there could be manufacture but no determination of policy."
ICI is in harsh competition with Du Ponts of the U.S. Analysis of the interlocking directorships of the ICI Board reveals that B.P. is closely linked with ICI as is the Lucas group, Richard Thomas & Baldwins, the Robert Fleming Banking Company. B.P. (which is half owned by the state) is closely allied to the shipping companies,

the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corp and its associated companies. But there can be no doubt that the main group of British monopolists are those grouped around the Anglo-American group, Rio Tinto Zinc, Shell, AEI, English Electric, Dunlop, BAC, Rolls Royce etc. This is the 'centre group' who while retaining independent economic interests nevertheless believe that it is in their interests to maintain the Anglo-American alliance. They are often enough involved in joint financial ventures with US firms. As already mentioned, Anglo-American has links with Morgan Guaranty Trust (on whose board is represented Esso, Bethlehem Steel, Du Pont, Proctor and Gamble, Singer, Gillette, Coca-Cola etc), while the Standard Bank, with a total capital of £25mn allowed Chase Manhattan (Rockefeller) to acquire a £2mn stake between 1954-65.

In a similar manner, Bolsa (Bank of London and South America) which is tied up with Oxo, Bovril, Liebigs (the Argentinian live-stock and processed foods monopoly), Canadian Pacific, the Royal Bank of Scotland and the Bank of Ireland, have strong links with Mellon International Bank of Pittsburgh, who have a 15% holding in Bolsa.
Recently Bolsa and Bank of Scotland bought a 7% share each in the French merchant bankers, Banque Worms. But here they are linked with the leading French Bank - Paribas (Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas).
Another example of Anglo-Us "cooperation" is given by the British Aluminium Company, which is 47% owned by Tube Investments and 45% owned by the US metals giant Reynolds. Both Shell and BP work in collusion with the US oil monopolies - e.g. in the Iraq Petroleum Company which has French, Dutch, US and British interests (BP holding over 23%); Shell and Esso are drilling together in the North Sea. However, there are still contradictions as evidenced by the way that Shell is to be allowed free access to the Common Market countries with its products (because of its Dutch interests), while the US firms and BP will face a stiff tariff barrier.
Moreover, in Surinam there is a fierce struggle between Shell and the US monopolies for the exploitation of oil there. So far Shell is winning and had support of the stooge government of Pengel.
The US imperialists are heavily backing the opposition party of Lachman and trying to foment racial strife.
RTZ works in close association with the US minerals company Kaisers, in Western Australia (Kaisers having a minority 40% holding) and with Newmont Mining and American Metal Climax in South Africa.
In another venture Kaisers,RTZ and the French monopoly Pechiney are involved in the exploitation of bauxite from Queensland: RTZ are planning with BICC (who are going over to making aluminium wire as opposed to copper), to smelt bauxite at Anglesey using nuclear power. This dollar saving project is viewed favourably by the government.
RTZ have developed phenomenally in the past few years, but the development capital has largely come from loans from US bankers at 4¾% - while a German bank lent $27 million. This is how the Anglo-US and NATO countries work in harness for the exploitation of the world. Even so there are contradictions among the 'partners' which

The British Library

cannot be settled. Thus in his last company report, Duncan of RTZ, warns against holding up the investment of capital overseas by British capitalists., "even if there were concern regarding our future competitive position as a UK-based international mining company, vis-a-vis those based in the USA and elsewhere."
So it can be seen, the British imperialists are divided amongst themselves over national policy towards US imperialism - some wish to pursue a more independent Gaullist line; others wish to maintain the alliance, in spite of its subordinating nature, bacause of economic facoks: on top of this, there is a not inconsiderable body of quisling monopolists in this country in the US owned companies, which are valued at $4.000 million.
The contradictions between these groups must increase.

HOME PRODUCTION

One must not forget either, the considerable body of domestic capitalists, of varying sizes, who are principally engaged in exploiting Britain. These people are badly hit by stagnation, the cut in working peoples' purchasing power, the curb on imports etc: also fret at high taxation wasted on arms expenditure and maintaining overseas bases which bring them no profit.
They also suffer from monopoly competition, fear take-over and cut-price war with the giants. Competition from the US is even more feared and resented.
These "national capitalists and petty-capitalists are potential allies of the working people in their struggle against imperialism and especially US imperialism . While their leadership cannot be followed and could take the form of extreme right wing toryism, a strong, united working class leadership could mobilise them to follow it in an anti-imperialist policy. At a given stage, the British working class may also be able to exploit the differences between the British imperialistsand the US imperialists and between the British imperialists themselves to bring about their downfall.

We must smash the Anglo-US alliance, weaken British Imperialism, isolate and destroy it before it destroys the British people,
to do this the Party of the working class must build a mass anti-imperialist movement, and can only do so by developing a popular Programme on the lines we have given.
There have been many spokesmen for the workers, who helped to develop, in England, the ideas of socialism, but it was not until the advent of Marx and Engels (who both spent many years in this country) that the working class finally obtained the scientific knowledge of how to practise class struggle with the aim of state power. This science is a living thing and has been developing by dint of practice and analysis throughout the world. Today, the world's leading and most experienced practitioner of scientific socialism, of Marxism-Leninism, is Chairman Mao Tse-tung of China, who has brought Marxism to a more advanced stage than that reached with Lenin. It

is as necessary for socialists to learn from him today as it was to learn from Lenin a generation ago. But the task continues to be to apply the lessons of the science of Marxism to the development of our country today. This cannot be done mechanically or in any imitative manner. The socialist revolution in Britain must be as British as the revolution in China had to be Chinese.
In Britain theory has lagged since the days of Marx, and empiricism and economism prevail. The militant working class believe in reform rather than revolution. As long as they appear to be getting wages and working conditions, welfare benefits etc. by strike action and other constitutional pressures, they are ready to accept the capitalist system, hoping it can be improved. This is a petty-bourgeois, social-democratic idea which predominates in the leadership of the official Labour Movement. It also prevails (as it is not really challenged on any sizeable scale) at shop floor level too. The belief in reformism and constitutional means of struggle reaches its apex in the unbounded confidence such social democrats have in the parliamentary system - as a manifestation of democracy. As though any real power resided in that institution. This fetishism has at its base a thoroughly erroneous understanding of the nature of the British (or any bourgeois) STATE. The state is seen by the reformists as some kind of neutral machinery of power which can be (peacefully) taken over by the working class 'representatives' and run in their interests.
The state is the organ of power of the ruling class. The working class cannot capture the state machinery of the imperialist ruling class. On the contrary they must smash that machinery, at the same time building up their own organs of state power independently: this new state machinery of the working-class-organised-as-ruling-class will be profoundly democratic and popular as far as the working class is concerned. It will be a dictatorship as far as the imperialists, exploiters and parasites are concerned.

Why is it that the working class in Britain has been chained to reformist illusions for so long?
Principally because Marxism-Leninism has never been used to create a revolutionary understanding of our conditions here in Britain, to create and then use a revolutionary situation to achieve the first decisive step - the seizure of state power by the organised workers.
The CPGB, explained elsewherenever became a revolutionary party, in spite of a promising period of development in the 1930's. It has now ceased to be of any practical significance, with the one exception of thefield of trade union politics, in which however there have always been strong differences between communist T.U. rank and file and the Party leadership, (illustrated in the E.T.U. in the 50's and in the A.E.U and the technicians' unionstoday.
The objective factor that has made possible this subjective backwardness of working class leadership has been, as Lenin pointed out, that the imperialists have been enabled by their superprofits from abroad to give ground to the organised trade union strength of the workers here in Britain. This has allowed reforms in the temporary interests of the working class at

The British Library

certain times and has bolstered up the notion of gradual reform of the whole system. Moreover imperialist exploitation has created a small, bourgeoisified 'labour aristocracy' - principally among trade union and Labour Party leaders - men such as Boyd and Carron. These men are among the worst enemies of the working class.

ATTACK ON THE WORKING CLASS

The British monopolists, hit be increasing competition with their imperialist rivals not only abroad but at home, and hit by the growing forces of national liberation and socialism in the colonies and neo-colonies, are in serious economic difficulties. These are expressed in the adverse balance of payments crisis whose causes we have already outlined above.
The British imperialists hope to solve their problems at the expense of the British working class. By means of the freeze and squeeze policy of Wilson they hope to stabilise the balance of payments. This entails cutting the living standards of the working class to make British manufactured goods more competitive while at the same time maintaining profit margins.
To make the wage freeze 'stick', the monopolists had to set about completely taming the unions and smashing the shop-floor organisation (shop-stewards' movement) of the men in those industries where local militancy was advancing wages. (e.g. motor and motor-components industry). As the working people are largely organised on economist, reformist lines at present, the monopolists have won some initial victories. But their problems have no solution. Unemployment rises, the economy is stagnant, imperialist rivalry gets hotter. This necessitates further attacks on the working people and on the small capitalists; the anger of the people mounts.
To undertake this attack on all sections of the working people, the imperialists have relied on their 'Labour' Party wing to do it in the name of "socialism". The Tory Party could never have got away with it. But it has meant exposing the Labour Party, as the fraud it is, very clearly. In Wales and Scotland this has had the effect of giving great impetus to the nationalist movements - and it is heartening that a Workers Party of Scotland has been formed based on Marxism-Leninism, applying the teachings of John McLean. Similar Parties are needed in Wales, Ireland and England. To achieve their ends of breaking up the British state and establishing socialism in these islands, these Parties must work in the closest possible unity.
The imperialists, as always, seek to divide the people against one another so as to perpetuate their own power.
To this end they try and utilise racialism, especially against coloured immigrant workers from the colonies and neo-colonies of India, Pakistan, the Caribbean etc. These immigrant workers are brought here as cheap labour and are treated as third class citizens in such things as jobs, housing, education and the provision of social amenities.

They are largely of working class origin in their homelands (except for a significant minority of poor peasants from Pakistan) and they are forced to migrate by the terrible unemployment and oppression that is forced on the colonies and neo-colonies by imperialism. With their clear understanding of imperialism, they are of key importance in the struggle.
The imperialists and their henchmen are determined to drive a wedge between indigenous and overseas-born workers, just as they hope to drive a wedge between the national-liberation struggles in the colonies and neo-colonies and the metropolitan class struggle.
It is one of our prime tasks to unite the working class against the imperialist enemy and to stamp out all racialism and fascism. We can only effectively achieve this by uniting the class struggle here with the raging national liberation struggles throughout the world.
There must be **PRACTICAL** solidarity between the workers here and their brothers in Aden, Oman, Trinidad, Hong Kong and so on.
We must mobilise the industrial strength of the British working class against imperialism, U.S. and British, for socialism.
This necessitates above all else organising on the shop floor and taking our full part as an organised Party in the shop stewards movement - to make it become part of a mighty class movement.
But above all we need a Marxist Leninist Party based on democratic-centralism (unity-discussion-unity within the organisation) serving the working people and organised on a programme which will achieve maximum unity against the main enemy - British imperialism in alliance with the world's number one enemy, U.S. imperialism.
. We must smash this alliance and so smash British imperialism - not being afraid to utilise the intra-imperialist contradictions, and to mobilise the small, domestic capitalists as allies in this decisive step.

But at all times the struggle must be led by the working class, whose aim has to be the establishment of its own class power as the only way to socialism.

.LONDON WORKERS COMMITTEE.

WORKERS' BROADSHEET is at the disposal of all who are interested in developing a Marxist-Leninist mass party, of all who see the need for Workers' Power. We undertake to publish all serious contributions (that should be kept as compact as possible) adding our comment when helpful or necessary. We invite argument as the best road to conviction. Let a hundred schools of thought contend.

.EDITORIAL BOARD.

The British Library