

The Marxist- Leninist



Internal Discussion Journal of the
Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist)

Vol. 1. No 1.

Sept. 74

Contents:

	Page
1. Statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) - August 1st, 1974.....	1
2. Statement of the National Executive of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) - July 10th, 1974.....	3
3. Letter from the National Executive of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) to Aravindan Balakrishnan.....	4
4. Important Note.....	5
5. Lenin as the Organizer and Leader of the Russian Communist Party - by J. Stalin.....	6
6. Political Report to the March 24th 1972 Meeting of the National Council of the English Communist Movement (Marxist-Leninist).....	7
7. Open Letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) from the National Executive of the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist).....	13
8. Open Letter from the National Executive of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) to the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist).....	15
9. The Prospects of the Communist Party of Germany and the Question of Bolshevisation - J. Stalin, Interview with Herzog, Member of the C.P.G.....	17
10. On Setting up a System of Reports.....	5
11. On Strengthening the Party Committee System.....	14
STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ENGLAND (MARXIST-LENINIST) - AUGUST 1st, 1974	

At an extraordinary plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) held on July 17th, the Central Committee decided unanimously to endorse the decision taken by the National Executive Committee of the Party on July 10th to suspend Aravindan Balakrishnan from all posts and from membership of the Party. The Central Committee also took appropriate disciplinary action on members of Aravindan Balakrishnan's small clique.

Aravindan Balakrishnan and his clique were suspended from the Party because of their

pursuance of conspiratorial and splittist activities and because of their spreading social fascist slanders against the Party and the proletarian movement.

The Central Committee regretted that, after 7 years of struggle to unite together in order to strengthen the proletarian revolutionary movement, and especially its proletarian headquarters, Aravindan Balakrishnan had unilaterally and without consultation attempted to destroy all the established unity instead of trying to strengthen it, had set himself up against the proletarian Party and violated all discipline, and had launched an entirely unprovoked and thoroughly unprincipled external attack on the Party.

The Central Committee noted that after several months of internal ideological struggle and disagreement on certain important questions, Aravindan Balakrishnan, suddenly attempted to abort the struggle to clarify differences and forge unity in the Party on the basis of principle and arrogantly and individualistically began to withdraw from his responsibilities to the Party and put himself above discipline, then after several weeks he launched his cowardly attack on the Party as 'fascist'. Through this Aravindan Balakrishnan has done serious harm to the proletariat and the Party.

The Central Committee resolutely opposed Aravindan Balakrishnan's line of seeking disunity and using ideological differences to divide. This method is not the method of genuine revolutionaries but is used by individualists who refuse to subject themselves to the collective, and refuse to accept the discipline of the Party as the necessary conscious and voluntary discipline in order to serve the proletariat. Not only did Aravindan Balakrishnan seek disunity, but he also tried to conspire to build a clique of people around 'his line' and establish his centre whilst still claiming to be in the Party, continuously saying one thing to the Party comrades and preaching and practising another to younger comrades and comrades under his 'discipline'.

The Central Committee repudiated the metaphysical logic harmfully promoted by Aravindan Balakrishnan in opposition to dialectical materialism and the concrete analysis of concrete conditions. This was especially manifest in his retrospective examination of history and passing judgements on past activities in such a way as to suggest that today's conclusions could have been gained without the experience of practice and the successes and pitfalls. Aravindan Balakrishnan through this one sided logic tried to absolve himself from all the policies and decisions he participated in taking, and from the responsibility of summing up the effect of those policies and the way forward from them. At the same time he uses the same logic to condemn the entire Party, its rich experience as well as to condemn the historical process for not unfolding in a different manner. Aravindan Balakrishnan uses this logic to suggest that if we had known yesterday what we know today, then yesterday's attempts to participate in the real world and move history forward would have been unnecessary. Obviously this logic propounded by Aravindan Balakrishnan is just another form of the idealist theory of knowledge because today's conclusions have only become possible through the experience gained in the past and could not have been reached any other way. Aravindan Balakrishnan is suggesting that with 'more understanding' and with a few dogmas and some quotations from Marxism it would be possible to bypass the arduous struggle of participating in practice to move the world forward, avoid all mistakes and build a conscious and advanced vanguard Party without basing this on leading the revolutionary struggles of the people in practice, and applying Marxism-Leninism to this task.

The Central Committee took account of the main ideological and political lines being pushed by Aravindan Balakrishnan in order to 'justify' his position. It is on account of his refusal to change these lines in the past, despite encouragement, that Aravindan Balakrishnan has taken the stand of opposition to revolution. The Central Committee decided to raise all these lines inside the Party for discussion.

Whilst regretting Aravindan Balakrishnan's departure from Marxism-Leninism, and unilateral withdrawal from sitting together with Marxist-Leninists to sort out contradictions, the Central Committee resolutely agreed that such struggles are inevitable and reflect the decay of the imperialist system and the fierce contradiction between progress and decay, revolution and counter-revolution. The Central Committee also agreed that such struggles are bound to lead to the strengthening and steeling of the Party cadres, and that it is, as comrade Lenin pointed out, only through such a process of purging itself of bad elements that revolution and the revolutionary Party advances to its goal. Aravindan Balakrishnan launched his cowardly

and futile attack at a time when the class contradictions in Britain are intensifying rapidly, when national minority workers throughout Britain are launching many vigorous struggles and when the entire proletariat in Britain is astir and launching serious battles against monopoly capital. Furthermore Aravindan Balakrishnan's attack comes at a time when the Party had forged more unity through struggle, and made certain advances which had prepared it to expand its work in the industrial proletariat as never before. Coming at such a time Aravindan Balakrishnan's cowardly and unprincipled attack can only be viewed with great contempt and serious lessons drawn from the lines which Aravindan Balakrishnan had been using to oppose the continued advance of the Party. By struggling against these lines which have opposed the twofold task of STRENGTHENING THE UNITY OF MARXIST-LENINISTS and ORGANISING THE PROLETARIAT, it is certain that the entire Party will strengthen its unity on a revolutionary basis and on a higher level, and that the task of organising the industrial proletariat will surge ahead, under the leadership of the Party.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF ENGLAND (MARXIST-LENINIST) - JULY 10th, 1974.

At a meeting of the National Executive of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) held on July 10th, 1974, it was unanimously decided to suspend Ara Balakrishnan from all posts in the Party. That is from his position as a member of the National Executive Committee, from the Central Committee and from his membership of the Party.

The reasons for this decision are as follows :-

Ara Balakrishnan has opposed the political line of the Party, that without a revolutionary Party there can be no revolution and that all genuine Marxist-Leninists must strive to build a unified and professional centre, always putting the Party above personal interest. As a consequence of opposing this line over the last few months Balakrishnan has violated and opposed the Party discipline, and integrity on a number of occasions. When confronted about this at a recent meeting between himself and the National Secretary of the Party, he openly gave the theory of exceptionalism, i. e. that he had the right to be an exception to following the Party discipline, and claimed 'justification' for this anti-Marxist-Leninist position by claiming that "the question had to be raised whether the Party was fascist or communist", that the National Secretary was a fascist who was preventing the revolution from advancing, and insinuated that all other comrades in the Party were just mindless slaves who ran around at the 'flick of the National Secretary's finger'. He further claimed to be engaged in the activity of "overthrowing and rebelling against" the Party leadership and on this basis claimed full right to place himself and his opinions at the centre of things and discard the Party principle.

Following this serious violation of discipline and the theoretical 'justification' of it by Balakrishnan, his social-fascist attack on the Party and the Party leadership and his self-declared aim of overthrowing the leadership, the National Executive solemnly decided that such an attitude was incompatible with his continued presence in the Communist Party and his claim to be a Marxist-Leninist. The National Executive therefore decided to suspend the comrade from all posts.

The National Executive wish to point out that if Balakrishnan had serious views and differences with the Party and wanted to build the Party to lead the revolutionary movement he would have participated in the internal democratic centralist process in the Party and contributed to strengthening unity and advancing the Party. However he has over several months now avoided this process, has refused to attend certain meetings, has detached himself from the Party and has now declared himself in the pursuit of overthrowing the leadership.

The National Executive warns Ara Balakrishnan that his subjectivist attacks and anti-Party activity will come to no good end. If he persists in his present social-fascist course of attacking the Party as fascist there can be no unity with him. If however he is a genuine Marxist-Leninist with differences with the Party then he will definitely make self-criticism and apply humbly to work within the Party. The National Executive sincerely hopes that Ara Balakrishnan will desist from going against the revolutionary trend and follow this latter

course of action. However, should he choose to persist in his present course of action the National Executive will call for his expulsion from the Central Committee and the Party.

The National Executive calls upon all comrades of the Party to pay serious attention to this matter and calls upon all genuine comrades to come forward vigorously to STRENGTHEN THE UNITY OF THE GENUINE MARXIST-LENINISTS and to oppose all ideas of disunity, or 'leaving strengthening unity to chance' or considering it as a secondary question. Only by strengthening the unity of the Marxist-Leninists in the proletarian party can the Party solve the problems of providing leadership to the class.

July 10th, 1974
Signed, etc.

LETTER FROM THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ENGLAND
(MARXIST-LENINIST) TO ARAVINDAN BALAKRISHNAN

"He who puts his ego against the forces of history will be crushed"

September 2nd, 1974.

Dear Mr. Balakrishnan,

Enclosed in this envelope you will find a copy of the decision of the National Executive of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) to suspend you from all posts in the Communist Party because of your splittist activity and because of your social-fascist denunciation of the National Secretary of the Party, the Communist Party itself and our founder, close comrade and Chairman of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) and Hindustani Ghadar Party (Marxist-Leninist), Comrade Hardial Bains, as fascists.

On account of your behaviour on the occasion when our representative visited you to give you this document it was in fact not possible to get you to accept it. This is because of your absolute refusal to discuss with the representative as even any ordinary honest person would do, leave alone someone who calls himself a Marxist-Leninist. Your behaviour on that occasion was, to say the least, anti-Marxist-Leninist and was in fact simply hysterical. In our outburst you cast complete contempt on the attitude of the Communist Party in this country to your splittism and social-fascist comments. As it is clear to all genuine Marxist-Leninists who uphold Chairman Mao's important thesis: "Practise Marxism, and not revisionism; unite, and don't split; be open and aboveboard, and don't intrigue and conspire" that genuine Marxist-Leninists will always sit together and attempt to sort out differences, we are sending you a copy of this document on yourself. If you are a Marxist-Leninist, or even an honest person with any kind of progressive or anti-imperialist views, we know that you will desist from your splittism, retract your social fascist comments and give serious self-criticism to the Communist Party and seriously and in a frank manner put differences upon the table and humbly discuss them.

May we express our utter contempt and class hatred for the miserable and pathetic attempts at rumourmongering and other forms of gutter politics in which you have become engaged. In this era of world revolution, to absolve oneself from all responsibility in terms of building and strengthening the Party and leading the masses, and instead putting oneself on some 'heavenly' and 'saintly' cloud and denouncing all who are participating in the class struggle to move the world forward is a criminal activity indeed. Furthermore, your deliberate slanders of the genuine Marxist-Leninists of England, Ireland and Canada, and your attempts to split and disrupt those who are participating in the revolution can only be seen as despicable and sordid attempts to set the wheel of history backwards. You will not succeed. The people of the world are aroused, the people of Africa, Asia and Latin America are staging ever more vigorous battles against the two superpowers, the great People's Republic of China and People's Republic of Albania are strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat against revisionism, old and modern, and the proletariat in the capitalist heartlands is astir and becoming revolutionised. Our proletarians, the proletarians of Britain of all nationalities, are very much astir and full of class wrath against monopoly capitalism; they are preparing for a final onslaught, and they are not going to let anything stand in their way. This is why revisionism old and new

and opportunism, 'armchair-Marxism' and splittism of all varieties will be wiped off the face of the old earth as the working class, led by the genuine Communist Party, the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist brings in the new. This new world, its construction out of the destruction of the old world, can only come about through the steeled cadres who have the class courage to stand up to the tasks of today, in order to achieve the great goals of tomorrow. Those who cannot face up to the necessity to unite and overcome all obstacles today will never be able to bring about this new world, nor will they be able to halt its birth.

Again, if you are a genuine person we shall expect a reply to our statement on the basis outlined. We know that the 'differences' about which you are ranting and raving are being used by you as a smokescreen for your own designs of disunity. Differences are not causes for splitting and disunity but of building further unity. If you do have any desire for unity and revolution we know that you will respond.

Finally, may we warn you that if you continue on your present course you may expect the same fate that comes to all those who pit themselves against the forces of history. This is an objective law of the world.

Death to revisionism and opportunism! Death to splittism!
Long live the proletarian socialist revolution! Long live the proletariat of Britain!
Long live the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist)!
Long live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought!

Signed, etc.

"Never refuse to do the little things, for from little things are built the big things -- this is one of Lenin's important behests."

STALIN.

*
* IMPORTANT NOTE *
*
* To date Aravindan Balakrishnan has refused even to accept the National *
* Executive statement on his position and the Central Committee's letter to him, *
* arrogantly saying he will not accept anything from a "fascist Party". This shows *
* Aravindan Balakrishnan's absolute refusal to humble himself, to struggle for *
* unity, to justify his views, and above all shows that he has taken a stand in oppo- *
* sition to proletarian revolution. *
*

ON SETTING UP A SYSTEM OF REPORTS*
January 7, 1948

In order to provide the Central Committee with timely information so that it can help all areas, either before or after the event, to avoid mistakes or commit fewer mistakes and win even greater victories in the revolutionary war, the following system of reports is instituted, beginning with this year.

1. For each bureau or sub-bureau of the Central Committee, the secretary is responsible for submitting to the Central Committee and its chairman a comprehensive bi-monthly report (written by himself, not by his assistants). The report should cover military, political, land reform, Party consolidation, economic, propaganda and cultural activities, the problems and tendencies that have arisen in these activities and the methods of dealing with them. Each report should be limited to about a thousand words and, except in special cases, should not exceed two thousand words. When all questions cannot be covered in one report, write two. Or the first report may concentrate on certain questions and deal briefly with the rest, and the next report may concentrate on the latter and deal briefly with the former. The comprehensive report should be concise in content and succinct in wording and point out the problems or controversial issues. It should be written and telegraphed early in every odd month. This is to be the regular report and request for instructions which the secretary of each bureau or sub-bureau is personally responsible for submitting to the Central Committee and its chairman.

LENIN AS THE ORGANIZER AND LEADER OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

There are two groups of Marxists. Both work under the flag of Marxism and consider themselves "genuinely" Marxist. Nevertheless, they are by no means identical. More, a veritable gulf divides them, for their methods of work are diametrically opposed to each other.

The first group usually confines itself to an outward acceptance, to a ceremonial avowal of Marxism. Being unable or unwilling to grasp the essence of Marxism, being unable or unwilling to put it into practice, it converts the living, revolutionary principles of Marxism into lifeless, meaningless formulas. It does not base its activities on experience, on what practical work teaches, but on quotations from Marx. It does not derive its instructions and directions from an analysis of living reality, but from analogies and historical parallels. Discrepancy between word and deed is the chief malady of this group. Hence the disillusionment and perpetual grudge against fate, which time and again lets it down and makes a "dupe" of it. The name for this group is Menshevism (in Russia), opportunism (in Europe). Comrade Tyszka (Jogiches) described this group very aptly at the London Congress when he said that it does not stand by, but lies down on the point of view of Marxism.

The second group, on the contrary, attaches prime importance not to the outward acceptance of Marxism, but to its realization, its application in practice. What this group chiefly concentrates its attention on is determining the ways and means of realizing Marxism that best answer the situation, and changing these ways and means as the situation changes. It does not derive its directions and instructions from historical analogies and parallels, but from a study of surrounding conditions. It does not base its activities on quotations and maxims, but on practical experience, testing every step by experience, learning from its mistakes and teaching others how to build a new life. That, in fact, explains why there is no discrepancy between word and deed in the activities of this group, and why the teachings of Marx completely retain their living, revolutionary force. To this group may be fully applied Marx's saying that Marxists cannot rest content with interpreting the world, but must go further and change it. The name for this group is Bolshevism, communism.

The organizer and leader of this group is V.I. Lenin.

Pravda, No. 86, April 23, 1920

Signed : J. Stalin.

* * * * *

Continued from page 5 - REPORTS

When the secretary is at the front directing military operations, he should, in addition to submitting his own reports, authorize the acting secretary or deputy secretary to report on rear-area activities. The above does not include occasional reports and requests for instructions which the bureaus or sub-bureaus should continue to submit to the Central Committee.

We are instituting this system of regular comprehensive policy reports and requests for instructions because, after the Seventh National Congress of our Party, some (not all) comrades in the bureaus or sub-bureaus still do not realize the necessity and importance of submitting reports to the Central Committee and asking for instructions before or after the event, or they send reports and requests for instructions only on technical points; and, as a result, the Central Committee is not clear or is not sufficiently clear about their major activities and policies (not those of secondary importance or of a technical nature), and therefore certain things have occurred that cannot be remedied or are hard to remedy, or can be remedied but have already caused losses. Beginning with this year, the Party's leading bodies at all levels must correct the bad habit of neither asking the higher level for prior instructions nor submitting reports afterwards. The bureaus and sub-bureaus; being organs appointed by the Central Committee to carry out on its behalf the tasks entrusted to them, must keep in the closest possible contact with the Central Committee. Also, the provincial or area Party committees must keep in close contact with the bureaus and sub-bureaus of the Central Committee. At a time when the revolution has entered a period of new high tide, it is imperative to strengthen these contacts.

2. Leaders of field armies and military areas, apart from their obligation to submit reports and requests for instructions on matters of strategy when necessary and their obligation to submit, as previously required, monthly reports on combat gains, on losses

continued on page 14 - REPORTS

POLITICAL REPORT TO THE MARCH 24th MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF THE ENGLISH COMMUNIST MOVEMENT (MARXIST-LENINIST) (1972)*

COMRADES!

Our movement has been in existence for just over four and a half years; as the English Internationalists from August '67 then as the English Communist Movement from January '70.

What have been our achievements? What obstacles have we had to overcome? What are the current problems to be resolved in order for the Party to advance still further? What has been the history, and what is the present stage of the revolutionary mass movement? How can we organise to influence it and ultimately to provide leadership to it? The following report should answer these questions.

EARLY BEGINNING OF THE ANTI-REVISIONIST MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND!

In 1963 the Communist Party of Great Britain split. Progressive individuals had been leaving the Party since the dissolution of the Third International, but the first official and major split based on opposing the Modern Revisionist political line took place in 1963. This anti-revisionist movement was led by Michael McCreery who formed the Committee to Defeat Revisionism and for Communist Unity. McCreery unfortunately died in April 1964 and following his death his entire Committee disintegrated. This split was a reflection of the Committee's failure to actually build communist unity. Thus while the Committee correctly refuted revisionism on the theoretical level, it did not in fact oppose revisionism on the level of methods of work. The following lessons can be learnt from the experience of the CDRCU.

1. Opposition to revisionism must not remain the exclusive right of an elite group of Marxist-Leninists. Opposition to revisionism must develop amongst the broad masses of the people; it must be based on their struggles and must serve their struggles.
2. To oppose revisionism it is not enough to 'theoretically' refute the revisionist line. Real opposition to revisionism must extend further. It must be reflected in methods of work - in organisation. Any opposition to revisionism which is not developed in this way is one sided and subjective and will itself inevitably give rise to revisionist theory.
3. To unite the broad masses of the people to oppose British monopoly capitalism it is first necessary to unite the Party organisations. The Party organisations and units must develop out of mass struggles. Any organisation, group or unit which is made up of a collection of chance individuals, each with their own individual interpretation of Marxism is bound to disintegrate and split. Unity of thinking develops out of struggle to sum up common and shared experience of actual struggles.
4. In order to build the Party organisations, strengthen and ultimately lead the revolutionary mass movement it is necessary to disseminate revolutionary ideology amongst the broad masses on an extensive scale. These are some lessons from the CDRCU experience.

By 1967 the revolutionary mass movement had achieved unprecedented heights, and was to continue to do so in each succeeding year up to the present. The youth and student movement erupted into vigorous struggles against the decadent bourgeois educational system; throughout the middle and late sixties the youth and students launched struggle after struggle against monopoly capital and expressed their resentment towards the concrete conditions of their particular form of oppression. This great movement was followed towards the end of the sixties by the workers and minorities who conducted struggles against racial discrimination, the rise in prices, low wages and unemployment. These struggles further developed into vigorous opposition to the fascist and anti-democratic policies of the Wilson and Heath governments on the questions of Ireland, immigration and Trades Unions.

It was out of the revolutionary mass movement of the youth and students that the English Internationalists developed. In August 1967 the Necessity for Change Conference held in London was a concrete expression of the revolutionary sentiment of the youth and students. It was the most advanced members of the revolutionary mass movement of youth and students who gathered together in London to form the English Internationalists after two weeks of intense discussion, debate and summing-up.

This revolutionary conference was led by Comrade Hardial Bains who represented both in line and method what was best in the revolutionary mass movement of that period. Comrade Bains was the founding member of the Internationalists in Vancouver in 1963, and in Ireland in 1965. It was Comrade Bains' correct leadership, his resolute adherence to revolutionary principle and his flexibility in applying these principles that ensured the development of the proletarian revolutionary line at the conference in contrast to and in opposition to the bourgeois reactionary line, and consequently, the victorious and successful conclusion of the conference.

The Necessity for Change Conference was a decisive turning point in the history of the struggle between the two lines in England. With the breakdown of the CDRCU following McCreery's death, by 1967 there were no less than twenty different organisations and groups in England all claiming to be opposed to revisionism, all claiming to be Marxist-Leninist, and all claiming to be developing the correct line and method in the English revolution. It did not take us long to learn the bitter truth. McCreery's experience had not been summed up and most of these groups had learnt nothing from it. What were the lessons of the Necessity for Change Conference?

THE QUESTION OF ATTITUDE IS FUNDAMENTAL:-

We learnt that the most basic mistake made by all previous anti-revisionists in England was that they doubted the revolutionary capacity of the English proletariat. Chairman Mao has pointed out: "We must have faith in the masses and we must have faith in the Party. These are two cardinal principles. If we doubt these principles we shall accomplish nothing." The bourgeois reactionary line was isolated and exposed at the conference. The left opportunist line was to doubt the revolutionary capacity of the masses. The right opportunist line was to doubt the revolutionary capacity of the Party. One line denounced the masses for not being revolutionary, the other line denounced the communists for not 'leading' the mass movement. The correct line adhered to by Comrade Bains opposed both these points of view.

The Internationalists developed out of the actual struggles of the revolutionary mass movement and as a consequence of this experience was imbued with the basic sentiment that the broad masses of workers and other oppressed sections wanted revolution. It is only the worst kind of bourgeois intellectual who has participated in no revolutionary struggles who acquires Marxism-Leninism through self-cultivation, thinks of himself as virtuous and revolutionary and the people as apathetic with all the faults.

The mass movement can only be influenced and ultimately led through sustained work from a low level to a higher level. Any attempt to jump from nothing to the 'heavenly kingdom' is bound to degenerate into reformism or terrorism, tailism or adventurism.

It is from this basic question of attitude that certain left and right opportunist tendencies have arisen in the anti-revisionist movement. Doubting the revolutionary capacity of the people leads to serious errors of programme and policy. It gives rise to 'organise to understand the world' as opposed to 'organise to change the world'. It gives rise to the line of convincing the masses to be revolutionary, and theories of 'creeping communism'. What sort of revolutionary programme can be developed when one starts from doubt?

CLASS STRUGGLE IN THE PARTY REMOULDS ONE'S THINKING, DEVELOPS CORRECT POLICY AND STRENGTHENS INNER PARTY UNITY:-

The Necessity for Change Conference taught us the necessity of adhering to a correct method of waging inner party class struggle. If the method is wrong then the results will inevitably be wrong; the method of inner party class struggle has been an important question in determining whether a revolutionary group or organisation unites to advance or splits and decays. In 1967 two attitudes were taken towards us on this question, and the experience taught us a profound lesson. Denounce all and repudiate all; doubt motive and ignore effect. This was one line. We were denounced, especially our leading comrades such as Comrade Bains, as petit-bourgeois intellectuals with romantic association with revolution. We were branded as non-Marxist-Leninist or anti-Marxist-Leninist. 'How can you be anti-revisionist without being Marxist-Leninist?' we were told. 'If you are not Marxist-Leninist we are not interested in you'. These were some of the 'repudiations'. From the other side, and this was mainly amongst our own ranks, some of our comrades regarded themselves and the

Internationalists as faultless and above criticism. Both positions are one sided and subjective. One gives rise to unprincipled disunity, the other to unprincipled unity which is bound to degenerate into the other.

Following the leadership of Comrade Bains the correct line was developed. 'Participate to solve the problem' and this has been a cardinal principle of our Party ever since. Has this not been a basic feature of the nine year history of the anti-revisionist movement in England? Subjectivism and one-sidedness have resulted in the worst forms of factionalism and splittism. In the course of our work we created the opposite trend, by adhering to the principle of 'Participate to solve the problem' and 'Cure the illness to save the patient'. We have systematically strengthened the inner party unity, encouraged our comrades to remould their thinking and developed the revolutionary policy of the movement.

The guidelines on this question are as follows:

- a) Differences in policy are developed over a long historical period.
- b) Struggle must be based on how to apply the policy and on summing-up the experience of applying the policy.
- c) Differences in the Party should never prevent us from working with those comrades with whom we differ up until those differences become fundamental and basic and there is no basis for unity.
- d) The basis for unity to adhere to is the fundamental desire to oppose British monopoly capitalism.
- e) The fundamental criterion in deciding if a political line is correct or not or if a comrade is good or bad must be based on effect, on social practice.
- f) We must insist on the unity of motive and effect. Doubting the motive of these comrades who have made mistakes and are under criticism, provides no way out for them to change. The motive of our comrades can only be revealed over a long historical period, unless conclusive evidence exists that they can not be trusted, are police spies, etc.
- g) Use the Internationalists' guidelines on building fraternal relations (See Note 1).

LEARN FROM AND APPLY THE LESSONS OF THE GREAT PROLETARIAN CULTURAL REVOLUTION; UPHOLD MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT:-

The final basic lesson of the Necessity for Change Conference was that we must learn from and apply the lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, we must acquire, grasp and apply Mao Tsetung Thought. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was a model for conducting Inner Party Class Struggle. Based on mobilising the Chinese people to rally around the proletarian revolutionary centre headed by Chairman Mao, uphold the proletarian revolutionary line and to denounce, repudiate and criticise the bourgeois reactionary line headed by Liu Shao-Chi. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was a model in arousing the masses and uniting them, in transforming the Party and rectifying its style of work and building closer ties between the broad masses and the Party, in opposing revisionism and adhering to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. Without learning from and applying the advanced experience of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution we shall be unable to lead and conduct any successful struggles. In 1967 the anti-revisionist movement was in the main sceptical of China and Chairman Mao, some actively and openly denounced China, and most of them believed that Mao Tsetung Thought had nothing in common with the English proletariat. These fundamentally wrong ideas were seriously opposed at the conference, and since that time our Party has never ceased to oppose revisionism and popularise Mao Tsetung Thought.

THE REVOLUTIONARY MASS MOVEMENT, ITS TACTICAL WEAKNESS AND STRATEGIC STRENGTH.

1. The Tactical Weaknesses of the Revolutionary Mass Movement.

- a) It is weak. b) Its associations and centres of command are infiltrated by the class enemy. c) Its struggles are sold out even before they begin. d) It is prone to imperialist and social fascist propaganda. e) It is aimless. f) It is without defence. g) Every failure leads to further disintegration of the revolutionary mass movement.

2. Strategic Strength of the Revolutionary Mass Movement.

- a) It is strong and in fact invincible. b) Its associations and centres of command can

never be infiltrated by the class enemy. c) Its struggles can never be sold out and every struggle strengthens it, on the long range basis. d) It is immune to imperialist and social fascist propaganda. e) It has the lofty aim of liquidating class society. f) Millions and millions of people form the impregnable and invincible defence. g) Every failure leads to further consolidation and strengthening of the revolutionary mass movement.

The tactical weaknesses of the revolutionary mass movement are irresistibly turning into their opposite, that is its strategic strength, UNDER COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP.

We must discern very carefully the real stage of the revolutionary mass movement. Between 1967 and 1972 it has become increasingly militant, its class composition has shifted from mainly petit-bourgeois and intellectuals, to industrial proletariat as the main force, it is influenced by the social fascist political line more strongly than ever before, it is organisationally extremely weak, its revolutionary capacity and strength are inexhaustible. There are important tendencies developing at this time to take note of.

1. There is no organised resistance in England against the policies of the Heath government on the North of Ireland.
 - a) There is widescale disapproval which is reflected in militant demonstrations and agitations, this widescale disapproval would indicate that conditions for development of organised resistance exist but as yet no such development has been brought about.
 - b) The principle reason for this situation is because of the influence of the social fascist and imperialist political line amongst the people.
 - c) Organisationally the revisionists, trotskyists, neo-trotskyists, liberals and social democrats are extremely weak, but their political line has a large amount of currency amongst the broad masses of the people.
 - d) The situation will not change by itself. It will not change by quantifying the present activities that the broad masses are engaged in. It will change by bringing about qualitative transformation in the present method of struggle. A clear line of distinction has to be drawn between the Marxist-Leninist political line and the political lines of the social fascists and imperialists. In this way the broad masses will learn and gradually changes will be brought about.
 - e) The Holy Alliance and all social fascists are demanding concessions from British monopoly capitalism. No revolutionary demands are being popularised.
 - f) The Holy Alliance has degenerated to new heights in providing a 'revolutionary' appearance to reformist and economist struggles. Today some of them are deceitfully calling Trades Union struggles revolutionary struggles and demands and strikes for higher wages, which are in the main led by various die hard revisionists, as guerilla war. They shamelessly equate people's revolutionary war and guerilla war with demands for higher wages, strikes for higher wages and better working conditions, etc. They are bent on continuing the trend of quantifying the present methods and forms of struggle even if they have to resort to providing these struggles with revolutionary names. This is one example of the social fascist influence which must be combatted amongst the broad masses of the people.
 - g) Opposition to these tendencies must start at a low level, through developing a new trend creating conscious models and popularising the experience of such work. It is essential to adhere to the Marxist-Leninist political line and the Marxist-Leninist style of work.
 - h) The revolutionary mass movement is organisationally extremely weak because the bourgeoisie is very strong at this stage.
 - i) The last five or six years' experience has shown that British monopoly capitalism places strong emphasis on giving long jail sentences to those that they fear, increasing the use of armed police and troops to combat the struggles of the broad masses of the people.
 - j) British monopoly capitalism is relying more heavily on the social fascist political line and social fascist political groups to assist it in liquidating any revolutionary struggles and in converting all struggles into exchange of platitudes and granting of concessions.
 - k) Again only communist revolutionary leadership based on adhering to the Marxist-Leninist political line and method is going to expose and isolate the influence of this process among the broad masses of the people.
 - l) Political sabotage is still the principal means by which British monopoly capitalism is safeguarding its interests. But the trend is towards resorting to force as the principal means

m) There has been a steady trend based on the consciousness of the people to be more scientific in opposing the social fascist and imperialist line. This trend is being spear-headed by all genuine communist revolutionaries, and in the main by our Party and our fraternal Party in Ireland.

TWO LINES IN THE PARTY. HOW HAVE WE INFLUENCED THE MASS MOVEMENT AND HOW CAN WE LEAD IT ?

The growth and development of our Party can be divided into two stages. From August 1967 to October 1970 : The stage of internal consolidation and internal growth. From October 1970 to the present time : The stage of external consolidation and external growth. The left and right opportunist tendencies we have had to combat can be characterised as follows : From 1967 to October 1970 the main left opportunist tendency to oppose was the line of solving the problems of inner party life and inner party building detached from and separate from mobilising the broad masses of the people. The crudest example of this was the line 'Problems of the individual can be solved without overthrowing British monopoly capitalism'. We have suffered many grave setbacks as a result of this line. For example, soon after August 1967 our Party actually divided as a result of this problem. Some comrades were preoccupied in trying to solve their 'sexual' problems instead of making revolution. In opposing this trend, other comrades simply 'walked out' left the Party and continued their revolutionary activity elsewhere. Both these lines and methods of dealing with the problems were one sided and subjective. A further example. Up until October 1969 comrades working in Sussex university used to give the slogan 'Be a communist and solve your hang-ups'. The most sophisticated expression of this wrong line came up in August 1970 when leading comrades (myself) attempted to rectify inner party life and deal with inner party problems divorced from developing the practical political programme and practical political work. When the comrades wanted to take these problems up leading comrades (myself) gave the line 'you cannot criticise the leadership'. this is the only leadership you have and you can not give criticism'. This entirely one sided and erroneous line had dangerous consequences, we came close to liquidating our Party and it was only the strength and faith of our comrades in the future of the Party and in Mao Tsetung Thought that allowed us to overcome the difficulties of that period, together with the timely assistance of our fraternal comrades in the Canadian Party led by Comrade Bains.

The right opportunist deviation we have had to deal with came up most strongly during the second phase of development, that is since October 1970. It is characterised by the line of mobilising the masses, building practical revolutionary programmes, participating in the revolutionary mass movement without putting the Party in command, without giving play to the leading role of the Party and without paying proper attention to inner party life and inner party affairs.

To build the Party internally we adhered to the general programmes of widescale dissemination of Mao Tsetung Thought, the development of the resistance movement and the development of the student movement. This work finally brought about an internal Party organisation and we were ready to enter the second phase of growth. This stage was launched at the historic BASIS OF UNITY CONFERENCE in October 1970 and was again led by Comrade Hardial Bains. A general revolutionary programme was developed : UNITE WITH THE ADVANCED ELEMENTS, TO MOBILISE THE MIDDLE SECTIONS TO AROUSE THE BACKWARD SECTIONS. Revolutionary area committees were opened up in select communities, book shops were opened, new units established and by March 1971 a national revolutionary newsweekly was being produced. The lessons of the Basis of Unity Conference were summed up and further developed by May 1971 under the leadership of our national secretary Comrade George P. Malcolm and the final defeat of the left opportunist line in the Party left over from the first phase of development was achieved. Thus all the leading elements who were unwilling to put into practice the line of the October Basis of Unity Conference were expelled from leading positions inside the Party or severely criticised.

At the present time we have a right opportunist deviation in the Party which is seriously affecting our work. A revisionist trend exists which must be combatted : LEFT OPPORTUNISM INSIDE THE PARTY RIGHT CAPITULATION OUTSIDE. Those comrades who are peddling the revisionist line in the Party constantly work to undermine the leading role of

the Party in the development of the revolutionary mass movement. They oppose the line of UNITE THE PARTY BRANCH IN ORDER TO UNITE THE BROAD MASSES OF THE PEOPLE. They promote themselves as the Party Branch, oppose coming under the supervision of the branch and the branch coming under the supervision of the masses. Instead they lord it over the branch and denounce the branch or the Party when their external programme gets into difficulties.

The leading role that the Party plays must be adhered to at all times. Our programme at this stage must be to strengthen the central organisation of the Party and arouse the broad masses of the people.

Strengthening the central organisation of the Party means applying Party policy, doing propaganda for the leading role of the Party, upholding the revolutionary authority of the Party leadership, making the Party membership subservient to the collective and the collective subservient to the broad masses. Representatives of the revisionist trend wish to go against this line. In more concrete form the revisionist tendencies in the Party are emerging on two basic questions. The question of the National Question in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales and the question of what attitude must we take towards national minorities in England, especially Irish and Afro-Asian minorities.

In order to oppose these tendencies in the most comprehensive fashion it is necessary to develop our programme still further of arousing the masses and pave the way to acquiring leadership of the revolutionary mass movement.

Our programme at this stage must be :

1. Intensify study, application and dissemination of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. (Study, that is the main activity inside the Party by 'studying only when we have specific problems in mind'; application, that is the main activity amongst the masses in order to elucidate our policy and draw clear lines between Marxism-Leninism and monopolist and social fascist politics; dissemination, that is the main overall activity as a contribution to fulfilling the revolutionary need for Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought by the advanced and middle section of the working class.)
2. Repudiate and denounce bourgeois parliamentary democracy.
3. Organise to acquire political power by establishing and consolidating workers' revolutionary area committees as the provisional organs of state power. Revolutionary committees must be established in all centres of production, that is in factories, colleges and communities.
4. Work tirelessly to draw clear lines of distinction on every issue between the Marxist-Leninist political line and the political lines of the monopoly capitalists and the social fascists.
5. Consciously develop model struggles amongst the working class against British monopoly capitalism.

The key to deciding the future of our country is WHO CONTROLS POLITICAL POWER. We will achieve nothing unless the broad masses of the people see the necessity to control political power. All issues, all demands, all agitations and actions must be subservient to this basic and fundamental question. Without acquiring political power we can achieve nothing. If we agree to and actually carry out this general line in all our units in a systematic and protracted fashion we are bound to arouse the masses and build the Party and smash the present road blocks to this growth.

Chairman Mao has pointed out recently : "Practise Marxism, and not revisionism; unite and don't split; be open and above board, and don't intrigue and conspire." 'Applying this instruction to all genuine communist revolutionaries is the best guarantee of going forward. We have been in existence for just over four and a half years. We feel very confident that the forces that Comrade Hardial Bains was instrumental in unleashing in 1967 in England are irresistible and are bound to surge forward from victory to victory.

Note 1. GUIDELINES FOR FRATERNAL RELATIONS - See: "One Struggle, Two Enemies, Three Guidelines, Four Levels of Work" available from Progressive Books and Periodicals.

* This political report was adopted by the National Council of the English Communist Movement (Marxist-Leninist) on March 24, 1972, and presented at the Founding Conference of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) which occurred on that date, subsequent to the dissolution of ECM(M-L).

OPEN LETTER TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF
BRITAIN (MARXIST-LENINIST) FROM THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF IRELAND (MARXIST-LENINIST).

23rd July, 1974.

To: The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
c/o 155 Fortess Road,
London NW5.

In the June 13th edition of your paper "The Worker", there is a statement on the front page written by the Chairman of your Party, Reg Birch. This statement is entitled "Troops Out!" and it deals with the situation in Ireland today and in particular with the recent strike organised in the north of Ireland by the "Ulster Workers' Council". The statement calls for the building of a "true Marxist-Leninist Party for Ireland", and fails to point out that a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party, the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) has been established in Ireland since July, 1970. This statement in fact blatantly ignores the existence of the Marxist-Leninist Party in Ireland, and in a deliberate and extremely harmful way promotes the line that there is no such Party.

It is the responsibility of Marxist-Leninists in each country to support the Marxist-Leninists in other countries, and thereby to support the vanguard of the entire movement of the working people in those countries. As far as we are aware your organisation has not made any statements in the past on the question of a Marxist-Leninist centre in Ireland and has not made any criticisms or specific statement in relation to the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist). Neither have representatives of your organisation formally approached the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) for discussion on the situation inside Ireland and the role of the Marxist-Leninist movement there.

In the light of this failure to take an open and clear stand in relation to the internal situation in Ireland it is highly irresponsible on your part to make such statements. The statements can only have the effect of promoting divisions amongst the revolutionary ranks in Ireland as well as in Britain and other countries of the world. The Irish working class has struggled for many years to organise for proletarian socialist revolution in Ireland, and to organise for national liberation as the first stage in this struggle. The establishment of the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) in 1970 represented an important step forward in achieving this goal. The Party was formed on the basis of the experience of the Internationalists from 1965, and the Irish Communist Movement (Marxist-Leninist) from 1969 in applying Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to the concrete conditions in Ireland. The Party, in the true tradition of the communist movement, was established in Ireland in the course of organising the broad masses of the Irish people for proletarian socialist revolution and in the course of staunch opposition to revisionism. Since that time the Party has been clearly acknowledged by all genuine revolutionaries in Ireland and in many other countries of the world as the centre of Marxism-Leninism in Ireland. It is a well known fact that there is not even any other organisation in Ireland claiming to be Marxist-Leninist and acknowledging the vanguard role of the People's Republic of China and its great leader Chairman Mao Tsetung.

Further, your organisation has not been the only organisation in Britain to support the National Liberation Struggle of the Irish people, and to support the movement to get the British imperialist troops out of Ireland. In fact, the line of supporting the National Liberation Struggle of the Irish people has been consistently upheld by the English Internationalists from 1967, and later by the Communist Party of England, (Marxist-Leninist). In contrast to the position taken by your statement on Ireland, the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) has consistently supported the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) as the Marxist-Leninist centre in Ireland, and has consistently taken the position of consulting our Party on the situation in Ireland.

The statement by Reg Birch in the June 13th edition of your paper can only do harm to the Marxist-Leninist movement in Ireland, and the rest of the world. We request that this statement be withdrawn and that your organisation makes clear its attitude towards

the situation in Ireland and especially your attitude towards the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist).

Revolutionary greetings, etc.

* * * * *

Continued from page 6 - REPORTS

and munitions consumed and on the actual strength of their forces, must also submit comprehensive policy reports and requests for instructions every two months, beginning this year. These should cover the discipline of the troops, their living conditions, the morale of commanders and fighters, any deviations that have arisen among commanders and fighters and the methods for overcoming them, the progress or retrogression in technique and tactics, the strong and weak points of the enemy forces and whether their morale is high or low, the political work of our army, its implementation of land policy, urban policy and policy concerning captives and the methods of overcoming deviations from these policies, the relations between the army and the people and the trends among different strata of the people. The length, method of writing and time of dispatch of these reports should be the same as those laid down for reports by the bureaus and sub-bureaus of the Central Committee. If intense fighting is going on when a report is due (that is, early in every odd month), its submission may be advanced or postponed a few days, but the reasons must be given. The section dealing with political work should be drafted by the director of the army's political department, examined and corrected by the commander and political commissar and then jointly signed by all three. These reports should be telegraphed to the Chairman of the Party's Military Commission. We require these comprehensive policy reports for the same reasons as we require such reports from the bureaus and sub-bureaus.

* This inner-Party directive was drafted by Comrade Mao Tsetung for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. The system of reports instituted in the directive was a development under new conditions in the long struggle of the Central Committee firmly to uphold democratic centralism and combat tendencies of indiscipline and anarchy. The problem was especially important at that time because there had been tremendous progress in the revolutionary situation. Many Liberated Areas had been linked together, many cities had been or were about to be liberated, the People's Liberation Army had become much more of a regular army, the People's War of Liberation had become much more of a regular war, and countrywide victory was in sight. This situation demanded that the Party should speedily overcome any conditions of indiscipline or anarchy existing in the Party and the army and should concentrate in the Central Committee all the powers that had to be and could be centralized. The setting up of a strict system of reports was an important step taken by the Party for this purpose. On this question, see also "The Work of Land Reform and of Party Consolidation in 1948", Section 6, p. 258 and "On the September Meeting - Circular of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China", Point 4, pp. 273-74 of volume IV, Selected Works of Mao Tsetung.

ON STRENGTHENING THE PARTY COMMITTEE SYSTEM*

September 20, 1948

The Party committee system is an important Party institution for ensuring collective leadership and preventing any individual from monopolizing the conduct of affairs. It has recently been found that in some (of course not all) leading bodies it is the habitual practice for one individual to monopolize the conduct of affairs and decide important problems. Solutions to important problems are decided not by Party committee meetings but by one individual and membership in the Party committee has become nominal. Differences of opinion among committee members cannot be resolved and are left unresolved for a long time. Members of the Party committee maintain only formal, not real, unity among themselves. This situation must be changed. From now on, a sound system of Party committee meetings must be instituted in all leading bodies, from the bureaus of the Central Committee to the prefectural Party committees; from the Party committees of the fronts to the Party committees of brigades and military areas (sub-commissions of the Revolutionary Military Commission or leading groups); and the leading Party members' groups in government bodies, people's organizations, the news agency and the newspaper offices. All important problems (of course

continued on page 19 - COMMITTEE SYSTEM

OPEN LETTER FROM THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ENGLAND (MARXIST-LENINIST) TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA (MARXIST-LENINIST).

21st August 1974

Dear Comrades,

The National Executive of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) is writing to you on behalf of our Party to strongly object to your reference to the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) and its sister Party, the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist), in your paper "Vanguard" last year.

In the August 23rd issue of Vanguard (vol. 10, no. 32) in 1973 you ran an article entitled "WAR IN NORTHERN IRELAND IS AGAINST BRITISH IMPERIALISM" in which you reported an article from "WORKERS' ENGLAND" daily news release. The original article was called "NO COLLABORATION WITH BRITISH IMPERIALISM'S WHITE PAPER." In your article, where you quoted extensively from the Paper "WORKERS' ENGLAND", you refer to the paper as "a daily news release of the revolutionary forces". You also referred to various calls made by the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) which was responsible for the article and which "WORKERS' ENGLAND", the daily news release of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist), was running. In your article you also referred to the call of the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) to support the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist).

Following the publication of your article, "Vanguard" of September 6th, 1973, (vol. 10, no. 34), printed the following under the title of "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT":-

"Vanguard has received several letters critical of the contributed article on the people's struggle in Ireland which appeared in the August 23rd issue.

"Vanguard is most grateful for the letters. They are being studied carefully and will be discussed with a view to further comment.

"Again we thank the authors of the letters. Their vigilance is encouraging and has led to a deeper study of the matters they mention."

The attitude of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) and our sister party the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) has always been to strive to build principled unity of all Marxist-Leninist Parties. We have always respected the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) and its paper "Vanguard" and held both in high esteem. In the spirit of fostering principled unity of Marxist-Leninists, we would like to make the following points with regard to the attitude taken by Vanguard towards both the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) and the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist) and to the struggle of the Irish people:

1. You printed the first article in which you quoted at length from the analysis of CPI(M-L), referred to both CPI(M-L) and CPE(M-L) by name and referred to "Workers' England" daily news release as a "daily news release of the revolutionary forces" of your own volition and choosing.
2. Without any explanation or any refutation of the issues raised in the article you issued the above insinuating and indirect statement "thanking your readers for their vigilance", which directly slurs the content of the article and the two Marxist-Leninist Parties.
3. You first of all reported on the analysis of the CPI(M-L) and the paper of CPE(M-L), as we said above entirely of your own volition, and then after two weeks you issued a very minor statement in the corner of your paper which insinuated things against the two Parties, and at no time did you consult either of the Parties that you had a serious issue to raise which required clarification. Both of the two Parties regularly send their papers to the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), on which addresses for contacting them are prominently displayed, yet to date you have contacted neither. Further, you have not as yet made further comment on the issues involved which your "Acknowledgement" suggested you would.

In our view, the question of building principled unity among Marxist-Leninists of all countries is a most important principle which all Marxist-Leninist Parties should uphold

by adhering to Chairman Mao's guideline:- 'Practise Marxism, and not revisionism; unite, and don't split; be open and aboveboard, and don't intrigue and conspire.' We do not consider that your comments in your "Acknowledgement" uphold this most important teaching to all Marxist-Leninists.

Your "Acknowledgement" does not give a serious explanation as to whether you disagree with the content of the article or whether you have some more basic objection to either of the two Parties. Yet you suggest by implication that something is wrong, and thank your readers for their "vigilance", as if they have discovered some bourgeois or revisionist line. Further, if you consider that there is something seriously wrong with the article, sufficient to warrant thanking your readers for their "vigilance", or if you have reconsidered and decided that this is not the case, we would have hoped, that as Marxist-Leninists, you would have stated your position in an open and aboveboard manner or would have contacted CPE(M-L) or CPI(M-L) to raise the issue and strive to build principled unity or principled disagreement on the question. We do not consider that your method of commenting on the article upholds this Marxist-Leninist spirit of building principled unity or the important teaching quoted from Chairman Mao above. Neither does it contribute towards a genuine dialogue between Marxist-Leninists of different countries on the important features of revolution in the various countries of the world and thus to a strengthening of the line of the international communist movement. On the contrary, your method of commenting on this article casts doubts on scientifically expounded argument and analysis and can only lead to gossip and the fostering of disunity, both of which are alien to Marxism-Leninism.

May we also take this opportunity to point out that our sister Party, the Communist Party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist), was founded in 1970 from a group formed in 1965 as the Internationalists, and that it is a vigorous Marxist-Leninist Party which alone has re-introduced Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to the Irish people after the betrayal of the revisionists in the Communist Party of Ireland, and has in fact re-founded the Communist Party which was originally founded in 1921, but later betrayed. The CPI(M-L) has through its practice of participation in the struggles of the people, developed a serious analysis of the present and past situation in Ireland, an aspect of which you were reporting on in your first article. We consider that in order to support the people of other countries the first duty of Marxist-Leninists is to support the Marxist-Leninist Party in those countries, or if not, then to present their serious disagreements with that Party in an open and aboveboard manner. In order to fully support the Irish people, we believe that you should uphold this principle in your attitude towards the CPI(M-L). The same is true with regard to our own Party, the CPE(M-L), which was founded with the direct assistance of the Irish comrades in 1972 by the forerunner of the CPE(M-L), the English Internationalists. Since 1967, when all the anti-revisionists and Marxist-Leninists in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales were invited to participate in a historic conference, THE NECESSITY FOR CHANGE CONFERENCE OF YOUTH AND STUDENTS, to exchange views on the prevailing situation and to work to bring about unity in order to advance the people's movement, there has been a consistent splittist and rumour-mongering campaign by various people in Britain calling themselves Marxist-Leninist, who right from the start have refused to sit together with other Marxist-Leninists, or with young revolutionaries (as our movement then was) to thrash out problems in the cause of the proletariat. It is only to the disadvantage of the proletariat and the shame of the so-called Marxist-Leninists that this behaviour occurred in revolutionary circles and has continued to date. We in CPE(M-L) were surprised that CPA(M-L) and its paper Vanguard, both of which, as we said above, we have always held in high esteem, should reflect certain of these wrong tendencies in the Marxist-Leninist movement and create unprincipled propaganda against us and our sister Party in the manner we have described.

The Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) fully upholds Chairman Mao's important call to "PRACTISE MARXISM, AND NOT REVISIONISM; UNITE, AND DON'T SPLIT; BE OPEN AND ABOVEBOARD, AND DON'T INTRIGUE AND CONSPIRE." This is a most important principle to uphold in practice. If differences occur between genuine Marxist-Leninists then these can be handled on a principled basis and this is bound to benefit both the Parties and their respective peoples.

continued on page 20 - CPA(M-L)

THE PROSPECTS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY AND THE QUESTION
OF BOLSHEVISATION

Interview with Herzog, Member of the C. P. G.

First Question (Herzog). Do you think that political and economic conditions in the democratic-capitalist republic of Germany are such that the working class will have to wage a struggle for power in the more or less immediate future?

Answer (Stalin). It would be difficult to give a strictly definite answer to this question if it were a matter of dates and not of trends. That the present situation, as regards both international and internal conditions, differs substantially from that in 1923 needs no proof. That, however, does not preclude the possibility of the situation changing abruptly in favour of a revolution in the immediate future as a result of possible important changes in the external situation. The instability of the international situation is a guarantee that this assumption may become very probable.

Second question. Considering the present economic situation and the present relation of forces, shall we need a longer preparatory period in which to win over the majority of the proletariat (the task which Lenin set the Communist Parties of all countries as an extremely important condition for the conquest of political power)?

Answer. As regards the economic situation, I am able to judge the matter only in the light of the general data that I have at my disposal. I think that the Dawes Plan has already produced some results, which have led to a relative stabilisation of the situation. The influx of American capital into German industry, the stabilisation of the currency, the improvement that has taken place in a number of highly important branches of German industry -- which by no means signifies a radical recovery of Germany's economy -- and lastly, some improvement in the material conditions of the working class -- all this was bound to strengthen the position of the bourgeoisie in Germany to some extent. That is, so to speak, the "positive" side of the Dawes Plan.

But the Dawes Plan also has "negative" sides, which are bound inevitably to make themselves felt at some definite period and to demolish the "positive" results of this plan. Undoubtedly, the Dawes Plan imposes a double yoke upon the German proletariat, the yoke of home and the yoke of foreign capital. The contradiction between the expansion of German industry and the shrinking of the foreign markets for this industry, the discrepancy between the hypertrophied demands of the Entente and the maximum ability of German national economy to meet these demands -- all this inevitably worsens the conditions of the proletariat, the small peasants, office employees and the intelligentsia, and is bound to lead to an upheaval, to a direct struggle for the conquest of power by the proletariat.

That circumstance must not, however, be regarded as the only favourable condition for a German revolution. In order that this revolution may be victorious, it is also necessary that the Communist Party should represent the majority of the working class, that it should become the decisive force in the working class. Social-Democracy must be exposed and routed, it must be reduced to an insignificant minority in the working class. Without that, it is useless even to think of the dictatorship of the proletariat. If the workers are to achieve victory, they must be inspired by a single will, they must be led by a single party, which enjoys the indubitable confidence of the majority of the working class. If there are two competing parties of equal strength within the working class, a lasting victory is impossible even under favourable external circumstances. Lenin was the first to lay special emphasis on this in the period before the October Revolution as a most essential condition for the victory of the proletariat.

It could be considered that the situation most favourable for a revolution would be one in which an internal crisis in Germany and the decisive growth of the Communist Party's forces coincided with grave complications in the camp of Germany's external enemies.

I think that the absence of this latter circumstance in the revolutionary period of 1923 was by no means the least important unfavourable factor.

Third question. You said that the C. P. G. must have the majority of the workers behind it.

Too little attention has been paid to this aim hitherto. What, in your opinion, must be done to convert the C.P.G. into such an evergetic party, with a progressively increasing recruiting power ?

Answer. Some comrades think that strengthening the Party and Bolshevising it mean expelling all dissenters from it. That is wrong, of course. Social-Democracy can be exposed and reduced to an insignificant minority in the working class only in the course of the day-to-day struggle for the concrete needs of the working class. The Social-Democrats must be pilloried not on the basis of planetary questions, but on the basis of the day-to-day struggle of the working class for improving its material and political conditions; in this, questions concerning wages, hours, housing conditions, insurance, taxation, unemployment, high cost of living, and so forth, must play a most important if not the decisive role. To hit the Social-Democrats day after day on the basis of these questions, exposing their treachery -- such is the task.

But that task would not be fully carried out if those everyday practical questions were not linked up with the fundamental questions of Germany's international and internal situation, and if, in all its work, the Party failed to deal with all those everyday questions from the standpoint of revolution and the conquest of power by the proletariat.

But such a policy can be conducted only by a party which is headed by cadres of leaders sufficiently experienced to be able to take advantage of every single blunder of Social-Democracy in order to strengthen the Party, and possessing sufficient theoretical training not to lose sight of the prospects of revolutionary development because of partial successes.

It is this, chiefly, that explains why the question of the leading cadres of the Communist Parties in general, including those of the Communist Party of Germany, is one of the vital questions of Bolshevisation.

To achieve Bolshevisation it is necessary to bring about at least certain fundamental conditions, without which no Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties will be possible.

1) The Party must regard itself not as an appendage of the parliamentary electoral machinery, as the Social-Democratic Party in fact does, and not as a gratuitous supplement to the trade unions, as certain Anarcho-Syndicalist elements sometimes claim it should be, but as the highest form of class association of the proletariat, the function of which is to lead all the other forms of proletarian organisations, from the trade unions to the Party's group in parliament.

2) The Party, and especially its leading elements, must thoroughly master the revolutionary theory of Marxism, which is inseparably connected with revolutionary practice.

3) The Party must draw up slogans and directives not on the basis of stock formulas and historical analogies, but as the result of a careful analysis of the concrete internal and international conditions of the revolutionary movement, and it must, without fail, take into account the experience of revolutions in all countries.

4) The Party must test the correctness of these slogans and directives in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle of the masses.

5) The entire work of the Party, particularly if Social-Democratic traditions have not yet been eradicated in it, must be reorganised on new, revolutionary lines, so that every step, every action, taken by the Party should naturally serve to revolutionise the masses, to train and educate the broad masses of the working class in the revolutionary spirit.

6) In its work the Party must be able to combine the strictest adherence to principle (not to be confused with sectarianism!) with the maximum of ties and contacts with the masses (not to be confused with khvostism!); without this, the Party will be unable not only to teach the masses but also to learn from them, it will be unable not only to lead the masses and raise them to its own level but also to heed their voice and anticipate their urgent needs.

7) In its work the Party must be able to combine an uncompromising revolutionary spirit (not to be confused with revolutionary adventurism!) with the maximum of flexibility and manoeuvring ability (not to be confused with opportunism!); without this, the Party will be unable to master all the forms of struggle and organisation, will be unable to link the daily interests of the proletariat with the fundamental interests of the proletarian revolution,

and to combine in its work the legal with the illegal struggle.

8) The Party must not cover up its mistakes, it must not fear criticism; it must improve and educate its cadres by learning from its own mistakes.

9) The Party must be able to recruit for its main leading group the best elements of the advanced fighters who are sufficiently devoted to the cause to be genuine spokesmen of the aspirations of the revolutionary proletariat, and who are sufficiently experienced to become real leaders of the proletarian revolution, capable of applying the tactics and strategy of Leninism.

10) The Party must systematically improve the social composition of its organisations and rid itself of corrupting opportunist elements with a view to achieving the utmost solidarity.

11) The Party must achieve iron proletarian discipline based on ideological solidarity, clarity concerning the aims of the movement, unity of practical action and an understanding of the Party's tasks by the mass of the Party membership.

12) The Party must systematically verify the execution of its decisions and directives; without this, these decisions and directives are in danger of becoming empty promises, which can only rob the Party of the confidence of the broad proletarian masses.

In the absence of these and similar conditions, Bolshevisation is just an empty sound.

Fourth question. You said that, in addition to the negative sides of the Dawes Plan, the second condition for the conquest of power by the C.P.G. is a situation in which the Social-Democratic Party stands fully exposed before the masses, and when it is no longer an important force in the working class. In view of actual circumstances, we are a long way from that. That is obviously the effect of the shortcomings and weaknesses of the Party's present methods of work. How can these be removed? What is your opinion of the results of the December 1924 elections, in which the Social-Democratic Party -- an utterly corrupt and rotten party -- far from losing votes, actually gained about two million votes?

Answer. That is not due to shortcomings in the work of the Communist Party of Germany. It is primarily due to the fact that the American loans and the influx of American capital, plus the stabilisation of the currency, which have somewhat improved the situation, have created the illusion that the internal and external contradictions connected with Germany's situation can be completely eliminated. It was on this illusion that German Social-Democracy rode into the present Reichstag as if on a white horse. Wels is now preening himself on his election victory; evidently he does not realise that he is claiming another's victory as his own. It was not the victory of German Social-Democracy, but of the Morgan group. Wels has been and remains merely one of Morgan's agents.

Pravda, No. 27
February 3, 1925

* * * * *

Continued from page 14 - COMMITTEE SYSTEM

not the unimportant, trivial problems, or problems whose solutions have already been decided after discussion at meetings and need only be carried out) must be submitted to the committee for discussion, and the committee members present should express their views fully and reach definite decisions which should then be carried out by the members concerned. The same procedure should be followed by Party committees below the prefectural and brigade levels. In the higher leading bodies there should also be meetings of the leading cadres in the departments (for example, the propaganda department and the organizational department), commissions (for example, the labour, women's and youth commissions), schools (for example, Party schools) and offices (for example, the research offices). Of course, we must see to it that the meetings are not too long or too frequent and they must not get bogged down in discussion of petty matters lest the work be hindered. On important problems which are complicated and on which opinions differ, there must, in addition, be personal consultations before the meeting to enable the members to think things over, lest decisions by the meeting become a mere formality or no decision can be reached. Party committee meetings must be divided into two categories, standing committee meetings and plenary sessions, and the two should not be confused. Furthermore, we must take care that neither collective leadership

continued on page 20 - COMMITTEE SYSTEM

Continued from Page 14 - CPA(M-L)

We trust that CPA(M-L) and the Vanguard editorial board will give due consideration to this matter and correct their stand. May we take this opportunity also to point out that both CPE(M-L) and CPI(M-L) are easily contactable by post, or indirectly, should any representative of your Party ever visit these countries and we trust that any serious issues you may wish to raise with us you will raise directly in a principled manner. We will of course be only too pleased to talk with your representatives at any time in order to clarify issues, explain our respective stands and foster unity.

With fraternal greetings, etc.

* * * * *

Continued from page 19 - COMMITTEE SYSTEM

nor personal responsibility is overemphasized to the neglect of the other. In the army, the person in command has the right to make emergency decisions during battle and when circumstances require.

* This decision was drafted by Comrade Mao Tsetung for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. In his "Report on the Amendments to the Party Constitution" delivered at the Party's Eighth National Congress on September 16, 1956, Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping described the significance of this document as follows :

For a long time the tradition in our Party has been that decisions on important questions are made by a collective of the Party, and not by any individual. Although violations of the principle of collective leadership occurred in our Party from time to time, yet once discovered they were criticized and corrected by the Central Committee of the Party. The decision by the Central Committee in September 1948 on strengthening the Party committee system played an especially great role in strengthening collective leadership in the Party. . . . This decision was put into practice throughout the Party and is still in force The significance of this decision is that it summed up the Party's successful experience in the conscientious practice of collective leadership, urged those organizations which had made collective leadership merely nominal to correct their mistake and extended the scope of the application of collective leadership.

* * * * *

The Marxist-Leninist - Internal Discussion Journal of the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) is edited by the National Executive Committee of the CPE(M-L). Comrades and friends, branches or units, who wish to submit contributions of an ideological nature, either on the topics already raised by the Journal, or others which they consider to be of importance are welcome to do so. The sole criteria for such contributions are 1) that they be in the interest of strengthening inner Party unity based on principle; 2) that the contributors are bound by the democratic centralist process, i.e. contributing articles or letters to the Journal is one method of raising things inside the Party, but cannot be substituted for going through formal channels for raising issues, questions, criticism of wrong trends, etc. and 3) the contributors have the responsibility to stand by their views in practice and work for their implementation.

The National Executive is producing the Journal in order to strengthen inner Party unity by raising in a formal manner certain problems which are facing the Party at this stage in order to promote discussion and change on these issues. All articles are selected from this standpoint. The National Executive sincerely invite comrades to contribute to the Journal or write with suggestions to the National Executive. In selecting content for the Journal the National Executive will be guided by the principal problems facing the Party and serious contributions on these problems will be selected.

Contributions and comment should be sent to the National Executive Committee, through the local Branch Secretary or to the Central Office of CPE(M-L), 569 Old Kent Road, London SE1.

The cost of the Journal will vary according to size, and will be the minimum necessary to cover the cost of production.