

REPORT OF THE DISCUSSION FORUM ON PEOPLE'S CHINA:

"The M.L.O.B. Replies to its Critics"

HELD ON SATURDAY MARCH 23rd AT THE CONWAY HALL

Opening Speech by Comrade Bill Bland.

INTRODUCTION

Some twelve years ago, in 1955, Marxist-Leninists in Britain made an analysis of the new leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, headed by Khrushchev, an analysis which demonstrated that these leaders were revisionists of Marxism-Leninism, that they were traitors to socialism and to the working classes of the world.

The authors of this analysis were greeted with a torrent of abuse from most of those who regarded themselves as Marxist-Leninists - until six years later in 1961, when the Albanian Party of Labour became the first party of the working class to endorse this analysis.

Now, in 1968, Marxist-Leninists in Britain have made an analysis of the so-called "cultural revolution" in the People's Republic of China which demonstrates that the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung is, despite its "leftist" phraseology, revisionist of Marxism-Leninism and counter-revolutionary.

The authors of this analysis, the Central Committee of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain, have been greeted with a torrent of abuse from most of those who regard themselves as Marxist-Leninists. I think it was Marx who once said:

"History repeats itself, first as tragedy, then as farce".

THE "MOTIVES" BEHIND PUBLICATION OF THE REPORT

The critics of the M.L.O.B. Report on the situation in the People's Republic of China agree on only one thing: that the analysis contained in it is "wrong".

They attribute its publication to various "motives".

The Committee to Defeat Revisionism, for Communist Unity (C.D.R.C.U.) "dismisses" the Report in a brief statement dated January 12th, 1968 by the simple, if lazy, device of declaring the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain to be

"agents of British imperialism" (p.1).

Now the function of "agents of imperialism" - paid or unpaid - is to serve the interests of imperialism. To establish that the M.L.O.B. serves the interests of imperialism, it is necessary for the C.D.R.C.U. to demonstrate that the Report is false - but this the statement makes no attempt whatever to do.

Nevertheless, let us try to look seriously at the C.D.R.C.U. denunciation. And since the C.D.R.C.U. does not regard the Report as worthy of analysis, let us go outside it and examine the policy of the faction in China headed by Mao Tse-tung towards the citadel of world imperialism - the United States of America.

The Communist Party of the U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist), which is recognised by the C.D.R.C.U. as a Marxist-Leninist Party, emphasises that the destruction of United States imperialism requires the united, revolutionary action of the working people, black and white.

However, an American Negro named Robert Williams is putting forward quite a different policy in the pages of a journal called "The Crusader". According to Williams, the proletariat in the United States is the black race and the bourgeoisie is the white race, since white workers share in the exploitation of the black proletariat and are therefore objectively counter-revolutionary. According to Williams, therefore, the "socialist revolution" in the United States will be a "black revolution", a "revolution" of the black race against the white race, and it will establish "black power", the dictatorship of the black race.

(Documentation on these two policies appears in "RED FRONT", March/April 1968).

One must ask the C.D.R.C.U.: which of these strategical policies is in accordance with Marxism-Leninism? The answer is clearly: that put forward by the C.P.U.S.A. (M.L.)

One must ask the C.D.R.C.U.: which of these strategical policies serves the interests of imperialism? The answer is clearly: that put forward by Robert Williams. Its effect would be to divide the Negro people in the South and the Negro workers in the North from their essential objective ally - the white workers. Its effect would be to divert the Negro people away from their real enemy, the U.S. imperialists, towards a false enemy, the white race, including white workers. Its effect would be to provoke the Negro people into sabotage and terrorism directed against the white race which would lead to the slaughter of the most militant sons and daughters of the Negro people and put back the socialist revolution in the United States for many years.

Yet Williams's journal "The Crusader" - in which this provocative, reactionary racialism appears - is published in Peking with the full backing of the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung.

It is quite impossible to reconcile these facts with the conception that the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung represents a Marxist-Leninist world leadership. Those who try to do so merely reveal that they are blinded by emotional wishful thinking.

R. Archbold, a member of the C.D.R.C.U., has issued a "critique" of the M.L.O.B. Report under the title "Britain's Khrushchov makes his Appearance in the Marxist-Leninist Movement".

Mr. Archbold begins by drawing attention to a fact which is emphasised in the Introduction to the Report: that in September 1967 the foundation conference of the M.L.O.B. supported the "cultural revolution" in China, while in January 1968 its Central Committee issued the Report opposing it.

This change of line, alleges Mr. Archbold, was not the result of correcting what we now know to have been a mistaken line; it was the result of the "deceit" of the leadership of the M.L.O.B. (p.1).

"Even while this estimation of Mao as the 'Lenin of our epoch' was being carried at the Conference, the leadership of the M.L.O.B. was already preparing to make an attack on Mao" (p.1).

Of course, until it was elected at the Conference, there was no leadership of the M.L.O.B. But no doubt what Mr. Archbold means to say is that certain delegates who are now in the leadership of the M.L.O.B. went to the Conference and voted for the resolution on People's China when they were really secretly opposed to it. Now Mr. Archbold regards the leaders of the M.L.O.B. as "careerists" (p.8), and it would seem a strange thing for "careerists" to pretend to support a policy to which they were opposed, in order to put themselves in the position of subjecting themselves to the severest criticism four months later!

On what, therefore, does Mr. Archbold base his allegation of "deceit"? Solely on

"the length of the document" (p.1),

which he considers could not have been prepared and published in four months!

In fact, it was not until the end of November 1967 that any member of the M.L.O.B. raised serious doubts about the correctness of the policy

on People's China adopted at the Conference. It was then that new information came into our possession which forced us to make the analysis that was later published as the Report of the Central Committee. This Report was prepared, adopted, presented to aggregate meetings of members throughout the country, set up and published in the course of six weeks.

If Mr. Archbold finds that incredible, he is simply paying an unwitting compliment to the M.L.O.B.

The "Finsbury Communist Association", in which a leading role is played by I. Kenna, raises the same point in an "Open Letter to Comrades of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain".

Our members have been overjoyed to hear that Mr. Kenna considers all but one of them to be

"honest" (p.4).

However, the "F.C.A." has a somewhat distorted picture of the way in which a Marxist-Leninist Organisation operates, for it sees the Report of the M.L.O.B. Central Committee as the individual work of one

"very crafty person" (p.4),

namely myself.

This may be the way in which the "F.C.A." works - I do not know - but I can assure Mr. Kenna that no individual member of the M.L.O.B. - however "crafty" he may be - is permitted to issue statements in the name of the Central Committee.

In fact, the whole open letter resembles rather a "Daily Mirror" gossip column than a serious political statement. Its infantile level can be demonstrated by one of the questions which it addresses to me personally:

"Who started off the whispering campaign that Mike Baker, not Bill Bland, was about to attack Chairman Mao?" (p.3).

I cannot answer this question, since Mr. Kenna does not specify in which public lavatory he heard the whisper. Clearly, Mr. Kenna sees himself as the Anna Louise Strong of Finsbury.

However, let us try to answer Mr. Kenna's other questions.

He asks:

"Is it a fact that he (i.e. Comrade Bland - Ed.) told the C.D.R.C.U. Comrades in December that he had been preparing this document for a year?" (p.3).

Answer: No, it isn't.

"Why no approach to the Communist Party of China before denouncing it?" (p.3).

Answer: The Report does not denounce the Communist Party of China; it denounces those counter-revolutionary revisionists who are attacking and seeking to destroy the Communist Party of China. Furthermore, an approach to the Communist Party of China must be made through its General Secretary. Perhaps Mr. Kenna is unaware that the General Secretary of the C.P.C. is one of those leading Comrades specially singled out for attack by the counter-revolutionary faction headed by Mao Tse-tung. If Mr. Kenna knows his present whereabouts, which we do not, we should be delighted to try to make contact with him.

"Why the hurry at this time to produce this document?" (p.3).

Answer: While it would not be true to say that the Report was produced "hurriedly", once a Marxist-Leninist Organisation reaches the conclusion that it has made an error, it has a duty to correct that error as quickly as possible.

"Could it have anything to do with Birch's party congress at the end of February?" (p.4).

Answer: Nothing at all.

The so-called "Communist Workers' Organisation (anti-revisionist)" comes to a different conclusion from the C.D.R.C.U. on the reason why the M.L.O.B. has published its Report on the situation in China. This appears in the February issue of its journal "The Communist", in an article under the somewhat sensational title "Is Mao a Fascist?".

It is always a joy to read a statement by the "Communist Workers' Organisation", alias the "Irish Communist Organisation", not for its content, but for the rich colour of its language that is such a precious heritage of the Irish nation.

According to the "C.W.O.", the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain is guilty of bourgeois intellectualism, vanity, blatant dishonesty, lying, charlatanism, ignorance, gibberish, metaphysics,

trickery, glibness, deliberate deceit, bureaucracy, gossip, manoeuvring, formalism, opportunism, revisionism, dogmatism and trotakysim!

Flattery will get you nowhere, Mr. Clifford!

The "conclusion" which the "C.W.O." draws from its "analysis" of the M.L.O.B. report is not uninteresting.

"We can speculate about why, for what subjective reasons, Messrs. Baker and Bland have produced this dishonest document. ... The reason ... is revealed on P27. ... And what does it amount to? Pique. Mao was given every opportunity by Mr. Baker to recognise him as the Marxist leader of the British working class - in which case Mr. Baker would not have called him a fascist. But Mao failed to do homage to Mr. Baker - so what else could he be but a fascist?" (p.15)

This is delightfully reminiscent of those pet social psychologists of the bourgeoisie who find Freudian subjective reasons behind all social phenomena. Does a worker become militant? It must be because he was frightened as a child by the postman!

In fact, the M.L.O.B. has never requested "recognition" by any foreign party or group and we have declared that we can well understand why a foreign Marxist-Leninist Party of the highest calibre should not wish to "recognise" any organisation in Britain at the present time.

The "apoliticalness" of representatives of the Chinese People's Republic in London towards Marxist-Leninists goes back at least to the year 1963, and it has been noted by the C.D.R.C.U. when led by Comrade Michael McCreery, by the A.C.M.L.U. and by the M.L.O.B. When it came to our knowledge that certain officials of the Chinese government had been spreading slanderous statements about the M.L.O.B., we drew the attention of the Charge d'Affaires office to this and received assurances which we accepted in good faith. We had no reason to doubt that such incidents were due to personal or local errors, based on incorrect information. Our attitude of (mistaken) support for the "cultural revolution" continued unchanged.

Towards the end of 1967, however, it became absolutely clear that the representatives of the People's Republic of China were pursuing throughout the world a policy of seeking to disrupt Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organisations that had already been established, and that the authorities in Peking were giving their support to all kinds of dangerous and harmful anti-Marxist-Leninist trends in various countries, including nationalism and racialism. The March/April issue of "Red Front" contains detailed examples of some of these trends. It was this knowledge which forced us to undertake what we admittedly should have undertaken months before; an objective analysis of the Chinese Revolution and of the situation in the People's Republic of China.

Let us, therefore, leave the attempts of the "C.W.O." to psychoanalyse the M.L.O.B. Central Committee, and pass on.

THE CHARACTER OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

Mr. Archbold accuses the M.L.O.B. of "trickery" in allegedly not having made it clear that Mao differentiates between the national bourgeoisie in China and "the imperialists, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists." (p.1).

This is patently untrue. The first section of the Report is devoted to this question. It makes it clear, with full quotations from the writings of Mao Tse-tung, that the Chinese Revolution was directed against the imperialists, landlords and comprador big bourgeoisie, and that the national bourgeoisie was an ally of the working class and poor peasantry in the Chinese Revolution.

"The Chinese Revolution was aimed at the foreign imperialists, the Chinese landlord class and those sections of the Chinese capitalist class dependent on foreign imperialism (the comprador big bourgeoisie).

Those sections of the Chinese capitalist class not dependent on foreign imperialism (the national bourgeoisie) formed an unstable ally of the working class and poor peasantry in the Chinese Revolution." (Report, p.2; original emphasis).

Seeking to defend Mao Tse-tung against the charge of revisionism, the "C.W.O." feels compelled to distort Mao Tse-tung's clear and correct characterisation of the Chinese Revolution as a national-democratic revolution, and to confuse the national-democratic revolution in colonial-type countries with the socialist revolution in advanced capitalist countries.

"If Mao's perspective was revisionist in 1945, as the M.L.O.B. alleges, it is inconceivable that the revolutionary forces in China should have triumphed under his leadership, while in Europe they

suffered a disastrous set-back under the leadership of Thores and Togliatti. ...

The M.L.O.B. can take its choice; either the Chinese revolution was essentially a bourgeois revolution of the old kind, or it was a people's revolution which triumphed spontaneously despite its revisionist leadership. Whatever line it chooses, it has left the real world behind it and become a stable-mate of trotskysism." (p.3,4).

Revisionism is the revision of Marxism-Leninism under the influence of bourgeois ideology, so that it serves the interests of the bourgeoisie. Of course a socialist revolution cannot triumph if the proletariat is under revisionist leadership; it can triumph only if the proletariat is under the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party.

But, as the report makes abundantly clear, the revolution which triumphed in China in 1949 was not a socialist revolution. Mao Tse-tung himself was explicit and correct about the character of the revolution.

"The character of the Chinese revolution at the present stage is not proletarian-socialist but bourgeois-democratic." (Mao Tse-tung: "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party", in "Selected Works", Volume 2, Peking, 1965; p.326).

But, he says, it was a bourgeois-democratic revolution of a new type:

"In present-day China the bourgeois-democratic revolution is no longer of the old general type. ... The new-democratic revolution is vastly different from the democratic revolutions of Europe and America in that it results not in a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie but in a dictatorship of the united front of all the revolutionary classes under the leadership of the proletariat." (Mao Tse-tung; ibid.; p.326, 327).

The M.L.O.B. Report puts forward neither of the alternatives presented by the "C.W.O." The Chinese Revolution which triumphed in 1949 was neither "essentially a bourgeois revolution of the old kind" nor a socialist revolution "which triumphed spontaneously despite its revisionist leadership". It was a new-democratic revolution consciously - indeed brilliantly - led by a vanguard party containing a dominant revisionist faction headed by Mao Tse-tung which planned to hold the revolutionary process at the completion of the new-democratic revolution and prevent its uninterrupted transition to the socialist revolution.

TROTSKYISM AND THE "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

It is particularly amusing to read charges of trotskysism levelled at the M.L.O.B. by the trotskyite "C.W.O." But let us pretend to take these charges seriously.

What, in fact, is the attitude of the trotskyite "Fourth International" to the "cultural revolution" and to the faction in China headed by Mao Tse-tung? It is one of full and unconditional support.

As listeners to Radio Peking will know, this station - under the control of the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung - has quoted with approval from "Red Flag", the organ of the "Revolutionary Workers' Party (Trotskyist)", the British Section of the Fourth International.

And, on its side, the "Revolutionary Workers' Party (Trotskyist)" congratulates the faction in China headed by Mao Tse-tung on having broken with "Stalinism", i.e., with Marxism-Leninism, and on having embraced trotskysism.

"It is quite ridiculous to regard the Chinese comrades as following in the steps of Stalin. In the past it is true they have defended him, but that is in the past. Their views have shown a definite advance and now they ignore him. ...

The report of the CCP Central Committee meeting at the beginning of August (1966-Ed.) ... marked in general outlines the advance of the political revolution in China, towards the positions of Trotskyism. This was clear above all in the emphasis placed on the role of the masses. ...

The Chinese attack Trotskyism in the years 1917-34, but they do not criticise Trotskyism today. Not a single attack against Trotskyism today has been published in Peking Review." ("Red Flag", October 1966; p.2,4).

"The Chinese ... are also supporting objectively and helping the Trotskyists." ("Red Flag"; June 1966; p.3).

To the trotskyites, China and Cuba - and particularly the former - are "workers' states" and, together with the trotskyite "Fourth International", form the "centres of the world revolution".

"The fundamental condition for the development of Trotskyism in America is the understanding, the attempt to understand the

objective world development of the world revolution particularly of the workers' states of China and Cuba and of Trotskyism as it is today, the IV International. Because these are the centres of the revolution." ("Red Flag", April 1967; p.8).

"China is the world centre which is going to tend to liberate the forces of the revolution." ("Red Flag", ibid.; p.2).

The trotskyites speak of the "cultural revolution" as

"the political revolution in China," ("Red Flag", April 1967; p.5).

and describe its character in the demagogic phrases used by the counter-revolutionary faction in China headed by Mao Tse-tung:

"The process of the political revolution is also going on in China. The team of Mao Tse-tung is leading it. The struggle against the conservative tendencies is the political revolution." ("Red Flag", June 1966; p.5).

"The army in the person of Lin Biao has erupted quite dramatically into the Political Bureau as number two, next to Mao. ... The army has in effect struck at the more conservative elements in the political bureau." ("Red Flag"; October 1966; p.2).

They therefore urge full and unconditional support for the "cultural revolution", and for the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung:

"A campaign must be made with ... support for the political revolution in China, supporting proletarian democracy, workers' control. ...

It is necessary to unite these activities with the unconditional support for the political revolution in China, ... to support the struggle of the wing in China trying to impel the political revolution." ("Red Flag"; April 1967; p.7).

Any trotskyite group which fails to give such unconditional support to the "cultural revolution" and to the faction in China headed by Mao Tse-tung is deviating from trotskyite "principles":

"Spartacist was not and is not a Trotskyist group. ... They compare Mao Tse-tung with Stalinism. ... They publish in their newspaper of November and December 1966 the principal article with the title 'Maoism runs Amock' (a monstrous attitude). ... They speak of China, to attack the political revolution. ...

This Spartacist group together with Healy in England and the other capitulators offer an elevated service to imperialism, slander and impugning the political revolution in China." ("Red Flag"; April 1967; p.5,8).

A resolution of the so-called "International Secretariat" of the "Fourth International" thus urges all trotskyite groups:

"Where there are pro-chinese groups, or pro-chinese groups in formation, we help them to develop." ("Red Flag"; Jan.10th,1967; p.4).

The primary strategic aim behind this policy is to try to use these groups for the purpose of building a united front between the trotskyites and the counter-revolutionary faction in China headed by Mao Tse-tung under the leadership of the latter:

"It is important to maintain our relationship with the pro Chinese groups as a means of access to the Chinese." ("Red Flag"; ibid.; p.4).

"WE PREPARE OUR ACTIVITY TO ORGANISE, IN A UNITED FRONT WITH THE CHINESE, THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP." (Headline, "Red Flag"; ibid.; p.3).

"When the Chinese feel that they can make a united front with us, without prejudicing themselves, without our disputing with them their revolutionary leadership, they are going to come to us." ("Red Flag"; ibid.; p.3).

It does not need a long experience in the movement to be able to understand that the trotskyite "Fourth International" are dangerous enemies of the working class.

And when these renegades give their unconditional support to the so-called "cultural revolution" in China, we suggest that those supporters of the "cultural revolution" who call themselves Marxist-Leninists should remove the blindfold from their eyes and recognise its clear counter-revolutionary character.

THE "CHINESE WALL"

The "Communist Workers' Organisation (anti-revisionist)" claims that Mao Tse-tung did not reject the Marxist-Leninist theory of the uninterrupted transition of the national-democratic revolution into the

socialist revolution. In support of this claim they quote a passage from Mao which ends:

"The task of the C.P. was: 'To complete China's bourgeois-democratic revolution and transform it into a socialist revolution when all the necessary conditions are ripe.'" (p.3).

This is, of course, exactly the point made in the W.L.O.B. Report. Mao puts forward the thesis, not of the uninterrupted transition of the national-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, but the postponement of the socialist revolution until some indefinite date in the future "when all the necessary conditions are ripe". And between the two revolutions? The "C.W.O." again gives the answer in Mao's own words:

"A certain degree of capitalist development will be an inevitable result of the victory of the democratic revolution in economically backward China." (p.2).

This thesis of an indefinite period of capitalism after the victory of the national-democratic revolution until "all the necessary conditions are ripe" for the socialist revolution is described by both Lenin and Stalin as the thesis of erecting a "Chinese Wall" between the two revolutions. It is a thesis in opposition to the Marxist-Leninist thesis of the uninterrupted transition of the national-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. And that Mao Tse-tung was the leading exponent of this thesis in China is confirmed by the "C.W.O."

It is clear that the indefinite postponement of the socialist revolution was not a necessity forced on the Communist Party of China by objective circumstances, but a deliberate policy planned many years before the triumph of the national-democratic revolution.

Mr. Archbold says:

"It is stated on page 19 that 'support for capitalism in China for an indefinite period after the bourgeois-democratic revolution was the policy of the Communist Party of China'. Whilst the W.L.O.B. 'Report' has documented practically everything else, it has not documented where the statement of such a policy can be found, THIS IS AN INVENTION BY THE FABRICATORS OF THIS SLANDER. ... THIS STATEMENT IS A FALSIFICATION." (p.7).

In fact, this statement is documented on page 6 of the Report. The objective mission of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, says Mao, the principal author of this policy,

"is to clear the path for the development of capitalism.

The new-democratic republic ... will neither confiscate capitalist private property in general nor forbid the development of such capitalist production as 'does not dominate the livelihood of the people'". (Mao Tse-tung: "On New Democracy", in: "Selected Works", Volume 2; Peking; 1965; p.344, 353).

"It is not at all surprising but entirely to be expected that a capitalist economy will develop to a certain extent within Chinese society with the sweeping away of the obstacles to the development of capitalism after the victory of the revolution. ... A certain degree of capitalist development will be an inevitable result of the victory of the democratic revolution in economically backward China." (Mao Tse-tung: "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party", in: "Selected Works", Vol.2; Peking; 1965; p.329).

"Some people suspect that the Chinese Communists are opposed to the development of individual initiative, the growth of private capital and the protection of private property, but they are mistaken. It is foreign oppression and feudal oppression that cruelly fetter the development of the individual initiative of the Chinese people, hamper the growth of private capital and destroy the property of the people. It is the very task of the New Democracy we advocate to remove these fetters." (Mao Tse-tung: "On Coalition Government", in: "Selected Works", Vol.3; Peking; 1965; p.281).

"In view of China's economic backwardness, even after the country-wide victory of the revolution, it will still be necessary to permit the existence for a long time of a capitalist sector of the economy. ... This capitalist sector will still be an indispensable part of the whole national economy." (Mao Tse-tung: "The Present Situation and Our Tasks" in: "Selected Works", Vol.4, Peking; 1961; p.168).

Such quotations could be multiplied almost without number. In fact, in the later 1940s, as the national-democratic revolution advanced towards victory, it was Mao Tse-tung who led the attack on the Marxist-Leninists

who fought to transform the national-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.

"The slogan 'the poor peasants and farm labourers conquer the country and should rule the country' is wrong. ... In the country as a whole it is the workers, peasants (including the new rich peasants), small independent craftsmen and traders, middle and small capitalists, oppressed and injured by the reactionary forces, the students, teachers, professors and ordinary intellectuals, professionals, enlightened gentry, ordinary government employees, oppressed minority nationalities and overseas Chinese, all united together under the leadership of the working class (through the Communist Party), who conquer the country and should rule the country, and it is not merely some of the people who conquer the country and should rule the country." (Mao Tse-tung: "On Some Important Problems of the Party's Present Policy", in: "Selected Works", Vol.4, Peking; 1961; p.182-3).

"The principles guiding the new-democratic national economy must closely conform to the general objective of developing production, promoting economic prosperity, giving consideration to both public and private interests and benefitting both labour and capital." (Mao Tse-tung: "The Present Situation and Our Tasks", in: "Selected Works", Vol.4, Peking; 1961; p.169).

These quotations - the last indistinguishable from a policy statement of Wilson - should be sufficient to convince even Mr. Archbold of the correctness of the statement in the W.L.O.B. Report that support for capitalism in China for an indefinite period after the bourgeois-democratic revolution was the policy of the Communist Party of China and that the principal architect of this policy was Mao Tse-tung.

THE CHARACTER OF THE STATE IN PEOPLE'S CHINA

According to the "C.W.O.",

"The W.L.O.B. does not anywhere investigate the actual nature of the state in China since 1949. It deals merely with the most formal aspects of the government." (p.6)

This is patently untrue. The report deals with the basic question of the state, namely, which class or classes hold political power in People's China.

Mr. Archbold alleges that the Report contains

"another untruth to the effect that 'at this period' (after the bourgeois-democratic revolution, that is) 'the policy of the Chinese Communist Party, binding on all its members, was that the dictatorship of the proletariat was not necessary for the construction of socialism in China, and that socialism in China could be constructed under the new-democratic state in which the working people share power with the capitalist class'. One is entitled to ask again, 'Where is this policy laid down?' THIS IS ANOTHER INVENTION OF THE AUTHORS OF THE 'REPORT'" (p.7).

In fact, this policy is documented throughout the Report. But let us summarise it again briefly for the benefit of Mr. Archbold.

One of the cardinal tenets of Marxism-Leninism is that the capitalist class is a social force which resists with every weapon in its power the construction of socialism. For this reason the working class needs its dictatorship, the dictatorship of the proletariat, in order forcibly to suppress the resistance of the capitalist class. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism cannot be constructed.

"I have shown you that the dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitable, that it is necessary and undoubtedly essential for the transition from capitalism." (V.I.Lenin: "The Deception of the People by the Slogans of Equality and Freedom"; London; undated; p.40).

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most determined and ruthless war waged by the new class against a more powerful enemy, the bourgeoisie." (V.I.Lenin: "Left-Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder", in: "Selected Works", Vol.10, London; 1946; p.66).

"Kautsky, with the learned air of a most learned archaic fool, or with the innocent air of a ten-year-old girl, asks: why do we need a dictatorship when we have a majority? And Marx and Engels explain: In order to break down the resistance of the bourgeoisie; In order to inspire the reactionaries with fear; In order to maintain the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie;

In order that the proletariat may forcibly suppress its enemies!" (V.I.Lenin: "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", in: "Selected Works", Volume 7; London; 1946; p.139).

But Mao portrays the Chinese capitalist class as a class which "approves, supports and works for the cause of socialist construction" (Report, p.4). Mr. Archbold agrees with this revisionist thesis:

"The national bourgeoisie ... is a non-resistant force to revolutionary socialism." (p.2).

Consequently, according to Mao, there is no need for the working class to suppress the capitalist class in China, there is no need for the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to construct socialism in China.

"The people" (which includes the capitalist class - ED.) cannot possibly exercise dictatorship over themselves; nor must one section of them oppress another section." (Mao Tse-tung: "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People"; Peking; 1964; p.5).

Thus the "new-democratic state", in which the capitalist class share power with the working people, which is "a state of the whole people", can construct socialism, says Mao.

"Ours is a people's democratic dictatorship.

The aim of this dictatorship is to protect all our people so that they can work in peace and build China into a socialist country." (Mao Tse-tung: *ibid.*; p.4-5).

Mr. Archbold, however, asserts that the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established in People's China.

"In China the foundation of State power is the dictatorship of the proletariat." (p.2).

But Mr. Archbold's conception of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is far removed from the Marxist-Leninist conception of that dictatorship. For on page 2 he ridicules the concept that the capitalist class should be crushed as a foolish whim of the M.L.O.B.

He attempts to invoke Lenin's support for this fantastic conception of a "dictatorship of the proletariat" which does not suppress the capitalist class by citing Lenin's criticisms of Trotsky's attitude towards the Soviet trade unions.

"The Trotskyists proposed methods of sheer compulsion, of dictatorship.' Although this refers specifically to Trotsky's advocated policy towards the trade unions, the meaning behind it is the same as the M.L.O.B. advocacy that the former (sic!) national bourgeoisie should be crushed." (p.2).

So, because Lenin was opposed to methods of coercion towards the trade unions, the mass organisations of the working class, Mr. Archbold suggests that he was opposed to methods of coercion towards the capitalist class, the class enemy of the working class! Such is the level to which Mr. Archbold has sunk in his attempts to defend the revisionism of Mao Tse-tung.

Let Lenin speak for himself on this question.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat presupposes a really revolutionary power which firmly and ruthlessly suppresses both the exploiters and the hooligans". (V.I.Lenin: "Theses on the Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", in: "Socheniya", Vol.22; Moscow; 1932; p.501).

The "C.W.O." is also explicit about the character of the state in People's China. They agree with Mr. Archbold that it is:

"in essence, the dictatorship of the proletariat." (p.7).

But what is the dictatorship of the proletariat? It is

"the power of this one class, the class of the proletarians, which does not and cannot share power with any other class". (J.V.Stalin: "On the Problems of Leninism", in: "Leninism"; London; 1942; p.127).

Mao Tse-tung speaks of three kinds of state in the modern world.

"The numerous types of state system in the world can be reduced to three basic kinds according to the class character of their political power: (1) republics under bourgeois dictatorship; (2) republics under the dictatorship of the proletariat; and (3) republics under the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes." (Mao Tse-tung: "On New Democracy", in: "Selected Works", Vol.2; Peking, 1965, p.350).

The state established by the victory in 1949 of the new-democratic revolution was of the third kind:

"The Chinese democratic republic which we desire to establish now must be a democratic republic under the joint dictatorship of all

anti-imperialist and anti-feudal people led by the proletariat, that is, a new-democratic republic." (Mao Tse-tung: *ibid.*; p.350).

Thus, the new-democratic state differs from the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the dictatorship of a single class, in being the joint dictatorship of several classes including the capitalist class.

"Who are the people? At the present stage in China, they are the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. These classes, led by the working class and the Communist Party, unite to form their own state." (Mao Tse-tung: "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship"; Peking; 1967; p.10).

"The "C.W.O." objects to the characterisation by the M.L.O.B. of this joint dictatorship of several classes as "a sharing of power" between these classes.

"In fact there was no sharing of power. Formally (to those like the M.L.O.B. who cannot see anything but the most superficial aspect of things) it might have seemed that there was a sharing of power. ...

The M.L.O.B. declares ... '... within the People's Republic of China the capitalist class still shares power in the state with the working class.' ... This can have only one meaning: the state in China is a bourgeois-proletarian dictatorship! There could hardly be a more thoroughly revisionist concept than that." (p.5,7).

But what is the difference between the dictatorship of one class and the joint dictatorship of several classes? It is that in the latter political power is shared between these classes. The phrase is, in fact, Mao's own:

"What is new-democratic constitutional government? It is the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes ... Someone once said, 'If there is food, let everyone share it'. I think this can serve to illustrate New Democracy. Just as everyone should share what food there is, so there should be no monopoly of power by a single party, group or class." (Mao Tse-tung: "New-Democratic Constitutional Government", in: "Selected Works", Vol.2; Peking; 1965; p.409).

Mr. Archbold does not challenge the statement in the Report that in the Chinese People's Republic the capitalist class shares power with the working people, but he asks:

"Does 'sharing state power' with the remnants (sic!) of the 'national bourgeoisie' mean 50-50, as the M.L.O.B. infers? Or does it mean supervision and leadership within the proletarian state power?" (p.2).

In fact, the M.L.O.B. Report does not infer a "50-50" sharing of state power. Until further analysis has been made of this question, the M.L.O.B. does not challenge Mao's claim that the working class is the leading force in the joint dictatorship (p.5).

"Ours is a people's democratic dictatorship.

Who is to exercise this dictatorship? Naturally it must be the working class and the entire people led by it." (Mao Tse-tung: cited in Report, p.5).

Strangely enough, it is Mr. Archbold who denies that the working class is the leading force in the joint dictatorship. He says:

"The leading force is the vanguard, and the vanguard is the Party, not the class. This is a basic argument." (p.1).

Is a state in which the leading role is played by a Communist Party necessarily a "proletarian state", as Mr. Archbold alleges? Clearly not, for the leading role in the Soviet Union is played by the Soviet Communist Party, and Mr. Archbold is on record as denying that the present Soviet state is a proletarian state.

If a Communist Party is not a party of the working class, basing itself on Marxism-Leninism, the fact that it is the leading force in a state does not make that state a proletarian state.

Mao himself has characterised the Communist Party of China as a party in which most of the members were not working class, but petty-bourgeois:

"Semi-colonial and semi-feudal China is a country with an enormous petty-bourgeoisie. Not only is our Party surrounded by this vast stratum: within the Party too, people of petty-bourgeois origin make up most of the membership. ... Moreover, in the economic conditions of China, even the masses of workers and Party members of working class origin are liable to have a petty-bourgeois tinge. It is therefore not surprising but inevitable that petty-bourgeois ideology should

frequently be reflected inside our Party in every shape and form." (Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of Our Party, adopted on April 20th, 1945, by the Enlarged Seventh Plenary Session of the 6th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China; in: Mao Tse-tung: "Selected Works", Vol.3; Peking; 1965; p.213-4).

In September 1949 the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference met, under the chairmanship of Mao Tse-tung, to establish the People's Republic of China, adopt the Organic Law (that is, the Constitution) and the Common Programme, and elect the Central People's Government. This conference had 662 delegates. How many of these 662 seats were allotted to the Communist Party of China? A total of 16! (see: Liao Kai-lung: "From Yenan to Peking"; Peking; 1954; p.112).

Furthermore, Mr. Archbold's assertion that the parties of the capitalist class are under the supervision of the Communist Party is not in accordance with the facts. As the Report points out, the relations between the Communist Party and the parties of the capitalist class are relations of mutual supervision.

"Mutual supervision among the various parties has also been a long-established fact. ... Mutual supervision, which is obviously not a one-sided matter, means that the Communist Party should exercise supervision over the democratic parties, and that the democratic parties should exercise supervision over the Communist Party". (Cited in Report, p.5).

Mr. Archbold's picture of People's China as a state in which the capitalist class was "supervised" by a party of the working class which dominated the state is clearly a long way from reality.

In our view, the precise role of the Chinese working class, both in the national-democratic revolution and in the new-democratic state, requires further research. In the absence of this, the M.L.O.B. Report does not challenge Mao's statement that the working class played the leading role in both.

LIBERALISM

The M.L.O.B. Report shows that the revisionist faction in China led by Mao Tse-tung has supported a policy of liberalism - freedom for the capitalist class to maintain its own political parties and its own organs, freedom to put forward the ideology of its class.

The "C.W.O." frankly defends this policy and invokes - of all people - Lenin in support of this complete betrayal of the Marxist-Leninist principles on this question.

"Lenin wrote that 'the necessary condition of the dictatorship is the forcible suppression of the exploiters' ... and not any formal restrictions of their political liberties" (p.13).

The concept of forcible suppression without restriction of political liberties is surely the most outstanding example of double-talk that the "C.W.O." has yet produced.

Let us look at what Lenin really said.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat imposes a series of restrictions on the freedom of the oppressors, the exploiters, the capitalists. ...

Where there is suppression, there is also violence, there is no freedom, no democracy. ...

Democracy for the vast majority of the people, and suppression by force, i.e., exclusion from democracy, of the exploiters and oppressors of the people - this is the change democracy undergoes during the transition from capitalism to communism." (V.I.Lenin: "The State and Revolution", in: "Selected Works", Vol.7; London; 1946, p.).

"Dictatorship ... certainly does mean the abolition (or very material restriction, which is also a form of abolition) of democracy for the class over which, or against which, the dictatorship of the proletariat is exercised. ...

A dictatorship presupposes and means a 'condition' of revolutionary violence of one class against another which is very disagreeable to all renegades. ..." (V.I.Lenin: "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", in: "Selected Works", Vol.7; London 1946; p.122, 124).

"In order to achieve real equality, and real democracy for the toilers for the workers and peasants, it is first of all necessary to deprive capital of the opportunity of hiring writers, of buying up publishing houses and bribing newspapers." (V.I.Lenin: "Theses and Report on Bourgeois Democracy and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", in: "Selected Works"; Vol.7; London, 1946; p.227).

"We say that the freedom of meeting for the capitalists is the great-

est crime against the toilers, that it is freedom of meeting for counter-revolutionaries. ...

To-day anyone who attacks us with the words 'democracy', 'freedom' stands on the side of the property-owning classes, deceives the people." (V.I.Lenin: "The Deception of the People by the Slogans of Equality and Freedom"; London; undated; p.22, 25).

Lenin's clear and firm words on the question of political freedoms for the capitalist class stand in the sharpest possible contrast to the liberal, revisionist concepts put forward by Mao Tse-tung, and those who seek to defend those concepts.

PEACEFUL TRANSITION

According to the "C.W.O.",

"The M.L.O.B. ... asserts that the very idea that the contradiction between capital and labour could, in any situation, be resolved peacefully in favour of the working class, is a revisionist idea." (p.12).

This, again, is patently untrue. The Report makes no such assertion.

The "C.W.O." draws attention to the fact that Marxism-Leninism teaches that in certain very exceptional circumstances a peaceful transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible. This, however, is neither because - as Mao says in his revisionist theses in "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" - the capitalist class can ever be a class which "approves, supports and works for" socialism, nor because they can be "ideologically remoulded" into socialists. As the "C.W.O." itself puts it in a quotation from an article by W. Steele (p.12), a peaceful transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat can occur only in the very exceptional circumstances where the capitalist class is convinced that, in a conflict between it and the working people, the chance of its victory would be "hopelessly small".

The "C.W.O." wisely ignores Mao's revisionist theses on this question and expresses the view that these exceptional circumstances operated in the People's Republic of China.

"The Chinese national bourgeoisie ... were very weak ... The Chinese national bourgeoisie ... had no state machinery with which to oppose the powerful dictatorship of the proletariat under which they lived". (p.10, 12).

But we have seen that the state in the People's Republic of China was not a "powerful dictatorship of the proletariat", but a joint dictatorship which included the capitalist class.

And Marxism-Leninism teaches that, even if the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, the capitalist class violently resists the building of socialism.

"The period of transition from capitalism to communism ... inevitably becomes a period of unusually violent class struggles in their sharpest possible forms." (V.I.Lenin: "The State and Revolution", in: "Selected Works", Vol.7; London; 1946; p.34).

This violent resistance is the more dangerous because, even when state power is in the hands of the working people alone, the capitalist class remains for a considerable time stronger than the working class.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most determined and most ruthless war waged by the new class against a more powerful enemy, against the bourgeoisie." (V.I.Lenin: "Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder", in: "Selected Works", Vol.10; London, 1946; p.60).

Clearly, if the dictatorship of the proletariat has not been established, if the ownership by the capitalist class of the means of production has not been liquidated, if the capitalist class shares in control of the state machinery of force, if it is permitted the liberal political and ideological freedoms given it in accordance with Mao's revisionist theses, it is relatively much more powerful than in the conditions envisaged by Lenin.

The references made by the "C.W.O." to peaceful transition - references so dear to the hearts of revisionists of all shades - have absolutely no relevance to the situation in People's China. In the circumstances existing in China, the concept of peaceful transition to socialism could be nothing but either the wildest of revisionist illusions or deliberate, criminal deceit.

The consequences are summed up clearly in the M.L.O.B. Report:

"If the Communist Party in a new-democratic state such as the People's Republic of China does not fulfil its historic task of forcibly expelling the representatives of the capitalist class from the state

and so transforming this into a state of the working people, led by the working class, THE INEVITABLE SEQUEL IS THAT THE CAPITALIST CLASS PREPARES ALL ITS STRENGTH TO STRIKE AT THE NEW-DEMOCRATIC STATE IN ORDER TO DESTROY IT AND REPLACE IT BY THE STATE OF THE CAPITALIST CLASS, THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE BOURGEOISIE." ("Red Front", January 1968, p.9).

This is the counter-revolutionary character of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" led, on behalf of the Chinese capitalist class, by the renegade Mao Tse-tung.

THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

The M.L.O.B. in its Report expresses the Marxist-Leninist view that, following the triumph of the national-democratic revolution, the next decisive progressive step to be taken should have been the expulsion of the capitalist class from shared political power and its liquidation as an exploiting class.

The fact that the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" has not been directed at the political and economic power of the capitalist class but at the organs of the party of the working class is the surest exposure of its reactionary, counter-revolutionary character.

The "C.W.O." defends the character of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" by expressing the view that the Chinese capitalist class - which continues to exploit the working class, which continues to share political power with the working people - is a

"red herring". (p.14).

The "C.W.O." holds that

"the main internal enemy of the Chinese revolution today is not the remnants (sic) of the old national bourgeoisie, but the 'Marxist' opportunists" (p.14).

It is not surprising to find the "C.W.O." - which has always concentrated its attacks upon Marxist-Leninists in Britain - campaigning on the side of those who have declared war on the Marxist-Leninists of China. It is not surprising to find them characterising the capitalist class, the main internal enemy of the Chinese working people, as a "red herring" to which no attention should be given. Betrayal of the working people in the interests of the class enemy, but couched in "revolutionary" "Marxist" phrases - this is the essential role of Trotskyite groups everywhere.

One of Mr. Archbold's main themes is that the M.L.O.B. analysis of the so-called "cultural revolution" as a counter-revolutionary movement disguised by "left" phraseology is "fantastic":

"It is like reading a script of the 'crazy gang' ..."

It is like reading a Chinese modern version of 'Alice in Wonderland' ... So this fantasy unfolds itself at the hands of the M.L.O.B. Ian Flemings". (p.4,5).

In fact, as Mr. Archbold well knows, there is nothing at all new or fantastic about reactionary movements being disguised under "left-wing" masks. Hitler's presentation of his fascist movement as one of "national socialism" is but one example.

Although Mr. Archbold is well-acquainted with these types of "left" disguise, it takes him an inordinately long time to see through them. In the January/February issue of "Vanguard", Mr. Archbold exposes the "Communist Workers' Organisation (anti-revisionist)" (alias the "Irish Communist Organisation") as a body of Trotskyite disruptors, having penetrated the disguise of the articles ostensibly "attacking" Trotskyism which have appeared in their journal. Yet it is but a few short months since Mr. Archbold was writing articles for the journal of this very body, and defending them as "honest Marxist-Leninists" just as he is now defending the disguised counter-revolutionaries in China headed by Mao Tse-tung against the M.L.O.B.

However, since we are on the subject of fantasy, let us look at the picture of contemporary Chinese society portrayed by Mr. Archbold.

According to this picture, the Chinese capitalist class still exploits the working class; nevertheless it wants socialism and is the ally of the working class in the construction of socialism, and so may be called the "former" capitalist class.

"The former national bourgeoisie, in a changed status in China, still constitutes a minor social force which must be retained as an ally. ... The national bourgeoisie, or what was formerly, is a non-resistant force to revolutionary socialism." (p.1,2).

What, then, is the social force which is opposed to socialist construction? It is, says Mr. Archbold, people in the Party and state who

want to maintain capitalism (or, as he puts it, to "restore" a capitalism which has not been abolished):

"The main opposing force to socialism is composed of the capitalist-roaders entrenched in State, Government, Party and enterprises. ... The 'national bourgeoisie' is not a social force attempting to restore capitalism, therefore the coercive power of the state is not directed against it, but those who are." (p.2).

And so, in Mr. Archbold's fantasy, we have the Chinese capitalists - those inscrutable figures so different from the capitalists we know! - fighting for socialism against those who want to keep capitalism going!

Of course, there are people in authority who want China to take the capitalist road. How can they be exposed?

Obviously, as the Report says, by making the policy of the Party one of ousting the representatives of the parties of the capitalist class from the state, one of liquidating the capitalist class, one of transforming the present state-capitalist economic system into a socialist economic system. Those in authority who want China to continue along the capitalist road will then be exposed by their opposition to this policy and their attempts to sabotage it.

In defending the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung for their opposition to the suppression and liquidation of the Chinese capitalist class, Mr. Archbold is, of course, himself exposing the members of this faction as the real "capitalist roaders" in China.

But these simple Marxist-Leninist principles do not apply in Mr. Archbold's fantastic "China". Here the "capitalist roaders" are to be identified

"through criticism" (p.5)

Criticism by whom? Not, of course, by the Party, for the vanguard role of the Party has been done away with in Mr. Archbold's picture. The Communist Party of China, according to Mr. Archbold, is simply an organisation

"providing a shelter for revisionists to remain unexposed" (p.5)

Criticism by whom, then?

Criticism by "the people" - a concept which to Mao and Mr. Archbold includes the capitalist class. It is, then, hardly surprising that those in authority who have come most strongly under criticism by "the people" should be the Marxist-Leninists who took the leading role in the exposure of modern revisionism.

As the Report says:

"The first target of the 'cultural revolution' was that of all counter-revolutions in the present era - the Marxist-Leninists" (p.15)

But the attack upon leading Marxist-Leninists is only the preliminary step to a main aim of the counter-revolutionaries: the destruction of the Communist Party of China as a Marxist-Leninist vanguard Party. As the Report points out (p.21), where the counter-revolutionaries have succeeded in setting up their so-called "revolutionary committees", these have taken over all power both from the Communist Party and from the organs of the new-democratic state.

The "spontaneous rebellion of the masses" which has been encouraged in China by the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung is the same "spontaneous rebellion of the masses" which was encouraged by the reactionaries in Hungary in 1956 and which is being encouraged today by the reactionaries in Czechoslovakia and Poland. In all cases this "rebellion" is directed at the destruction of the vanguard party of the working class - or what remains of it in the eastern European countries.

The difference is merely that, in Hungary in 1956 as in People's China today, the political situation made it necessary to disguise this reactionary rebellion under "left-wing" slogans, while ten years of revisionist degeneration in Czechoslovakia and Poland make this "left" cloak unnecessary there.

The aims of the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung to destroy not only the Communist Party of China but Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organisations throughout the world have been exposed in crude fashion by one of its American mercenaries in Peking, Sidney Rittenberg, in a speech he made in April 1967, in which he speaks of:

"... the Party machine which is built by the Liu Shao-chi and the Teng Hsiao-pings. This is what the masses are smashing in China. And this is what will be smashed wherever it exists all over the world." (S. Rittenberg: "Liu Shao-chi and his Evil Book"; Speech to the Bethun Yenan Revolutionary Rebel Regiment; Peking; April 1967)

Mr. Archbold denounces the M.L.O.B. Report as

"dastardly attack on the Communist Party of China" (p.9).

To, Mr. Archbold. You are standing reality on its head. The M.L.O.B. Report calls for unity with the Chinese Marxist-Leninists against the counter-revolutionaries who are attempting to destroy the Communist Party of China.

MAO AS "ANTI-REVISIONIST"

Mr. Archbold attempts to portray Mao Tse-tung as playing a leading role in the exposure of modern revisionism made by the Chinese Marxist-Leninists from 1960 onwards, claiming that it was only

"when Mao was 'forced' to resign as President of the Republic ... and could devote his whole attention to the matter, that modern revisionism was exposed from 1960 onwards." (p.4).

In fact, not one of the documents of the Communist Party of China directed against modern revisionism during the "Great Debate" of 1960-65 appeared under the signature of Mao Tse-tung. On the contrary, the documents concerned make it clear that the campaign to expose modern revisionism was directed by Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping and Peng Chen - all main targets of the counter-revolutionary faction headed by Mao Tse-tung since the start of the "cultural revolution".

But who was it that the Soviet revisionists specifically and repeatedly invited to come to Moscow to "improve relations" between the two Parties?:

"The C.P.S.U. Central Committee sent a letter to Comrade Mao Tse-tung on May 12, 1960, inviting him to come and spend a holiday in the U.S.S.R. Unfortunately at that time Comrade Mao Tse-tung could not avail himself of our invitation. The C.P.S.U. Central Committee would welcome a visit by Comrade Mao Tse-tung." (Letter of C.C. of C.P.S.U. to the C.C. of the C.P.C., March 30th, 1963).

"HOW TO BE A GOOD COMMUNIST"

The January/February issue of the C.D.R.C.U. journal "Vanguard" publishes a "critique" of the Report, the whole of this "critique" being devoted to one minor point: the question of whether or not Liu Shao-chi included the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" in his book "How to be a Good Communist".

Whether he did or not, tells us, of course, nothing about the situation in the People's Republic of China. Nor does it tell us whether or not Liu was a Marxist-Leninist when he wrote it, for the book does not deal with that subject. However, if Liu did include the phrase and is being attacked by the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung for not having done so, then the falsity of the charge reveals the dubious lives of his attackers. It was in that context that the matter was dealt with in the Report.

"Vanguard", however, accuses the M.L.O.B. of "fraud" in relation to this question. Let us, therefore, examine the issue in detail.

"Vanguard" refers us to page 19 of the Report, where a quotation is given from an attack by the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung on Liu's book relating to the above phrase:

"The author has even deleted the term from two passages quoted from Lenin." (Peking Review, No.20, 1967; p.9).

The M.L.O.B. Report then proceeds to quote from Liu's book to show that the term "dictatorship of the proletariat" did appear in the book.

"Vanguard" goes on to say:

"The passage quoted in the 'Report' is from the 1951 edition of 'How to be a Good Communist', but as revealed in Peking Review, later editions have this passage omitted." (p.1).

In fact, "Peking Review" reveals nothing of the sort. The attack on Liu's book states:

"The various editions of the book on 'self-cultivation', including the revised 1962 edition, quote this passage as follows: " (i.e., with the phrase omitted - Ed.) ("Peking Review"; ibid.; p.9).

In other words, "Peking Review" does not reveal that later editions have this passage omitted. It alleges explicitly that "the various editions" of the book have it omitted. And of these "various editions" the 1951 edition happened to be the one in our possession.

There has been no "fraud" or "trickery" on the part of the M.L.O.B. and the allegation of the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung that the various editions of Liu's book had this phrase omitted is, as the Report says, untrue.

THE ATTACK UPON STALIN

The M.L.O.B. Report draws attention to certain statements by Mao Tse-tung, and by the Communist Party of China under his leadership, which attack Stalin with all the venomous slanders coined by the trotskyites and the modern revisionists.

The fact that these attacks were made places all the critics of the M.L.O.B. Report in a dilemma. Either, in defending Mao Tse-tung, they defend these attacks and so associate themselves with them; or they repudiate these attacks, as Marxist-Leninists must, and so implicitly criticise Mao Tse-tung for having fallen, at least temporarily, into the pit of revisionism. Since very humble and ordinary students of Marxism-Leninism, of whom there are some in this hall, were exposing these anti-Stalin slanders in 1956, how is it possible to explain such an appalling lapse into revisionism on the part of "the greatest genius the world has yet produced", "the greatest Marxist-Leninist of all time", one "whose every word is truth"?

It is not surprising that most of the critics of the M.L.O.B. Report try to avoid this dilemma. The "C.W.O." simply refers, without commenting on their justification or otherwise, to

"criticisms of him (i.e., Stalin - Ed.) made by the C.P.C." (p.14) and attempts to draw a red herring across the trail by attacking the M.L.O.B. for having drawn attention to these "criticisms":

"The M.L.O.B. now discards the mantle of Stalin-critic and tries to appear as the ardent champion of Stalin against criticisms made of him by the C.P.C. in 1956/7. This is charlatanism of the lowest kind." (p.14).

In fact, of course, the M.L.O.B. has been consistently the ardent champion of Stalin against the attacks made upon him by the trotskyites and the modern revisionists, for it is well aware that these attacks were in reality attacks upon Marxism-Leninism. In the absence of any criticism of Stalin by the M.L.O.B., the "C.W.O." makes reference to an editorial written by Comrade Mike Baker in the journal of the former A.C.M.L.U. "Hammer of Anvil", in 1966, in which he referred to an

"error in the Soviet experience - an error which J.Stalin, as is proved by his last written work, 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.', was on the point of correcting when he died." ("Hammer or Anvil", Nov./Dec., 1966; p.7).

In a leaflet issued by the "Irish Communist Organisation" under the title of "Stalin's Errors" this statement is described as a "public attack" upon Stalin:

Were there errors in the Soviet experience during Stalin's lifetime? It can hardly be forgotten that after his death, after thirty-six years of the dictatorship of the proletariat, revisionists were able to seize power in the U.S.S.R., destroy socialism and restore all the essentials of a capitalist society. Do Marxist-Leninists regard such an appalling development as inevitable? Of course not. It is, therefore, essential for Marxist-Leninists to draw the necessary lessons from the Soviet experience to prevent such a development from ever occurring again in a socialist country.

The Soviet Marxist-Leninists of the Revolutionary Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), have drawn such lessons and express the following view in their programmatic document:

"Stalin's fight against the bureaucratic strata which developed in the building of an industrialised socialist state was just and necessary. But he tried to fight these bureaucratic strata from within the bureaucratic apparatus itself, and with the aid of the bureaucratic apparatus itself. For this reason he was not able to defeat them decisively." (Draft Programme of the Soviet Revolutionary Communists (Bolsheviks), in: "Hammer or Anvil", Supplement, p.6).

As Comrade Mike Baker pointed out in the editorial referred to, Stalin had already begun to take steps to defeat the revisionist tendencies observable in the Soviet Party and state, - steps which were interrupted by his death.

The Chinese Marxist-Leninists, drawing the lessons of the Soviet experience, initiated the "socialist cultural revolution" with the aim of drawing the masses into active ideological struggle under the leadership of the Party against bourgeois and revisionist ideas. The fact that the "left" revisionist faction headed by Mao Tse-tung was able to pervert this movement into a bogus "great proletarian cultural revolution", counter-revolutionary in character, does not invalidate the lessons they draw. It makes it more imperative than ever, however, for

Marxist-Leninists to analyse the experience in all socialist countries, as well as in the People's Republic of China, in order that future socialist revolutions may be carried through to complete and final victory.

Such an essential critical analysis of Soviet experience, made with the aim of making present and future socialist societies secure, has nothing whatsoever in common with the slanderous attacks upon Stalin made by the trotskites and modern revisionists for the purpose of destroying socialism. And this red herring has been introduced by the "C.W.O." with the sole aim of diverting attention from their absolute inability to reconcile the attacks upon Stalin made by Mao Tse-tung, and by the Chinese Communist Party under his leadership, with the concept they wish to foster of Mao Tse-tung as "a great Marxist-Leninist".

In seeking to excuse the non-publication by the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung of the Programme of the Soviet Revolutionary Communists, Mr. Archbold says:

"The 'organisation' referred to has not been verified as an authentic revolutionary body. Its programme, printed in English, was distributed in this country from a generally unknown source, and bears no imprimatur, country of origin, nor support from any Marxist-Leninist body." (p.9).

Nothing could be further from the truth. The document concerned was issued in several languages by the Albanian Party of Labour, and republished by Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organisations throughout the world.

The fact that this document, which called for international support for the revolutionary overthrow of the Soviet revisionist leading clique, has not been published by the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung reflects the spurious character of the "polemic" between the "left" revisionists of Peking and the right revisionists of Moscow - a "polemic" which bears the stamp of the shadow-boxing between Tory and Labour members of the House of Commons.

Mr. Archbold defends the support given by the revisionist leaders of the Chinese Communist Party to the infamous 20th Congress of the Soviet revisionists, to their attacks upon Stalin and to their "rehabilitation" of the Titoites in the following words:

"The nature and features of revisionism in the Soviet Union had not been revealed, exposed and identified at the time of the articles and speeches quoted. There was no reason to disbelieve what was said at the time of the 20th Congress ... 'An objective analysis' was not possible outside the Soviet Union ... To demand that the C.P.C. should have recognised Khrushchev for what he was is to demand that people be not Marxist-Leninists, but clairvoyants." (p.4).

This is quite untrue. An incontrovertible objective analysis of the treachery of the Yugoslav revisionists had been made by the Communist Information Bureau, under Stalin's leadership, in 1948. When Khrushchev went to Belgrade in 1955 and claimed that the Titoites were "good Communists", the revisionist character of the new Soviet leadership was unmistakably exposed.

Clearly, Mr. Archbold did not accept this exposure until some years later. At this time he was probably to be numbered among those who were attacking British Marxist-Leninists as "imperialist agents" for an analysis of Khrushchevite revisionism which they made in 1955!

When did Mr. Archbold finally come to accept the revisionist character of the Soviet leadership? I do not know. Presumably, from his

statement about "clairvoyance" cited above, it was in the 1960s when, as a result of the eclipse of the revisionists in China, the Marxist-Leninists in the leadership of the Communist Party of China publicly began to expose the revisionist character of the leaders of the C.P.S.U.

Certainly the "anti-revisionism" of most of those who make up the so-called "anti-revisionist" movement dates not from 1955 or 1956, but from the time of the public split in the International Communist Movement in the 1960s. Forced by this event to choose between following the line of Moscow or the line of Peking, they chose the latter course. And of course, they chose correctly.

But the so-called "cultural revolution" in China now presents a historical event comparable to Khrushchev's visit to Belgrade. It is clear to all, except those who do not wish to see, that the faction headed by Mao Tse-tung has been for many years pursuing a revisionist policy. It is clear to all, except those who do not wish to see, that the so-called "cultural revolution" - despite its "left" mask - is a counter-revolutionary attack upon the Communist Party of China.

Mr. Archbold does not wish to see this now, just as he did not wish to see the character of the Soviet revisionists in 1955. He has an emotional need for a great and powerful Communist Party to follow, a great and powerful revolutionary state on which to lean. He finds the fact that not only Moscow but also Peking is under the control of revisionists to awful to contemplate. This is clearly shown by his pathetic cry:

"If both are revisionist, who is to take up the struggle?" (p.3).

Marxist-Leninists are taking up the struggle, Mr. Archbold. And Marxist-Leninists have never been afraid to look reality in the face.

The rebuilding of the world Communist movement from the roots is a gigantic task, but it does not daunt Marxist-Leninists, even if it for the moment daunts Mr. Archbold. For Marxist-Leninists understand that, no matter what setbacks they suffer as a result of the treachery of leaders, the working class in all countries will throw up new vanguard parties which will be stronger and more determined because of the experience of these setbacks and these betrayals.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, we are satisfied that the Report of the M.L.O.B. on the situation in the People's Republic of China is correct in all its essentials. We are satisfied that it has established, on the basis of objective political analysis, the reactionary, counter-revolutionary character of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" led, on behalf of the Chinese capitalist class, by the renegade Mao Tse-tung. We have studied the virulent attacks which have been made upon the Report by those who continue to give their support to the "cultural revolution", and these attacks strongly reinforce our view of the Report as fundamentally correct.

We not only stand by it. We say categorically that those who continue to support "the thought of Mao Tse-tung" are - whether deliberately or mistakenly - supporting a "left" revisionism of Marxism-Leninism which can only do great harm to the movement all over the world. We say categorically that those who continue to support the "cultural revolution" are - whether deliberately or mistakenly - supporting a counter-revolutionary attack upon the Chinese working people, upon the great Chinese Communist Party, upon Marxism-Leninism, and upon the whole world revolutionary movement.

Documents referred to in Comrade Bland's speech are as follows:

Archbold, N.: "Britain's Khrushchev makes his Appearance in the Marxist-Leninist Movement".

Committee to Defeat Revisionism, for Communist Unity: "'Red Front' truly a 'Front' of Reaction", in: "Vanguard", Jan/Feb. 1968.

Committee to Defeat Revisionism, for Communist Unity: "Agents of British Imperialism launch Attack on the Vanguard of the World Revolutionary Movement", in: "Vanguard Bulletin" No. 3; 15th January 1968.

Communist Workers' Organisation (anti-revisionist): "Is Mao a Fascist?", in: "The Communist", February 1968.

Finsbury Communist Association: "An Open Letter to the Comrades of the M.L.O.B."

Irish Communist Organisation: "Stalin's Errors".

DISCUSSION

A long discussion period followed, with no time limit on contributions from the floor. Representatives of all the bodies which had published attacks upon the M.L.O.B. Report were present in the audience, and many of these spoke several times. The main tenor of their contributions was that Comrade Bland had distorted their arguments by not presenting them in sufficient fullness, but no examples of such distortion were given. Their intermittent heckling was not effective enough to disrupt the conduct of the meeting which was capably chaired by Comrade Bill Glen.

Mr. Archbold objected vociferously to the fact that Comrade Bland had replied to the allegations concerning Liu's book "How to be a Good Communist" contained in "Vanguard" and not to those contained in his open letter. He said that the two articles had been written quite independently and that for Comrade Bland to reply to the "Vanguard" allegations on this point was to evade replying to those in his open letter.

We print below, without comment, the relevant passages from the two documents.

ARCHBOLD'S "OPEN LETTER"

On page 19, second column, third paragraph, the 'Report' quotes a passage from "How to be a Good Communist" in which Lui Shao-Chi makes a quotation from Lenin in which occurs the passage 'the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential'. However, in Peking Review No. 20 (1967) on page 9 and 10 are quoted passages from Liu's book in which this passage is omitted. In other words the M.L.O.B. 'Report' deliberately misleads its readers by quoting an edition in which this passage had not been deleted, whereas in later editions it was. Thus those who compiled this 'Report' can be justly accused of being tricksters, and the charge against Liu of deleting passages from the book which included references to the dictatorship of the proletariat by Lenin is fully corroborated. Liu's true position has been falsified by the M.L.O.B. 'Report'. Contrary to the M.L.O.B. 'Report', China's Khrushchov did delete the term 'dictatorship of the proletariat' in the quotation from Lenin printed in editions of his book after 1951. What is the answer to this? After this discovery of fraud on the part of the originators of the 'Report', what credence could even the most naive place in them? None at all".

Mr. Archbold concluded by saying that the "cumming duplicity" of the Report was of such a high standard that he doubted that it had been prepared by the M.L.O.B. at all.

Mr. Clifford's contribution to the discussion was mainly concerned with a desperate repetition of his denial that the "Communist Workers' Organisation (anti-revisionist)" (alias the "Irish Communist Organisation") was a trotskyite body.

"VANGUARD" Jan/Feb 1968, p.1-2.

On page 19, second column, third paragraph, the 'Report' quotes a passage from "How to be a Good Communist" in which Lui Shao-Chi makes a quotation from Lenin in which occurs the passage 'the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential'. However, in Peking Review No. 20 (1967) on page 9 and 10 are quoted passages from Liu's book in which this passage is omitted. In other words the M.L.O.B. 'Report' deliberately misleads its readers by quoting an edition in which this passage had not been deleted, whereas in later editions it was. Thus those who compiled this 'Report' can be justly accused of being tricksters, and the charge against Lui of deleting passages from the book which included references to the dictatorship of the proletariat by Lenin is fully corroborated. Liu's true position has been falsified by the M.L.O.B. 'Report'. Contrary to the M.L.O.B. 'Report', China's Khrushchov did delete the term 'dictatorship of the proletariat' in the quotation from Lenin printed in editions of his book after 1951. What is the answer to this? After this discovery of fraud on the part of the originators of the 'Report', what credence could even the most naive place in them? None at all".

Then, in company with Mr. Finlayson of the "London Workers Committee", he proceeded to make an attack upon the Vietnam Workers' Party for collaborating with the national bourgeoisie in the present war of national liberation directed against United States imperialism. This is, in fact, the trotskyite strategy in all its duplicity. To oppose collaboration with the national bourgeoisie in the national-democratic revolution, when the national bourgeoisie may be an objective ally of the working class; and to support collaboration with the national bourgeoisie when, as in People's China, the national-democratic revolution has been completed and when it is necessary for the working people to suppress the national bourgeoisie in order to construct socialism.

Mr. Brandler said that the M.L.O.B. had not to his satisfaction disproved his view that the freedom of capitalist exploitation permitted in People's China was comparable to the situation in Soviet Russia under Lenin's "New Economic Policy".

(Replying, Comrade Baker pointed out that there was no question of the Soviet state, at the time of N.E.P., being presented as "a joint dictatorship of several classes, including the capitalist class", as Mao Tse-tung had defined the "new democratic state" in People's China. Thus, the purely temporary "freedom of capitalist exploitation" permitted under the Soviet New Economic Policy was in fact strictly controlled by the state of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat, which ended N.E.P. as soon as it had served its purpose.)

Miss Hodgetts felt that it would have been preferable for the Discussion Forum to have been by invitation rather than public, in order that disruptors could have been excluded. She had been uneasy for some time about certain aspects of the "cultural revolution", in particular the hysteria attached to it, but had not yet come to a definite conclusion about its character.

An M.L.O.B. member drew attention to the great decline in the political quality of "Peking Review" since the commencement of the "cultural revolution". When he proceeded to demonstrate that Mr. Kenna's device of dividing the profits of the Chinese capitalist class among the whole population did not provide a reliable index of the social importance of this class, Mr. Kenna was roused to the hysterical shouting of abuse and had to be called to order by the Chairman.

Mr. Wilson, while expressing the view that the M.L.O.B. Report did less than justice to what he felt were the positive aspects of Mao Tse-tung's "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People", agreed completely with the Report's characterisation of the "cultural revolution" as a counter-revolutionary movement directed against the Communist Party of China.

COMRADE BAKER'S STATEMENT

After replying to points raised in the discussion, Comrade Mike Baker proceeded:

Modern revisionism is imperialism's answer to the victories won by the world working class in its advance up to the present stage, when national liberation struggle is spreading through three continents. Those who deny this real and objective basis for the emergence of modern revisionism are deserting the scientific positions of Marxism-Leninism and adopting an idealist standpoint - one which ascribes modern revisionism merely to the subjective errors of leaders.

It is of imperative importance, in this new and intensified phase of the general crisis of capitalism, to discard all subjective and idealist views concerning the concealed enemies of the working class within the ranks of the international Marxist-Leninist vanguard and to relate modern revisionism concretely to the strategic perspectives of this world situation - a world situation which is moving with increasing rapidity towards the unfolding of the world socialist revolution on a world-wide front. All who aspire to Marxism-Leninism and to participation in the complex tasks of scientific revolutionary leadership must understand first of all one elementary truth about

modern revisionism: that its main strategic aim is to split the unity of the world working class forces and their Marxist-Leninist vanguard in all sectors of the world, and to prevent the growth and consolidation of revolutionary unity between the working class and its allies. For it is this unity which is the prime strategic requirement for the advance of the world socialist revolution and the main foundation for its victory.

THE AIMS OF THE MODERN REVISIONISTS

The first strategic aim of the concealed enemy, the modern revisionists, was to destroy the main base won by the world working class and the main arsenal supporting and nourishing the revolutionary movement in all lands - the socialist camp of nations - and, by reversing the trend of development in the socialist countries to bring about the restoration of capitalism - to integrate them into the world capitalist system. The second strategic aim was to destroy the national sections of the former Communist International, the Communist Parties of all lands, by transforming them into "left" Labour Parties which have renounced the socialist revolution.

And now, as all the counter-revolutionary manoeuvres of the concealed revisionist enemy have been powerless to prevent the continued upsurge of class struggle on a world scale, the modern revisionists have been compelled to adopt yet a third counter-revolutionary aim: that of trying to split the emerging working class forces in the colonial-type countries from the working class in the developed capitalist countries, of seeking to strengthen and perpetuate the hegemony of the petty bourgeoisie in the colonial national liberation movements in order to prevent the working class from assuming the vanguard role in national liberation struggle, and of trying by all means to disrupt and smash the new emerging Marxist-Leninist vanguard parties in all lands which are the product of the struggle against modern revisionism and a prime essential for the world working class in its struggle. As the discussion here tonight has conclusively shown, this final counter-revolutionary aim is being pursued under cover of a "left" disguise and its leading centre is the counter-revolutionary faction in China headed by Mao Tse-tung.

RIGHT AND "LEFT" DEVIATIONS

The emergence of twin complementary poles of modern revisionist betrayal - the right revisionism of the Soviet leading centre and the "left" revisionism of the counter-revolutionary faction in China headed by Mao Tse-tung - link up objectively and organically with two fundamental anti-Marxist-Leninist trends in the working class vanguards of all lands, including the developed capitalist countries - and especially Britain. The first of these trends is that of accommodation to the capitalist class, and is manifested chiefly in the long-standing social-democratic and reformist policies which arose to meet the needs of declining imperialism; its highest expression is the revisionism of the C.P.G.B. leadership. This trend is the right deviation within the working class movement and constitutes the principal danger at the present time. The second of these anti-Marxist-Leninist trends is that of seeking to skip over objectively necessary stages of the struggle and is manifested chiefly in the tendency to withdraw from the concrete tasks of a strategic and tactical nature imposed by the necessity to concentrate upon the main contradiction prevailing at a particular time. This is the "left" deviation within the working class movement; it is characterised subjectively by an emotional reaction to the harsh realities of the class struggle, especially in the sphere of ideology, the essential feature of which is withdrawal from struggle against the open and concealed representatives of the class enemy in favour of aggressive struggle against the emerging Marxist-Leninist vanguard. Thus the "left" deviation acts objectively as the ally of the main rightist enemy, spreading confusion and disunity in order to hold back the most advanced and class conscious adherents to the cause of the working class from uniting their forces to defeat the rightist enemy within their ranks and build a vanguard party of the working class.

At times when the class struggle in all spheres reaches a crucial turning point, these two deviations tend to fuse together - the "left" deviation acting as the mask for the counter-revolutionary attacks of the main rightist open class enemy. This is the role to which all "left" deviators must eventually degenerate, whether they be open trotskites or whether they parade their wares under the false label of "Marxism-Leninism" as do the gentlemen of the "left" opposition present here tonight.

The general slogan of "anti-revisionism" has thus been used by the deviators of right and "left" as a disguise to conceal the launching of attacks against the emerging Marxist-Leninist vanguard.

THE ROLE OF THE "LEFT" REVISIONISTS

So long as the Marxist-Leninists of China maintained their tenuous control of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, their existed the possibility of the C.P.C. forming the cornerstone of a united Marxist-Leninist world movement which, in its turn, would form the foundation of a future Marxist-Leninist International. But we now know not only that the Marxist-Leninist leadership which gained ascendancy in the C.P.C. in 1959 was locked in incessant inner-Party struggle against the revisionist faction headed by Mao Tse-tung and its open allies, the parties of the Chinese capitalist class, but also that these direct representatives of the capitalist class already held control of important organs of state, including the foreign ministry and the foreign embassies. It has been to a large extent through these agencies that ideological and political confusion has been spread throughout the emerging Marxist-Leninist organisations and groups ever since the Great Debate took on its open form some five years ago. It has been for that reason that the officials of the Chinese Embassy in London were active from the very beginning in building close connections with all kinds of concealed revisionist elements whose aim was to build a neo-revisionist "united front" embracing both the right and the disruptive and unprincipled rabble of the "left", from open trotskites and syndicalist organisations such as "International Socialism" to the sectarian groups of anti-Marxist-Leninist renegades disgorged from the darkest corners of the C.P.G.B. for the precise purpose of spreading confusion and disunity in the name of "anti-revisionism".

We now know the answer to several more puzzling questions: why did the rightist and capitalist-financed group around "The Marxist" receive from the beginning the eager support of the officials of the Chinese Embassy in London? Why did these same officials, acting on behalf of the Chinese state, provide every assistance to such an openly opportunist organisation as SACU, while simultaneously bringing the full weight of the name and influence of the Communist Party of China to bear in an effort to discredit by every means possible the first genuine Marxist-Leninist organisation to be built in this country, under the leadership of Comrade Michael McCreary, in the period of the struggle against modern revisionism?

The essential unity between the deviators of both right and "left" is now fully exposed by the fact that the "left" deviationist and sectarian groups - having failed to make a single valid political criticism of the Report of the Central Committee of the N.L.O.B. on the Situation in People's China - have now rushed to offer their assistance to the rightist representatives of the counter-revolutionary faction headed by Mao Tse-tung, thus laying the basis for the "unity" of right and "left" deviations. It is therefore necessary for the Marxist-Leninists and their vanguard Organisation, the N.L.O.B., to draw a clear line of demarcation between these renegade groups and all working class forces genuinely aspiring to Marxism-Leninism.

The Marxist-Leninist analysis made by the N.L.O.B. of the counter-revolution in China and its opposing socialist revolution has eliminated the last objective basis for subjective and idealist illusions acting as a substitute for scientific theory and practice in relation to both the British and the world struggle. The aim of the Mao Tse-tung counter-revolutionary faction has clearly been the attempt to prevent the development of that unity among the Marxist-Leninists themselves which will bring about the building of a Marxist-Leninist Party. In Britain, the representatives of this faction have sought to build so-called "broad" organisations, the ideological basis for which has been petty bourgeois nationalism manifested in such racialist movements as "black nationalism".

TOWARDS A MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY

The two complementary world revisionist centres of right and "left" now stand fully exposed as detachments of world imperialism. A cardinal task of the emerging and developing Marxist-Leninist vanguards in the present pre-revolutionary phase is utterly to rout the spontaneous petty bourgeois nationalist deviation, which is seeking to disrupt the unity of the world working class forces and divert them onto the path of accommodation to imperialism.

As Comrade Lenin put it:

"It is self-evident that final victory can be won only by the proletariat of all the advanced countries of the world, and we, the Russians, are beginning the work which the British, the French, or the German proletariat will seal. But we see that they will not be victorious without the aid of the toiling masses of all the oppressed colonial peoples, and primarily the eastern peoples." (Address to the 2nd. All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East, November 22nd, 1919).

Today this behest of Comrade Lenin has acquired an over-riding and concrete significance. It is expressed in the fundamental responsibility of the emerging Marxist-Leninist vanguard in the imperialist countries to build their revolutionary organisations of the working class and their Marxist-Leninist vanguard parties as their contribution to the building of the united forces of world revolution - in preparation for the onset of the final revolutionary battles in the heartlands of imperialism for which the present pre-revolutionary phase is preparing the way. In Britain, all the objective conditions for leadership in class struggle by the Marxist-Leninists and for the building of mass united front organisations based on the independent initiative and struggle of the working class are growing by leaps and bounds as the crisis of imperialism matures.

An essential pre-requisite for this tremendous task of forging the revolutionary unity of the working class at all levels is the

need to draw a firm line of demarcation in ideology and organisation between the emerging Marxist-Leninist vanguard and the concealed representatives of the class enemy. In drawing this line of demarcation we must be guided by the correct Marxist-Leninist principle of distinguishing between the committed revisionist leaderships of these renegade organisations and all honest militants aspiring to Marxism-Leninism who have been temporarily misled into adhering to these groups. Against the former we will wage a principled but relentless war in all spheres, aimed at destroying their already unstable organisational cohesion in order to liberate such honest members as they contain from the trap of false loyalty. Towards the latter we will pursue a policy of patient explanation and clarification with the aim of winning them to the ranks of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard.

We say clearly and unequivocally to the gentlemen of the right and "left" oppositions: Your days of concealment under the banner of Marxism-Leninism have passed! The M.L.O.B. stands united in its firm resolve to fulfil its revolutionary responsibilities. Its inevitable growth into the future Marxist-Leninist Party of the British working class will equally inevitably bring about your complete rout and dispersal.

Despite the long-standing and continued disruptive role of your groups, but with the future co-operation of such honest militants as you contain, the Marxist-Leninist Party of Britain will be built!