

# RED FRONT

FOR WORKING CLASS POWER  
FOR A SOCIALIST BRITAIN

ORGAN OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN



July/August 1971

Price: 10p

## TOWARDS THE MARXIST-LENINIST INTERNATIONAL!

THE FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF AN INTERNATIONAL DECLARATION ADOPTED AFTER CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION AND AMENDMENT BY MARXIST-LENINISTS IN THE U.S.A., GERMANY AND BRITAIN. IT IS THE AIM AND INTENTION OF ALL PARTICIPATING ORGANISATIONS THAT THE DECLARATION SHOULD SERVE BOTH AS A THEORETICAL AND PROGRAMMATIC INSTRUMENT FOR PROMOTING UNITY ON THE BASIS OF MARXISM-LENINISM WITHIN EACH COUNTRY AND AS THE PROGRAMME-IN-EMBRYO OF THE FUTURE MARXIST-LENINIST INTERNATIONAL.

Political Bureau, M.L.O.B.

The contemporary phase of the General Crisis of Capitalism represents a period in which the world capitalist system has become weaker and more riven with insoluble contradictions than ever before, a period in which the objective conditions for decisive advance by the world working class have never been more favourable. On the other hand, at no previous time in the history of the world working class movement have the dangers facing the working classes of all lands from the forces of imperialism been more insidious or tactically diversified.

After the end of World War Two, the international working class and communist movements achieved advances which wrought fundamental changes in the relations of forces between the camp of the world proletarian-socialist revolution and the camp of imperialism. These important advances were manifested particularly in the wresting of an entire chain of countries in Eastern Europe out of the sphere of the world capitalist system to form, along with the Soviet Union, a camp of socialist states.

Following the death of Stalin, however, the new leadership of the Party and state in the Soviet Union intensified their attacks upon the scientific revolutionary teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. They incepted policies designed to bring about, by successive stages, the dismantling of the democratic

dictatorship of the proletariat and the replacement of socialism by bureaucratic forms of state capitalism. As a result, with the exception of the People's Republic of Albania, these vitally important bases were temporarily lost to the working class and these formerly socialist countries have now degenerated into a new, though highly unstable, capitalist bloc dominated by the - now imperialist - Soviet Union. As a consequence of the historically unprecedented acts of betrayal committed by the revisionist leaders of the communist and workers' parties in these and other countries, the international communist movement has been virtually destroyed and the working class of the world left without any organised Marxist-Leninist leadership.

These adverse developments were counter-balanced to some extent by the progressive upsurge, from about 1955 onwards, of national liberation movements developing into national-democratic revolutions throughout Africa, Asia and Latin America. The focal point of these movements has been the heroic struggle of the people of Vietnam for national independence from, first French, later US imperialism, and for democratic rights and liberties. On their part the imperialist powers have greatly intensified their colonial wars of aggression and are engaging in ever fiercer attempts to defeat the just aspirations of the



oppressed peoples of the colonial-type countries, seeking to incorporate them into their respective spheres of influence and to subjugate them permanently to the yoke of finance capital. To this end they are combining feverish war preparations with a rapidly accelerating rate of economic penetration and capital investment in these countries. This is bringing about an equally rapid proletarianisation of the peasant and urban petty-bourgeois masses, laying in turn the objective basis for the young, emerging working class of the colonial-type countries to assume the leadership of the developing national-democratic revolutions.

Thus, in one colonial-type country after another, a fierce ideological and political struggle is developing between the most advanced representatives of the emerging working class and the representatives of the national bourgeoisie - a struggle to determine which of these two classes, proletariat or national bourgeoisie, shall lead the national-democratic revolution in these countries.

The basic strategy of the revolutionary proletariat in the colonial-type countries must be to achieve the uninterrupted transformation of the national-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, and the essential prerequisite for this is that the proletariat should have won the leading role in the national-democratic revolution. Only when this fundamental strategic class factor is present can the national liberation movements and the developing national-democratic revolutions be regarded as a constituent part of the world proletarian-socialist revolution. When this factor is absent, the proletarian and petty-bourgeois masses in the colonial-type country that is engaged in national liberation struggle will fall inevitably under the ideological and political influence of the national bourgeoisie, which will then be able to utilise its leading role in the national liberation movement in order to halt the revolutionary process at the stage of the completion of the national and democratic tasks and prevent the uninterrupted transformation to the socialist stage of the revolution, thus diverting the newly-emerged nation on to the path of capitalist development, leading to its ultimate integration into the world capitalist system.

However, the development of national liberation struggles in the colonial periphery of the world imperialist system is increasingly whittling away imperialism's sources of super profits and obstructing the expansion of its foreign exploitation. This is increasing the contradictions between the rival imperialist blocs, but - even more importantly - is rapidly undermining the economic basis of

reformist and social-democratic deception of the working class in the developed capitalist countries. This, in turn, heralds the onset of a new stage in the development of the world proletarian-socialist revolution, one characterised in general by the revolutionisation of the proletarian masses in the developed capitalist countries and the consequent shifting of the sphere of anti-imperialist struggle from the colonial periphery to include also the developed heartlands of imperialism.

In reaction to this increasingly favourable objective situation for the development of the world proletarian-socialist revolution, the forces of world imperialism are themselves attempting to prepare a more favourable social and political terrain for their counter-offensive against the proletariat and working people of the developed capitalist countries. They are striving, as has already largely been accomplished in the USA, to deprive the working class of its independent mass organs of struggle and to absorb them into corporate state frameworks under the direct control of the monopoly capitalist class. In particular, they are actively promoting new concealed detachments serving the interests of imperialism within the working class movements, the dual aim of which is to foster "new" reformist conceptions with a pseudo-left bias to replace the illusions of classical social-democracy concerning "peaceful" social advance for the working class within the capitalist system - illusions which are in process of being shed - and to retard the development of genuine Marxist-Leninist vanguard parties having as their aim the preparation and leadership of the working class for the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

One of the most important of these new concealed detachments of the capitalist class within the working class movement consists of the former communist parties of most countries. The revisionist leaderships of these parties preach the possibility of "peaceful, parliamentary transition" to "socialism" - the old reformist conceptions of the now discredited social democratic parties in a false "Marxist" wrapping; the world headquarters of this right variant of revisionism is Moscow, where the leading clique headed by Brezhnev and Kosygin represents the interests of the new Soviet imperialist bourgeoisie and has succeeded in temporarily transforming the Party of the Soviet working class into a centre of counter-revolutionary betrayal.

A second concealed detachment is formed by the Maoist parties and groups. The leaders of these, while denouncing the right revisionists for "betraying Marxist-Leninist principles",

Continued on page 15



# THE BILL & THE BOMB!

IN RECENT ISSUES OF "RED FRONT" WE HAVE DESCRIBED THE POLICY ADOPTED BY BRITISH MONOPOLY CAPITALISM TO MEET THE NEW STAGE OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE SUCCESSES OF THE NATIONAL-LIBERATION STRUGGLES IN SO MANY OF ITS FORMER COLONIES, AND ITS MANOEUVRES TO MEET THE SITUATION IN WHICH THE BRITISH IMPERIALISTS ARE IN PROCESS OF SEVERING THEIR "SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP" WITH THE UNITED STATES IMPERIALISTS IN ORDER TO ENTER A NEW EUROPEAN IMPERIALIST ALLIANCE ECONOMICALLY AND MILITARILY STRONG ENOUGH TO CHALLENGE THE HEGEMONY OF U.S. IMPERIALISM WHICH HAS EXISTED SINCE THE SECOND WORLD WAR.

A cardinal point in these manoeuvres is the drive to impose tighter state control over the trade union movement - the failure to achieve which was a primary factor in bringing about the contrived end of the Labour Government.

Secretary for Employment Robert Carr claims that the Industrial Relations Bill is

".... the most comprehensive and enlightened code of workers' rights in the history of our country."

Firstly, says Carr, it gives a worker "a legal right to belong to such trade union as he may choose". But this must be a registered trade union, that is, a trade union which has received a licence of approval from the state. Furthermore, trade unions have subscribed to an agreement (the Bridlington agreement) under which one union rightly refuses to accept as a member a worker who is in dispute with another union; when the Bill becomes law this refusal would be illegal, since it "violates" the right of a worker to belong to such trade union "as he may choose".

Of course, says Carr, "justice" demands that a worker should also be given the legal right not to belong to a trade union. But the economic position of individual workers depends on their collective action; the non-unionist is not merely one who takes all the benefits of such collective action without accepting any of the obligations of trade union membership; worse, the strength of the collective action of a group of workers is reduced in proportion to the number of non-unionists among them. Even the Donovan Commission declared that "the right not to join a union" was

".... designed to frustrate the development of collective bargaining".

"100% trade union shop" agreements (which now embrace some three million workers in Britain) and "pre-entry closed shop" agreements (which embrace some three-quarters of a million workers) will be outlawed when the Bill becomes law, since they conflict with a worker's "right" not to belong to a trade union. In their place is offered an import from the United States - the "agency shop", under which workers who do not wish to belong to a union may pay equivalent contributions either to the union or to a charity. Not being trade union members, these workers will not be, as the government puts it, "subject to the union's discipline".

Even an agency agreement, however, can only be obtained or continued by a registered trade union and only then (if the employer or 20% of the workers request it) after a majority of those eligible to vote have voted for it in a secret ballot organised by the Commission for Industrial Relations.

Secondly, says Carr, the Bill gives workers "protection against unfair dismissal". But this "protection" applies only to workers employed with the same firm for at least two years, and it is laid down that a dismissal is not to be regarded as "unfair" if the employer states that it was related to the "ability" or "conduct" of the worker, or due to "redundancy". Dismissal for participation in any "unfair industrial practice" (such as an unofficial strike or work-to-rule) is, of course, automatically "fair". But even if an Industrial Tribunal finds that a dismissal was the most blatant victimisation, it has no power to order reinstatement, only to "recommend" it. And should the shop stewards take industrial action to compel reinstatement, they would, of course, be committing an "unfair industrial practice" which would render them liable to unlimited penalties.



Thirdly, says Carr, the Bill gives trade union negotiators the right to obtain from the management any information necessary to further their negotiations. But here again the proviso is made that the provision of the information does not involve the management in what it may regard as "excessive work" and that the management does not claim that disclosure of the information would "hurt its commercial interests".

Fourthly, says Carr, the Bill will change the Contracts of Employment Act. It reduces the period of service entitling a worker to a week's notice from 26 to 13 weeks, and it increases the period of notice that an employer has to give a worker to 6 weeks after 10 years' service and to 8 weeks after 15 years' service.

Naturally, in the interests of "fairness", workers must accept some disadvantages in return for these stupendous benefits!

### "BREACH OF CONTRACT"

At present, by virtue of the Trade Union Act of 1871, a court is prohibited from regarding any agreement between workers' and employers' representatives as legally enforceable. This important provision, the result of arduous struggles by the working class over many years, is to be repealed by the Bill.

When the Bill becomes law, any agreement made between workers' and employers' representatives will be regarded as legally binding, unless this is explicitly repudiated in the agreement - that is, unless the employers' representatives agree to this repudiation. It is accepted by the government that where an employer agrees to the insertion of a provision repudiating the legally binding character of the agreement, the union negotiators will have to make concessions to the employers in other respects. Where an employer refuses to agree to such a provision under any circumstances, the only way the workers' representatives can avoid signing a legally binding contract is to sign no agreement at all. But then the employer could apply to the Industrial Relations Court to have a procedure agreement imposed.

With the passage of the Bill, an employer may complain to the courts that a breach of contract has occurred. The court may then direct those involved to "cease their breach"; if they fail to do so they may be imprisoned indefinitely for contempt of court.

Alternatively - or in addition - the court may award compensation against those which it finds guilty of breach of contract. In the case of registered trade unions, the maximum compensation that may be awarded varies from £5,000 for a small union to £100,000 for a large one. In the case of unregistered trade unions, shop stewards and workers, the compensation that may be awarded is unlimited. To avoid the award of damages against it, a trade union has to convince the court, not merely that it was not responsible for the breach of contract, but that it took all such steps as were "reasonably practicable" to prevent the breach of contract from occurring.

Even where no such legally binding agreement is involved, industrial action almost invariably involves workers in some breach of their individual "contracts of employment". Under the Trades Dispute Act of 1906, no one can have any legal action taken against them for seeking to induce workers to break their contracts of employment in pursuance of a trade dispute.

Under the Bill this provision, also won after years of working class struggle, is to be repealed for all except registered trade unions and officials duly authorised by registered trade unions to call for industrial action.

Thus, when the Bill becomes law an unregistered trade union, a shop steward, a rank-and-file worker - even someone who publishes a journal or issues a leaflet - would be committing an "unfair industrial action". The National Industrial Relations Court could then order him to desist from the action, and to send him to prison if he failed to desist. Alternatively, or in addition, the court of an industrial Tribunal may order the defendant to pay an unlimited sum in "compensation" to the aggrieved employer.

### "UNFAIR INDUSTRIAL PRACTICES"

As has been said, to induce or try to induce industrial action without specific authority of a registered trade union is defined by the Bill as an "unfair industrial practice" which renders the convicted defendant liable to heavy penalties.

But the Bill lays down a further twelve "unfair industrial practices", which apply to all workers and all trade unions, whether registered or not. The most important of these is to induce or try to induce industrial action in sympathy with the workers employed by another firm. A defendant convicted of any "unfair industrial practice" renders himself liable to the penalties already described.



RED FRONT

"EMERGENCY POWERS"

At present, if the government wishes to take some action during a strike such as the introduction of troops, it has to use the Emergency Powers Act of 1920. This Act debars the government from declaring a strike illegal, but under it a state of emergency may be declared, with the approval of Parliament, where a strike threatens to deprive "any substantial portion of the community of the essentials of life", and the government is then empowered to take steps to secure essential services.

Under the Bill not even the pretence of a parliamentary debate is called for. The Minister can apply to the National Industrial Relations Court for an order prohibiting all industrial action for a period of 60 days. Anyone failing to carry out the provisions of the order renders himself, of course, liable to indefinite imprisonment for contempt of court. And the Minister may make his application on much wider grounds than are laid down in the Act of 1920, for example, in the case of a strike or threat of a strike which would be "gravely injurious to the national economy".

"COMPULSORY BALLOTS"

In any major strike where the Secretary for Employment feels that he has

"reasons for doubting whether the workers who are taking part or are expected to take part ... would be taking part in it in accordance with their wishes, and whether they have had an adequate opportunity of indicating their wishes in this respect",

he may ask the National Industrial Relations Court for an order that a compulsory ballot should be held. Until this has been held and its result announced by the Commission for Industrial Relations, it is an "unfair industrial practice" to "call, organise, procure or finance" the strike.

REGISTRATION

The disadvantages enjoyed by a registered trade union under the Bill, while very considerably less than those enjoyed by any trade union at the moment, are nevertheless greater than those enjoyed by an unregistered trade union. Unregistered trade unions lose their existing immunity for inducing breaches of individual "contracts of employment", and in case of "unfair industrial practices" their liability to pay compensation is unlimited. In addition they lose their existing right to tax relief on interest and dividends on provident funds (amounting to £750,000 a year in the case of the Transport and General Workers' Union).

To become and remain a "registered trade union", however, a union must have its rules approved by the state, it must conform to certain "guiding principles" and to "any other requirements laid down by the Registrar". In other words, the rights won by the working class in a century and a half of organised struggle are to be converted, legally, into "privileges" dependent on what the state, that is, the organised machinery of coercion of Big Business, chooses to regard as "good behaviour".

STATE CONTROL OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

Even the above somewhat cursory examination of the main provisions of the Industrial Relations Bill makes it abundantly clear that, as we said at the beginning of this article, its primary aim is TO IMPOSE TIGHTER STATE CONTROL OVER THE TRADE UNIONS AND TO ENHANCE THE POWER OF THE REACTIONARY LEADERS OF TRADE UNIONS TO "CONTROL" THEIR MEMBERS IN THE INTERESTS OF BIG BUSINESS.

"REICHSTAG" WITHOUT FLAMES

In a recent special issue of RED FRONT, we drew attention to the successful attempt of the capitalist state to turn "public opinion" - that is, the opinion of the petty-bourgeoisie and the more politically backward strata of the working class - against the power workers during their "work-to-rule" by the device of imposing deliberate and completely unnecessary power cuts on the whole country, not excepting hospitals.

On January 12th, 1971, on the day of the mass demonstration of trade unionists against the Industrial Relations Bill, a "bomb attack" was reported against the home of the Minister responsible for the Bill, Robert Carr. The "attack" was attributed by the authorities and by the press to a "dangerous, highly organised group of anarchists or other extremists".

Anarchists, who profess to believe that capitalism can be overthrown by acts of individual terrorism, have existed in the world for a long time. Far from furthering the cause of the liberation of the working class, such acts, of course, merely provide a pretext for the imposition of more highly repressive measures against genuine socialists and against the working class as a whole.



The circumstances of the Carr "bomb attack", however, are such that it cannot, with the most vivid imagination, be placed in this category.

After the discovery of a German seaman inside 10, Downing Street, it was officially stated that special security measures had been taken to guard in future the homes of all Ministers, while it has since been declared by the authorities that similar "hitherto undisclosed" attacks took place on the homes of other "prominent people" both before and after January 12th. Carr himself was, until his ministerial appointment, a director of the largest security firm in the country, Securicor Ltd.

In these circumstances it would be so strange as to be incredible if, on the very day that a mass demonstration against the Bill was taking place, a group of anarchists were able to enter the garden of the Minister responsible and place bombs against his house. THE ONLY PEOPLE WITH SUCH ACCESS WOULD HAVE BEEN THE FORCES OF THE SPECIAL BRANCH.

It is known that an attempt was made to bring charges in connection with the "attack" against an anarchist found guilty of a similar offence in fascist Spain, but the police found their attempt frustrated by several hundred witnesses who could testify to his innocence.

The case brought later against two young men - with its deliberate attempt to silence their legal representatives, the ostentatious ringing of the court with hordes of police, the "evidence" against them consisting almost entirely of the word of convicted criminals who have everything to gain by collaborating with the authorities and falsely swearing that the accused "admitted" complicity in the "attack" during their long incarceration in prison - all this can be dismissed as another clumsy attempt by the state to extricate themselves from an untenable position by means of a "frame-up".

The phoney "bomb attack" upon Carr's home, and its "legal" aftermath, should not be under-estimated. It forms a further part of the organised plot to frighten the petty-bourgeoisie and the more politically backward strata of the working class into acquiescing in the semi-fascist measures of Big Business which are now under way, and of which the Industrial Relations Bill and the Immigration Bill form only the first steps.

There can be no doubt of the determination of the working class to resist these measures, and to struggle for the release of the victims of this new, as yet small-scale, "Reichstag fire". But for this fight to be effective, more than determination is required; what is essential is the scientific leadership of working class struggle by an organised, disciplined Marxist-Leninist Party of the working class. With the surrender of the leadership of the Communist Party of Great Britain to revisionism, so that it has become a mere "left" social-democratic party serving to deceive the workers and channel their activities along the harmless parliamentary channels of "Out with the Tories!", no such party exists in Britain at present. Its formation is the most urgent task which faces militant, socialist workers at the present time.

## "THE WELFARE STATE"

In December 1970 tuna fish on sale in Britain was found to have a mercury content similar to that detected in a million tins withdrawn from sale in the United States. Minister of Agriculture James Prior announced that the sale of the contaminated fish would not be banned in Britain since

"we in this country eat very little tuna fish".

In March 1971 a new "Social Security Bill" was published. It will abolish insurance benefit for the first three days of sickness or unemployment. It will cut the personal allowances receivable by a striker (i.e., strike pay) without affecting Supplementary Benefits to his family from £4.35 to £1. It will further reduce (by up to 40% of the rate) the Supplementary Benefits payable to a worker who is dismissed for "industrial misconduct" or who voluntarily leaves his job "without just cause".

In March 1971 cheap welfare milk for expectant and nursing mothers and children under 5 was abolished, together with free school milk for children over the age of 7.

In March 1971 the Patient's Association reported that patients are still having to wait six or even nine years for admission to hospital in many cases.

In April 1971 increased health service charges (in the case of spectacles up to 230%) came into force.

## THE RESPECTABLE COMMUNISTS

Under the headline "COMRADE DIGBY HAS FRIENDS IN WHITEHALL" the "Sunday Times" of April 4th, 1971 comments on the election of revisionist Communist Party member Digby Jacks as President of the National Union of Students:

"Britain's 450,000 students put a Communist at their head for the first time in 30 years. ...

Privately, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher's Department of Education is pleased with the result."

The Queen has put in a claim for higher pay. At present the Royal Family receives state funds of £3,686,500 a year. The Select Committee set up to consider this claim will, unlike the Department of Social Security, not take into account the Queen's personal fortune estimated at £70 million.



# THE "STRANGE" WORLD OF 1971

DURING THE LAST FEW MONTHS MANY "STRANGE" THINGS HAVE HAPPENED IN THE WORLD.

Among those with which we deal in this issue of RED FRONT may be mentioned:

Britain runs down its coal industry - to import coal;  
"Socialist" China draws closer to the imperialists of Washington;  
Socialist Albania draws closer to the regime of the Greek colonels;  
the "socialist" Soviet Union places under house arrest a high-ranking delegation from "socialist" North Vietnam;  
the "socialist" Soviet Union aids the government of Ceylon, against the attacks of guerillas aided by "socialist" North Korea;  
workers stage mass strikes and demonstrations against the "working class" government of "socialist" Poland;  
the "socialist" Soviet Union forms a "United Front" with Croatian fascists to dismember "socialist" Yugoslavia .....

Like all phenomena in the universe which appear "strange", these world happenings have a perfectly rational basis. If the present world situation appears to be irrational, this is largely because, as a result of the destruction of the international communist movement as the vanguard of the world's working class, many capitalist classes - although they continue to behave like capitalist classes - are able to speak from under a cloak of "Marxism-Leninism", beneath a false "Red Flag".

The present world situation is indeed complicated, and one can understand the attitude of many young progressives who, to avoid the effort of making a scientific analysis of this world situation, dismiss theory with a shrug as unimportant and raise the banner of "practice". Theory without practice is indeed sterile, but practice that is not based on correct theory is less likely to help the cause of the working class than to help the cause of its class enemies.

That a few Marxist-Leninist publications in Britain and the USA, such as RED FRONT, enable their as yet limited number of readers to make sense of this complicated world situation is not because the groups who publish these papers are "more intelligent" than others. IT IS BECAUSE THEY ARE GUIDED BY SCIENTIFIC THEORY, THE SCIENCE OF HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE AND OF SOCIALIST REVOLUTION, that is, BY MARXISM-LENINISM, WHICH ALONE CAN ILLUMINATE AND MAKE INTELLIGIBLE THE "STRANGE" THINGS THAT ARE HAPPENING IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD.

## THE CURRENCY CRISIS

Two years ago, discussing the moves of the British imperialists to enter the European Economic Community ("British Imperialism Moves Towards a New Alliance", in RED FRONT May/June 1969), we drew attention to the relative and absolute decline in the economic strength of United States imperialism, as well as to the struggle between the West German and French imperialists for the dominant role within the developing West European imperialist bloc - a struggle in which the Bonn imperialists have achieved victory.

Both these factors were reflected in the currency crisis which struck Europe in May 1971.

Although this currency crisis manifested itself in Europe, its source was across the

Atlantic. As a result of vast overseas expenditure - particularly in connection with the US war of aggression in Vietnam, the "aid" programme designed to serve US foreign policy, and the buying up of large slabs of foreign industry - the deficit in the United States balance of payments has for some years been averaging \$ 3,000 million a year. At the same time US production... had ceased to rise in 1970, while the US budget for 1971-72 shows an inflationary deficit of \$ 11,600 millions. All this had, by April 1971, created a serious "crisis of confidence" in the stability and profitability of the US economy, causing capitalists throughout the world to transfer large amounts of their capital from the United States to Europe, particularly to West Germany. During April alone \$ 7,000



million "flowed out" of the United States in this manner, and by the end of the month West German banks possessed enough "Eurodollars" (i.e., claims on dollars, and so on U.S. gold reserves) completely to empty, if presented, Fort Knox.

What perturbed the dominant section of German finance capital about this "influx of dollars" was that the fixed exchange rate between the Deutschmark and the dollar did not reflect the new relations between the economic strengths of West German and United States imperialism, so that Deutschmarks were being bought with dollars "too cheaply". On the other hand, the French imperialists strongly opposed an upward revaluation of the Deutschmark, on the grounds that this would make it impossible to maintain fixed common prices for EEC agricultural products, on which the French economy depended.

The West German imperialists, however, felt their position strong enough in May 1971 to ignore the fierce opposition from Paris, and their decision to abolish for the time fixed exchange rates and allow the Deutschmark to "float" in accordance with supply and demand on the foreign exchange market was, in the existing circumstances, equivalent to an upward revaluation of the Deutschmark.

The blow dealt to the French imperialists during the May 1971 currency crisis was an important factor in their sudden increase in enthusiasm for the entry of Britain into the EEC; they see the British imperialists as a possible ally in the struggle against West German hegemony within the "community".

### THE CRISIS IN THE I.L.O.

In the years immediately following the Second World War, when US imperialism was by far the strongest imperialist power in the world, its strength enabled it to dominate many of the institutions of the "United Nations" and to use them as instruments serving its foreign policy.

The decline of the economic strength of US imperialism in recent years relative to that of the West European imperialist powers and also to that of Soviet neo-imperialism has begun to change this situation.

In the summer of 1970 the American David Morse was succeeded as Director-General of the International Labour Organisation, a section of the United Nations, by a Briton, David Jenks - elected with US support in order to defeat his French rival. To the horror of the US imperialists, Jenks appointed as Assistant Director-General a Soviet citizen, Pavel Astapenko.

The attack on this "treachery" was launched by George Meany, President of the American Federation of Labour/Congress of Industrial

Organisations. Urging the House of Representatives Appropriation Committee to cease paying the US contribution to the I.L.O., Meany declared that the organisation

"is, and has been for a long time, in the Russians' corner".

Meany's proposal was strongly supported by the Committee's Chairman, John Rooney, who declared:

"This bird Jenks thinks he has inherited the I.L.O. lock, stock and barrel. There is about as much democracy under him as there is in the Soviet Union. Mr. Jenks needs to be rucked. I know of only one way to ruck him: cut off his water".

Accordingly, on the recommendation of its Appropriations Committee, Congress refused to authorise the US contribution to the International Labour Organisation, which accounts for a quarter of the ILO budget, and the United States now owes \$ 7.4 million up to the end of June 1971. As a result, the staff at the I.L.O headquarters in Geneva have had to forego a long-awaited pay rise, light and heating are strictly rationed, and long-distance telephone calls are forbidden except in emergency.

### BRITAIN'S ROLE IN "EUROPE"

Two years ago, discussing the (then rejected) application of Britain to join the European Economic Community, we said that Britain's entry

"meant, of course, sacrificing the interests of Britain's small farmers and accepting serious damage to her relations with the Dominions. But the interests of small farmers were not of vital concern to British monopoly capitalists, and Britain's relations with the Dominions had been in decline for a considerable period." (RED FRONT, May/June 1969; p.8).

At the time of writing of the present notes, negotiations with the E.E.C. with regard to New Zealand dairy produce are still proceeding. Unless the continental European powers can be induced to modify the present arrangements considerably, Britain will virtually cease to be a market for this produce by 1978 and, in view of the difficulty in obtaining alternative markets, it is reliably forecast that this must result in 55% of New Zealand's productive capacity having to be diverted to other uses, with the taking out of cultivation of 2.3 million acres of land, the slaughter of 1.4 million dairy cows, and the "redundancy" of 10,500 farm workers and small farmers. It is expected that the E.E.C. will ultimately make concessions that will permit the export of New Zealand dairy produce into the Common Market at 50-60% of the present level.

The "special interest" of the Commonwealth sugar producers has already been



RED FRONT

sacrificed to the desire of the British monopoly capitalists to join the developing West European imperialist bloc, nothing having emerged from the negotiations with Brussels on this issue except a vague, pious assurance that gives no guarantees whatsoever about permitted imports of Commonwealth sugar.

In the same article of two years ago we said:

"Bonn's view was that Britain's admission to the E.E.C. should be postponed until her economic position had been further weakened." (Ibid.; p.8).

Since that date the economic position of British imperialism has declined to the point where the British monopoly capitalists have been forced to accept secret terms from the West European imperialists that will place the country virtually in a semi-colonial position - as a market for continental food and an industrial assembly plant dependent upon coal and steel imported from the Ruhr and elsewhere.

That the deliberate running down of Britain's coal industry is not due, as has been suggested, to "dwindling markets" is shown by the announcement in December 1970 that in future unlimited importation of coal and coke would be permitted.

The Government's refusal, earlier this year, to authorise more than half of the 15% price increase demanded by the British Steel Corporation (despite the Corporation's loss of £25 million in the last financial year) is indicative in itself of government policy towards the steel industry. The Corporation is to close down during 1971-2 more than 20 of its steel works, making more than 12,500 steel workers redundant. The plans to build a new £100 million high-productivity steel works to replace the output at present coming from these works have now been "indefinitely postponed", making massive imports of steel from the continent essential as the obsolete steel-making plant is phased out.

Because the coal and steel industries are nationalised, their destruction can be brought about without direct loss to any group of British monopoly capitalists.

Steel, of course, is the backbone of a developed industrial country, the core of its economic independence. The loss of political independence which will follow from Britain's entry into membership of the European Economic Community will be associated with a corresponding loss of economic independence.

With Britain's entry into the E.E.C., the sterling currency bloc and the use of sterling as a reserve currency will disappear and it is expected that sterling deposits in Britain will be handed over to a European consortium.

BRITAIN: THE ROLLS-ROYCE AFFAIR

Two years ago, discussing the rejection of Britain's application to join the European Economic Community at that time, we said:

"The principal open opposition came from the French imperialists, who tended to accept the Washington view that the British monopoly capitalists were servants of U.S. imperialism and would, in the existing conditions, form a pro-American 'Fifth Column' within the E.E.C.; the official Paris view was that Britain must already have adopted a decisive anti-American stand before she could be admitted." (RED FRONT, May/June 1969; p.8).

And almost a year ago, discussing the effects of the election victory of the Conservative Party, we said:

"Because of its unwillingness to break its special dependence upon that (now minority) section of British monopoly capital which favours continued collaboration with, and subordination to, US imperialism, the Labour Party has ceased to be, at least for the time being, effective in serving the foreign policy desired by the dominant section of the British imperialists. Despite its lip-service to the concept of British participation in the European Economic Community (the present form of the developing West European imperialist bloc), the Labour Government was held in practice to be sabotaging moves for British entry, while the existing members of the Community were not prepared to admit a Britain which could be an American Fifth Column." (RED FRONT, August/September 1970;p.7).

The action necessary to demonstrate to the French imperialists that the now-dominant section of their British counterparts, represented by the Conservative government, were prepared to adopt "a decisive anti-American stand" was taken in connection with the Rolls-Royce affair.

In March 1968 Rolls-Royce gained the largest order in their history from the American Lockheed Aircraft Corporation - for 540 RB-211 engines for the "Tristar" airliner at a total cost of some £150 million. They won the contract, however, by tendering at a price which Lockheed officials afterwards gleefully described as "fantastically low", and by pledging themselves under heavy penalty clauses to produce a new engine twice as large as anything they had previously developed in half the time (all the engines had to be delivered by November 1971, under penalty clauses not revealed but believed to involve £100 million). They took this course on the firm, though verbal, assurance of the pro-U.S. imperialist Labour government that, since the contract was vital for the "national interest", it would guarantee the company against any loss.

Inevitably, technical problems arose. The



blades of carbon-fibre failed to stand up under test, and had to be re-engineered in titanium - a process which necessitated the re-tooling of much of the Derby works.

In November 1970 the company informed the (now) Conservative government that the contract could not be completed on time, and that the cost of each engine would be nearly double the contracted price. It appealed to the government for state aid.

The government had two courses open to it:

1) it could recognise the "national importance" of Rolls-Royce as a key name in British industry, the importance of preserving the "reputation" of British industry for "honouring its foreign obligations", and in consequence assist the company with state funds; or

2) it could do nothing, allow Rolls-Royce to go bankrupt (thus making the penalty clauses in the Lockheed contract inoperable), and then continue as a nationalised enterprise those sections of Rolls-Royce the products of which were necessary to British monopoly capital as a whole.

To the indignation of the Lockheed Corporation - and to the whole of the U.S. monopoly capitalists - the government chose the latter course. This left two courses open to Lockheed:

1) to waive the penalty clauses, renegotiate a new contract for the Rolls-Royce engines at a higher price and try to secure from the US Treasury (as demanded by the British government) a guarantee that it would meet Lockheed's obligations to Rolls-Royce (1971) Ltd. should Lockheed be unable to do so; or

2) follow Rolls-Royce into bankruptcy, gazing regretfully at the largest glider in the world.

President Nixon has now taken the unprecedented step of asking Congress to approve guarantees in connection with this contract amounting to £104 million. At the time of writing these notes, Congress has not yet made its decision.

In the meantime, state-owned British European Airways has calmly refused the US demands that it place a firm order for "Tristars", declaring that it is "equally" interested in the European "Airbus" (A300B7), which is being built by a French-West German-British-Dutch consortium (the wings in Britain by Hawker-Siddeley); the cost of this is almost £1 million less than that of "Tristar", and its running costs per seat mile about 10% less.

Of course, if the renegotiated contract falls through, it will result in some 32,000 aircraft workers being made redundant in Britain alone. But the whole operation has demonstrated to the satisfaction of Paris that the now-dominant section of British imperialists are indeed prepared to adopt "a decisive anti-American stand".

To clinch the matter, there followed - a few

days after the Rolls-Royce "collapse" - the bankruptcy of the second largest motor insurance firm - Vehicle and General - leaving a million policyholders uncovered.

What surprised many observers was the fact that the company had been accepted in 1966 as a member of the British Insurance Association, which had long carried out a large-scale publicity campaign to the effect that to insure with a B.I.A. member company meant security for the policy-holder. As Gordon Hayman, the Chairman of the Federation of Insurance Brokers said on March 2nd:

"Without doubt if the members of the B.I.A. had wanted to save Vehicle and General, they could have done so".

That they did not want to do so lies, no doubt, in the fact that in October 1965 a major American insurance group, Life & Casualty of Tennessee, purchased an 13½% stake in V & G at a cost of £1 million.

#### BRITAIN - SOUTH AFRICA: ARMS TO SOUTH AFRICA

Almost a year ago, analysing the effect of the victory of the Conservative government, we said:

"The British imperialists aim also at securing other allies in the shape of the at present friendless white racist states of South Africa and Rhodesia. ...

The Labour Government was .... openly against opposing US imperialism in the field of a rapprochement with South Africa and Rhodesia". (RED FRONT, August/September 1970;p.7).

In December 1970, during Heath's visit to Washington, U.S. President Nixon affirmed the strong opposition of the United States imperialists to the sale of arms to South Africa. And at the Commonwealth Conference in Singapore in January 1971, Canadian Premier Trudeau expressed similar opposition.

In February 1971 the British government announced its decision to supply 7 "Wasp" helicopters to South Africa, in violation of the 1964 United Nations embargo.

#### GERMANY: THE BETRAYAL OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

In discussing the "European Collective Security" scheme sponsored by the Soviet neo-imperialists, we said a year ago:

"The basic aim of Soviet foreign policy in relation to Western Europe is to build up a "European Collective Security Bloc" of European states designed to achieve the following long-term ends:

1) to place West German imperialism, which constitutes the



main challenge to the hegemony of the Soviet Union within the proposed European bloc as well as a potential military threat to the security of the Soviet Union, under a form of collective control of the imperialist states of Europe beneath the cloak of which the hegemony of the Soviet Union over West German imperialism and its military apparatus of force would be guaranteed;

2) to promote the hegemony of the Soviet Union in an all-European bloc of imperialist and neo-capitalist states which are in contradiction with US imperialism.

The immediate aim of the scheme is to provide security for the Soviet Union along its western border (as well as economic support) and so enable it to concentrate the major part of its military strength against China.

The Soviet revisionists' scheme for "European Unity" differs from that put forward by certain imperialist groups in Western Europe (discussed in the May/June 1969 issue of RED FRONT - P.B.,M.L.O.B.) in three fundamental ways:

Firstly, it aims to embrace all European states and not merely those of Western Europe; ...

Secondly, it aims to place restrictions on the military power and expansionist capacity of West German imperialism, with the effect of making the Soviet Union (and not the Federal German Republic, as in the Western imperialists' scheme) the dominant power in Europe; ...

Thirdly, it aims to win for the Soviet neo-imperialists a stake in key sections of the economies, and a share in the exploitation of the working classes, of the West European countries, while giving to the West European imperialists in exchange a stake in key sections of the economies, and a share in the exploitation of the working classes, of the East European countries (RED FRONT, Special Edition, March 1970, p.27).

During the past year the Soviet imperialists have been working consistently to bring to fruition their "European Collective Security" bloc, which, if and when erected, would embrace the greater part of all Europe, East and West. The greatest obstacle in the way of this has naturally been the need to offer sufficient material advantages to the West German imperialists as would compensate them for the loss of hegemony and the relative restrictions involved for them in this scheme, compared with the smaller and more restricted West European bloc now at a relatively advanced stage of construction.

The material compensations which it is proposed to offer to the West German imperialists to entice them to support the "European Collective Security" bloc relate mainly to the present German Democratic Republic.

The Brandt government was persuaded to sign treaties, in August 1970 with the Soviet Union, and in November with Poland, recognising as "inviolable" the existing frontiers of West Germany. It was agreed; however, that

West German ratification of these treaties, together with West German endorsement of the "European Collective Security" conference, would take place only after settlement of "the Berlin question".

The revisionist leaders of the German Democratic Republic, headed by Walter Ulbricht, have long and vigorously resisted the "concessions" proposed in relation to the sovereignty of their state. In May 1971, however, Ulbricht resigned as First Secretary of the Socialist Unity Party and the Soviet neo-imperialist leaders immediately opened talks with his successor, Erich Honecker. Following these talks the Soviet government informed the governments of France, Britain and the United States that it was prepared to agree that the sovereignty claimed by the government of the German Democratic Republic over the access routes to Berlin through its territory should be recognised only in words, but cancelled in practice.

The concessions on the "Berlin question" are, however, only the first of the concessions which the Soviet neo-imperialists are prepared to grant at the expense of the German Democratic Republic in order to bring about the All-European bloc in which they will represent the strongest power.

#### THE CHINESE-U.S RAPPROCHEMENT

A year ago RED FRONT noted

"Since the victory of the clique headed by Mao Tse-tung in the counter-revolutionary 'cultural revolution', ... moves by the U.S. imperialists towards a rapprochement with the Chinese military dictatorship have gathered speed. ....

On the Chinese side, the moves towards a rapprochement with United States imperialism are necessarily more discreet, since open moves in that direction necessitate dropping the 'left' mask which the Chinese revisionists found so valuable in their counter-revolutionary 'cultural revolution'. However, it is worthy of note that the proposal for a Chinese-Soviet agreement on peaceful co-existence came from Peking." (RED FRONT, March 1970; p.33-34).

These developments have proceeded apace during recent months.

In October 1970 diplomatic relations were established between the People's Republic of China and the United States' northern dependency - Canada.

In February 1971 the Chinese government commenced negotiations to buy £400 million worth of jet airliners from the United States, and in the same month President Nixon, in his "State of the World" message, declared that it was the aim of the United States to draw the People's Republic of China

"into a constructive relationship



with the world community".

In March 1971 the United States government lifted all restrictions on the travel of its citizens to the People's Republic of China.

In April came the Chinese invitation for an American table-tennis team to visit the country, and its acceptance, and in May the hints from "responsible quarters" in Washington that the U.S. government would not in the future oppose membership of the United Nations by the People's Republic of China. \*

ALBANIA: THE DEVELOPING RAPPROCHEMENT WITH GREECE AND YUGOSLAVIA

A year ago we said:

"In recent months the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour (like the leadership of the Communist Party of China) has ceased its ideological exposure of Yugoslav revisionism. ....

More recently still, under the pressure of the Chinese revisionists the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour has made it clear that it is prepared to bring the People's Republic of Albania into an alliance with the Romanian ultra-revisionists and the Yugoslav revisionists directed against the Soviet Union. ....

The formation of such a new 'Balkan Entente' could serve only the interests of U.S. imperialism - giving it an extensive sphere of influence and bridgehead in the Balkans which, taken together with Greece, would surround revisionist-led Bulgaria.

One of the aims of US imperialism is to obtain from the People's Republic of China, as part of a marriage settlement yet to be negotiated, the transfer of the People's Republic of Albania into the sphere of influence of the United States by means of this projected 'Balkan Entente'. (RED FRONT, March 1970, p.32).

In June 1970 a trade agreement was signed between Albania and Greece, the first since before the Second World War. In February 1971, following the establishment of diplomatic relations between Peking and Belgrade, Albania and Yugoslavia raised their respective diplomatic missions to the level of Embassies. And in May 1971 diplomatic relations at ambassadorial level were established between Albania and Greece.

KOREA, VIETNAM, CEYLON AND RUMANIA: LE DUAN AND KIM IL SUNG CLIMB DOWN OFF THE FENCE

A year ago we said:

"The 'centrist' revisionists of Cuba, Korea and Vietnam are endeavouring to build their own system of alliances - composed of 'small states' like themselves who cannot rely for the protection of their independence on any forces but their own. ...

The ruling capitalist class of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the most industrialised of the states with 'centrist' revisionist leaderships, is making a particular bid for hegemony in this

This passage was drafted prior to Nixon's projected visit to China being announced.

projected bloc of small states." (RED FRONT, March 1970; p.36).

In this connection we must look at recent events in Ceylon.

The May 1970 elections in Ceylon brought about the defeat of the pro-imperialist United National Party government headed by Dudley Senanayake, and the election of a "United Front" government representing the interests of the national bourgeoisie.

The "United Front" is composed of three parties:

- 1) the Sri Lanka Freedom Party, the open party of the national bourgeoisie;
- 2) the trotskyite Lanka Sama Samaja Party; and
- 3) the right-wing revisionist Communist Party.

The new cabinet consisted of 17 members of the SLFP, headed by its leader Mrs. Sirimano Bandaranaike as Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, Minister of External Affairs, and Minister of Planning and Employment; 3 members of the LSSP; and 1 Communist (Peter Keuneman, the party's general secretary).

On June 14th 1970 the Governor-General, in the Speech from the Throne, affirmed that the new government would pursue the policy on which it had been elected, namely: severance of the connection with Britain and the transformation of Ceylon into a "free, sovereign and independent republic"; nationalisation of the banks and foreign trade; state direction of the British-owned agency houses and of the tea, rubber and coconut plantations; the withdrawal of diplomatic relations with Israel pending a satisfactory settlement of the Arab-Israeli war; and the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the German Democratic Republic.

Since coming to office, the "United Front" government has, under pressure from the Communist Party, been pursuing a policy of "closer association with", i.e. greater dependence upon, the Soviet Union.

The "United Front" government is, of course, not a socialist government of the working class, and the next stage of the Ceylonese revolution is the organisation of a socialist revolution, led by the working class. This, however, requires the leadership of the working class by a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party which, with the surrender to revisionism of the leadership of the Communist Party, does not exist at present in Ceylon.

In these circumstances frustration at the relative lack of progress of the Ceylonese revolution and dissatisfaction with the fact that the "United Front" government (representing the interests of the national bourgeoisie) naturally wished to hold back the revolution at the stage



of national capitalism, caused many young people drawn from the petty-bourgeoisie to give their allegiance to a semi-anarchist political organisation called the Janatha Vimukhti Perarnuna (JVP) (People's Liberation Front), headed by Rohan Wijeweera, a former student at the Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow who became emotively disillusioned both with the right revisionism of Moscow and the "left" revisionism of Peking.

In April 1971 the JVP opened guerrilla warfare in the countryside directed at the overthrow of the "United Front" government.

That this movement was in no way one of the working class is highlighted by the unprecedented action of the government in agreeing to arm the working class for the defence of the state. Whatever the subjective motives of these rural guerrillas, the objective effect of their success could only be to destroy a national-democratic state and allow it to be replaced, not by a socialist state of the working class, but by a counter-revolutionary pro-imperialist state.

However this objectively counter-revolutionary guerrilla movement was given full support by the diplomatic representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in Ceylon, who saw in it the possibility of winning away Ceylon from its association with the Soviet Union into the projected alliance of "independent small states" which they were attempting to sponsor.

With the crushing of the guerrillas, the Korean diplomats were expelled from Ceylon.

The recent events in Ceylon and elsewhere demonstrate that in the contemporary world - where small states are threatened on every hand by great imperialist and capitalist powers and where these powers are already lining up into rival blocs in preparation for a Third World War - the attempts of such small states to steer an "independent", "centrist" or "neutral" course are doomed to failure - unless they can secure the backing of a powerful mass movement of the working people over a considerable area of the world.

Thus, the attempts of the revisionists of North Vietnam and North Korea to maintain such a "centrist" course are now coming to an end. With the decline of the economic and military power of U.S. imperialism relative to that of Soviet neo-imperialism, the national bourgeoisies of these two countries are beginning to see the greatest threat to their independence as coming no longer from Washington, but from Moscow. Geographically, both these states are protectively separated from the Soviet Union by the territory of the People's Republic of China and ideologically (as has been demonstrated in RED FRONT, March 1970; p.7-10) the revisionism of their leaders is far closer to that of Peking than to the right revisionism of Moscow, which is

designed primarily for use amongst the working classes of developed industrial countries.

The logic of the changing world situation is thus driving the North Vietnamese and North Korean national bourgeoisies, and the revisionist leaderships which represent their interests, into the arms of the developing US-Chinese bloc.

Both the ruling classes of these divided countries see in this course the possibility of securing the peaceful unification of their countries within this bloc with the approval of United States imperialism.

A year ago, describing the developing Washington-Bucarest Axis, we said:

"The Romanian ultra-revisionists, who wish to detach their country from the Soviet-dominated bloc of states, look for support primarily to US imperialism..."

At the same time as developing relations of collaboration with Washington the Romanian ultra-revisionists have not neglected to reaffirm similar relations with the potential ally of the US imperialists in the Far East - the People's Republic of China." (RED FRONT, March 1970; p.32).

During the last year the Romanian ultra-revisionists, headed by President Nicolae Ceausescu, have been acting as high-level secret intermediaries between the U.S. imperialists on the one hand, and the Chinese, North Vietnamese and North Korean national bourgeoisies on the other. Ceausescu's June journey to Peking, Hanoi and Pyongyang (on which he will pass through Moscow without breaking his journey) represents a serious attempt to find acceptable terms to bring the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea into the developing Sino-U.S. bloc.

The fury of the Soviet neo-imperialists at this development is reflected not only in their unpublished note of protest to Bucarest on the anti-Soviet overtones of Ceausescu's Far East trip, but above all on the placing under house arrest for several weeks of the Vietnamese delegation, headed by Le Duan, to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (March/April 1971); on his release Le Duan significantly flew straight to Peking.

#### POLAND: THE POLISH WORKING CLASS BEGINS TO MOVE

With every step which the revisionist leaders of the eastern European countries take in the restoration of capitalism, the law of the antagonism between workers and management, between exploited and



exploiters, operates with ever increasing intensity. For a time the operation of this law, the law of the class struggle, may be held back - principally by means of demagogic propaganda about the continuing existence of a "socialist society". But the fact of exploitation cannot be concealed from the exploited for long.

In December 1970 (that is, just before Christmas) the Polish government announced an increase in food prices, together with a twelve-month freezing of wages.

On December 14th, workers marched to the Party headquarters in Gdansk, singing the "Internationale", to protest at these measures. They were met by police with gas bombs. On the following day they returned in larger numbers, fought off the police with stones and Molotov cocktails, and set fire to the party offices.

On December 16th, the demonstrations spread to the shipyard workers in Gdynia and Szczecin, who occupied the office buildings and held members of the management as hostages.

On December 17th the Prime Minister, Jozef Cyrankiewicz, read out on TV an order to the police and troops to fire on workers taking part in any further demonstrations. The workers replied by issuing a call for a nation-wide general strike on December 21st.

On December 20th, on the eve of the general strike, the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party met and decided that concessions had to be made to the working class. Wladyslaw Gomulka, the revisionist leader imposed on the Polish Party by the Khrushchovites in 1956, was removed from the position of First Secretary of the Party and replaced by Edward Gierek, formerly secretary of the industrialised Silesia district of the Party. The Central Committee also relieved four other members of the Political Bureau of their positions, including the President, Marian Spychalski, who was replaced by the former Prime Minister Cyrankiewicz.

On February 12th, 10,000 textile workers (mostly women) went on strike in Lodz and defied all attempts at persuasion and intimidation. Three days later a joint session of the Political Bureau of the C.C. of the Party and the Cabinet announced the cancellation of the food price increases.

The momentous events in Poland have not changed - could not change - the character of the revisionist regime in Poland. They were the first spontaneous, militant outburst of the working class against their new exploiters. For this spontaneous, militant movement to be transformed into a revolutionary movement that will eventually sweep away the new Polish bourgeoisie and re-establish a

socialist Poland, the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist Party of Poland is essential.

### YUGOSLAVIA: THE SOVIET-USTASHI UNITED FRONT

In the 1940s the Titoite revisionists turned Yugoslavia from the path of constructing socialism to that of restoring capitalism - so coming to represent the interests of a new bureaucratic capitalist class which exploits the working people in a manner which differs only in its superficial form from the manner of capitalists in the old-established capitalist countries.

Like minority exploiting classes everywhere, the new Yugoslav bourgeoisie has sought to maintain its power by encouraging national prejudices and jealousies among the different peoples within Yugoslavia. On the basis of this nationalism the neo-capitalist classes of, in particular, Croatia and Serbia, the two wealthiest of the constituent states of Yugoslavia, have built up a movement for greater autonomy for these states.

Under the Nazi occupation, Croatia was accorded the distinction of formation into a separate "independent state", nominally under the rule of the Ustashi, the Croatian fascist party then headed by Anton Pavelich. Today the Ustashi leaders are mostly in exile in Western Europe, but they are far from inactive politically: they see in the dismemberment of Yugoslavia an opportunity to return to positions of influence. Headed by Branco Jelic, who publishes the journal "Hrvatska Drzava" in West Berlin, they have been particularly active in "educational work" on behalf of the "national liberation movement" for the constituent republics of Yugoslavia among the Yugoslav workers forced to go to Western European countries to seek work unavailable in "socialist" Yugoslavia. Over the last year Tito's secret police have been engaged in a campaign of murder against these exiled fascists, who have replied with a similar campaign of murder against Yugoslav diplomats abroad.

The national prejudices and jealousies among the peoples of Yugoslavia have also been encouraged in every way by the Soviet neo-imperialists, who see in the dismemberment of Yugoslavia into small weak semi-independent states the best opportunity of reorientating the country from its present subordination to United States imperialism into semi-colonisation by themselves. The common aims in this respect of the Soviet neo-imperialists, the new Croatian bourgeoisie and the exiled Croatian fascist leaders has led in recent months to the formation of a "united front" between them, a "united front" financed to a considerable extent by funds from Moscow.



INTERNATIONAL DECLARATION Continued from Page 2

have themselves repudiated Marxism-Leninism for the pseudo-left variant of revisionism known as "Mao Tse-tung Thought". By means of the most unbridled demagoguery and pseudo-revolutionary phrasemongering, they work to divert militant activity into divisive, reactionary racialist and nationalist channels. The world headquarters of this "left" revisionism in Peking, where the leading clique headed by Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao - following the counter-revolutionary "cultural revolution" of 1966-68 directed against the Chinese Marxist-Leninists, the Communist Party of China and new democratic state - have established a military dictatorship on behalf of the Chinese national capitalist class.

A third concealed detachment of the capitalist class within the working class movement consists of the "centrist" revisionist parties, headed by the Workers' Party of Vietnam, the Workers' Party of Korea and the Communist Party of Cuba. These parties have established in their respective countries forms of state capitalism masquerading as "socialism" and represent the interests of the national bourgeoisie of these countries, national bourgeoisies which were and are in sharp contradiction with the U.S. imperialists. For this reason, during the Khrushchov era when the cardinal point of Soviet foreign policy was collaboration with US imperialism, these national bourgeoisies found this foreign policy unacceptable and their parties took up a "centrist" position, a position critical of Soviet revisionism. Following the reorientation of Soviet foreign policy since 1965 towards collaboration with capitalist classes and other social forces opposed to US imperialism, the leaderships of the "centrist" revisionist parties have moved closer to the position of the Soviet revisionists and now function as a semi-independent "left-wing" of Soviet revisionism, serving its purposes in spheres where this has become discredited and, in particular, in its struggle against the pro-US ultra-revisionists in the leadership of certain communist parties, such as those of Romania, Britain and Italy. \*

Thus there have arisen on a world scale three principal forms of modern revisionist theory and practice: the right revisionism of the Soviet neo-imperialists; the "left" revisionism of the Chinese national capitalist class; and the "centrist" revisionism of the North Korean, North Vietnamese and Cuban national bourgeoisies. These three variants of modern revisionism fulfil essentially complementary roles on behalf of imperialism in its offensive against the maturing world proletarian-socialist revolution and its small but developing Marxist-Leninist vanguard. Soviet right revisionism is directed primarily at the long-established working class movements of the developed capitalist countries, where the bourgeoisies want revolution not at all; Chinese "left" revisionism is directed principally at the young, emerging working class movements of the colonial-type countries, where the national bourgeoisies need revolution in order to win their national freedom from the yoke of imperialism; and "centrist" revisionism represents a semi-independent "left" wing of Soviet neo-imperialism\* in its bid to win the support of the national bourgeoisies, their petty-bourgeois political representatives and the working masses generally of certain smaller and weaker countries newly emerged from domination by one or other of the established imperialist powers behind the attempt of Soviet neo-imperialism to extend its world spheres of influence at the expense of the established imperialist groups, above all of United States imperialism. Soviet right revisionism and Chinese "left" revisionism also serve the expansionist interests of the Soviet neo-imperialists and the Chinese capitalist class respectively, whilst small-state "centrist" revisionism serves the aim of the North Korean, North Vietnamese and Cuban national capitalist classes in seeking to influence their ultimate master, Soviet neo-imperialism,\* to grant to them the status of comprador-type overseers of its developing imperialist-type acquisitions amongst the emerging and underdeveloped nations.

In the present period of the General Crisis of Capitalism, international contradictions between capitalist classes in different countries, and between alliances of such capitalist classes, have greatly increased. This situation is leading inevitably towards yet another global war for the redivision of the world - this time between two vast imperialist groups dominated respectively by the United States imperialists and the Soviet neo-imperialists. As this process of polarisation develops, the imperialist powers of Western Europe, Japanese imperialism, India and the small-state bloc of North Korea, North Vietnam and Cuba are beginning to move towards the Soviet pole, while China, Albania, Pakistan and those neo-capitalist states of Eastern Europe which have broken (or will at some future date have broken) free from Soviet domination are beginning to move towards the US pole.

A future imperialist world war, which is even now at an embryonic stage of preparation, would almost certainly destroy the world capitalist system. But it would also bring such mass slaughter and suffering to the working people of the world as would make the two previous

\* Over recent weeks evidence has accumulated that the "centrist"-revisionist leaderships of North Vietnam and North Korea have shifted their allegiance from Soviet neo-imperialism to Chinese state-capitalism, and hence onto a course leading ultimately to alliance with the U.S.



world wars pale almost into insignificance. Since the continuation of imperialism makes such a world war inevitable, the strategic task of the working people of all countries is to destroy imperialism prior to the outbreak of such a war; or, if this should not be possible, to snuff it out at its onset by transforming the imperialist world war into civil war on a world scale against the imperialists.

At this crucial moment in history, when the world working class is faced with the acute danger of fascist-type repression and devastating war, yet when the objective conditions for decisive advances for the world proletarian-socialist revolution are developing most favourably, the world working class finds itself without the leadership of organised Marxist-Leninist Parties. In this situation, when the course of world history hangs in the balance, a tremendous responsibility rests upon the Marxist-Leninists, as yet few in numbers, of the developed imperialist countries, including our own countries, the United States of America, Germany and Britain. Once again the contradictions of the General Crisis of Capitalism are operating to shift the main centre of revolutionary confrontation towards the developed countries of the imperialist heartlands. On us falls the proletarian-internationalist duty of taking up the tasks of theoretical analysis, political leadership and organisational re-grouping which the modern revisionists of right, "centre" and pseudo-left have so hideously betrayed, and of developing Marxism-Leninism to new heights in preparation for the violent revolutionary class upheavals which lie ahead.

The following are the main tasks which must be solved before the world proletarian-socialist revolution can secure important advances in the coming period:

In the developed imperialist countries:

- 1) the ideological and political influence of the "left" revisionist agents of the counter-revolutionary faction headed by Mao Tse-tung, representing the interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, and of the small-state "centrist" revisionism of the North Korean, North Vietnamese and Cuban national bourgeoisies, representing the interests of both their own and, ultimately, of the Soviet neo-imperialists, must be decisively broken;
- 2) Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class must be built on the basis of a correct programme combining broad united front with vanguard armed revolutionary forms of struggle, and with a firm and disciplined democratic-centralist structure;
- 3) Mass anti-imperialist united front movements must be built with the proletariat as the leading force, based on the independent organs of struggle of the working class, the whole under the overall leadership of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard Party.

In the colonial-type countries;

- 1) the ideological and political influence of the "left" revisionist agents of the counter-revolutionary faction headed by Mao Tse-tung, as well as of the small-state "centrist" revisionist leaders representing the interests of the North Vietnamese, and Cuban national bourgeoisies and their ultimate patron, Soviet neo-imperialism, must be decisively broken;
- 2) Marxist-Leninist Parties of the emerging working class must be built on the basis of a correct programme of striving to gain and maintain proletarian leadership in the developing national-democratic revolutions and of striving for the uninterrupted transition to the socialist revolution, and with a firm and disciplined democratic-centralist structure;
- 3) mass national front movements, embracing all classes which have an interest in the victory of the national-democratic revolution (including, if and wherever possible, the national bourgeoisie) must be built under the leadership of the working class, the whole under the overall leadership of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard Party; with the inevitable desertion of the national bourgeoisie from the national front in the course of development of the national democratic revolution along these correct lines, this national front must be transformed into a narrower united front embracing all classes which have an interest in the victory of the socialist revolution, under the leadership of the working class, the whole under the overall leadership of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard Party.

On a world scale;

- 1) a Marxist-Leninist International must be established on the basis of a firm democratic-centralist structure, in order to integrate the revolutionary programmes and policies of the Marxist-Leninist Parties of the various nations and national sections of the world front of struggle;
- 2) a world anti-imperialist united front must be built and organised in an integrated structure, with a world leading centre composed of representatives of the various anti-imperialist national fronts and united front organisations in each nation and national section of the world front of struggle.

The present stage of development of the world proletarian-socialist revolution represents nothing less than the first onset of a world pre-revolutionary situation. We are now witnessing, as a necessary pre-condition for the growth of this pre-revolutionary situation into a fully



RED FRONT

developed world revolutionary struggle on all fronts, the re-awakening of the proletariat in the developed imperialist countries from their long reformist slumber and the first wave of a new intensive round of class struggles which will lead to the opening up of the front of the world proletarian-socialist revolution in the central strongholds of the world imperialist system.

As in the case of a pre-revolutionary situation within a single country, the primary aim of the class struggle now unfolding between proletariat and bourgeoisie is to determine which of these two fundamentally opposed classes shall win the allegiance of the intermediate classes and strata and so secure for its class the decisive strategic advantage in the coming final stages of the world proletarian-socialist revolution. To enable the truly revolutionary class, the proletariat, to seize the decisive initiative in each nation and national sector comprising this pre-revolutionary situation, and in particular to enable it to pass over to the offensive and to realise in practice the unfolding of the world proletarian-socialist revolution on a world-wide front, the key factor is the establishment of programmatic and organisational unity between the Marxist-Leninist vanguard parties that must be built in every nation and every national sector.

The representatives of the MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF THE U.S.A., the MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF GERMANY and the MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN call upon all Marxist-Leninists throughout the world to begin now the urgent and essential task of re-establishing in every country genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties of the working class. In this way the nucleus of the new Marxist-Leninist International can be formed, which will carry forward the great revolutionary traditions of the Communist International and re-apply to the new world situation of heightened class antagonisms and inter-imperialist contradictions the principles of scientific revolutionary leadership and organisation first developed in theory and practice by Lenin and Stalin, and so begin the task of elaborating a common international programme of struggle based on a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the world situation and the perspectives of advance of the world proletarian-socialist revolution.

The future victorious outcome of the world proletarian-socialist revolution depends to a considerable degree on the speedy and successful accomplishment of these historic tasks of revolutionary leadership on the part of the emerging and developing Marxist-Leninist world vanguard.

Workers of all lands, unite .

Marxist-Leninist Organisation of the U.S.A.  
Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Germany  
Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain

---

MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF GERMANY FOUNDED

The Political Bureau of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain announces that a Provisional Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Germany has recently been formed. A representative of the Political Bureau of M.L.O.B. recently held extended and detailed talks with a representative of the Provisional Committee, M.L.O.G. at which he was informed that the primary aim of the new brother organisation is to work for the speediest possible establishment of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party of the working class in Germany and in the meantime to strive by all possible means to forge unity between potential Marxist-Leninists through the waging of a principled struggle against all forms of modern revisionism and so to assist in the essential tasks of theoretical and programmatic clarification.

As heir to the glorious Communist Party of Germany which up to the triumph of Hitlerite fascist counter-revolution in January 1933 had played, under the leadership of Cde. Ernst Thaelmann, the leading role within the Communist International in developing the strategy and tactics of the mass revolutionary Red Front and of the principles of socialist revolution in a developed monopoly-capitalist society, the Political Bureau of M.L.O.B. extends to our German Comrades its warm fraternal good wishes and expresses the firm conviction that its struggles on behalf of the German working class will result in the restoration of the great traditions of the revolutionary vanguard of the German working class and to a great new upsurge in its contributions to the international treasurehouse of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, and so to the development by German Marxist-Leninists of an important and leading role in the building of the fundamentally necessary instrument of the world revolutionary proletariat, the Marxist-Leninist International.

---



THE "STRANGE" WORLD OF 1971

Continued from page 14

In these circumstances the movement for national autonomy of the constituent republics of Yugoslavia has developed to the point where last autumn, when Tito announced his imminent resignation as President of Yugoslavia, constitutional amendments were put forward to give these republics such economic and political autonomy as would reduce the federal state apparatus to a mere shadow.

These constitutional amendments should have come into force in April 1971, but the republics were unable to agree on the extent of autonomy which would be desirable, in consequence of the differing levels of economic development among them. The neo-capitalist classes of the two richest republics, Croatia and Serbia, wish, for example, to retain within their republics the entire foreign exchange resulting from their exports; the neo-capitalist classes of the poorer republics, such as Albanian-speaking Kosovo, wish, however, to share in the foreign exchange yielded by their wealthier neighbours. At the time of writing the constitutional amendments are due to come into effect in July 1971, while Tito's resignation has been postponed until August.

JAPAN: JAPANESE IMPERIALISM BEGINS TO BREAK FREE

A year ago we said:

"Soviet foreign policy is directed towards the formation of a military alliance with Japan and India directed primarily against China. But the formation of this alliance necessitates Japan and India first breaking free of domination by US imperialism. ...

While the Japanese revisionists help the Japanese imperialists by mobilising the working people of Japan to assist them to free Japan from the yoke of US imperialism, the Soviet revisionists are offering them markets and a share in the exploitation of the Siberian workers now, and a "sphere of influence" on the mainland of Asia after "military victory". (RED FRONT, March, 1970, p.33, 27-28).

In December 1970 the United States government announced that, at a top-level meeting with representatives of the Japanese government in Tokyo, it had agreed to withdraw all U.S. troops and almost all combat aircraft from Japan by mid-1970.

AUSTRALIA: AUSTRALIA MOVES TOWARDS TOKYO

In the years immediately following the end of the Second World War, the Australian capitalist class reorientated their policy away from their previous dependence upon British imperialism, now gravely weakened, into dependence upon the strongest imperialist power in the world, the United States.

In the last decade, however, the economic strength of U.S. imperialism has declined, not only relative to that of the West European imperialist powers and to that of Soviet neo-imperialism, but also relative to that of Japanese imperialism. This change has been reflected in a new reorientation of the Australian economy towards dependence upon Japanese imperialism. As Jean Knecht, Pacific Editor of the French newspaper "Le Monde" expressed it in April 1971:

"Japan has progressively ousted the United Kingdom and the United States as Australia's commercial partner. Last year Japan became, by far, Australia's number one customer, having absorbed, on her own, more than a thousand million dollars' worth of Australian goods - that is, about a quarter of the country's total exports and as much as Britain and the United States together. During the next decade Japan will buy the bulk of Australia's mineral production." (Sydney Morning Herald, April 3rd, 1971).

In recent years the great Japanese monopolies, such as Mitsui and Mitsubishi, have begun to exploit Australia's vast mineral wealth on a large scale, both as a source of super-profits squeezed from the Australian working class and as a source of raw materials for Japanese industry. According to Wakasugi, the President of the Mitsui Company, who recently visited Australia to inspect his properties, Australia already supplies 40% of Japanese iron ore requirements.

The requirements of the Japanese trusts were the primary cause of the replacement of John Gorton as Prime Minister by William McMahon in March 1971. Gorton represented the interests of the Australian national capitalists, that section of the capitalist class which sought to throw off the domination of U.S. imperialism in order that Australian workers might be exploited by Australian capitalists and not by those of foreign powers. Confronted with the hostility of the powerful comprador capitalists, who favoured Australia's continued subordination to foreign imperialism, the national capitalists strove to avoid complete isolation by not seeking to use the full power of the state to enforce payment of the heavy fines inflicted on trade unions under the notorious anti-strike legislation. Gorton's successor, McMahon, is pledged both to "favour foreign investment", and to "enforce the law" in relation to the workers.

CANADA: "QUEBEC LIBRE!"

Quebec forms a separate nation at present within the state of Canada, a French-speaking nation with a language, history and culture quite distinct from those of the rest of Canada.

Quebec forms an oppressed nation within Canada, a nation which is oppressed and exploited by the capitalist ruling class of the dominant Anglo-Canadian nation, which is in turn a dependency of United States imperialism. 38% of the population of Quebec live below the official poverty line; the province has the highest infant mortality rate and the lowest life expectancy rate in Canada; the wages of French-speaking workers are, on the average, 40% lower than those of English-speaking workers within the province itself; with 25% of Canada's workers, Quebec has 41% of its unemployed; Montreal has the worst slums in Canada.

As an oppressed nation, the French-Canadian people of Quebec have the right to self-determination, up to and including the right to secession from Canada. The exercise of this right can be attained only by means of a national-democratic revolution.

The largest of the Quebec political parties which claim to stand for the national liberation of the Quebec people is the Parti Quebecois, founded in 1968 under the leadership of Rene Levesque. With a membership drawn mainly from the French-Canadian petty-bourgeoisie, its programme is aimed at diverting the national liberation movement along the constitutional path of "peaceful, parliamentary transition" to "independence". In the provincial elections of April 1970, the Parti Quebecois polled 24% of the vote, but won only 7 seats out of a total of 108 as a result of the rigged electoral system (it requires about 5,000 electors to elect an M.P. in the rural areas of Quebec, from 25,000 to 75,000 in the urban areas).

In the days when the Communist Party of Canada was a Marxist-Leninist Party of the working class, it called for the national liberation of the French-Canadian nation by means of a national-democratic revolution:

"The guarantee for complete self-determination (French Canada) can only be achieved through revolutionary action". (Report of the Sixth National Convention of the Communist Party of Canada, 1929, cited in: "Communist Viewpoint" (Toronto), March/April 1971; p.22).

Now that the leadership of the C.P. of Canada has embraced revisionism, however, it calls merely for a "new constitution", to be obtained through "parliamentary means", based on the "federal union" of English-speaking and French-speaking Canada



within "a united country":

"The preservation of Canada as a united country requires a new constitution .... by which federal union could protect the joint interests of the two peoples." (Report of the 18th Convention of the Communist Party of Canada, 1964, cited in: *ibid.*; p.24).

In the absence of any Marxist-Leninist Party that could provide scientific leadership of the national-democratic revolution, many young militant elements of the petty-bourgeoisie, seeing only too clearly the diversionary character of the "parliamentary road" to national liberation, have been diverted from the organisation of serious revolutionary activity into various anarchist and semi-anarchist groups. The most important of these is the Front de Liberation de Quebec (FLQ) (the Quebec Liberation Front), which last Autumn had a membership estimated at 150.

In October 1970 the F.L.Q. kidnapped James Cross, the British Trade Commissioner in Montreal and, later, a prominent member of the Quebec government, Pierre Laporte. It offered their release in return for: the publication and broadcasting of the F.L.Q.'s manifesto; the release of 23 political prisoners, who should be permitted to go to Cuba or Algeria; the payment of £200,000 to the FLQ; and the reinstatement of 400 post office employees dismissed in a dispute over trade union rights.

The Canadian Federal Government is headed by a figure drawn from the French-Canadian comprador bourgeoisie - "trendy", photogenic Pierre-Elliott Trudeau, elected in June 1968 on the slogan "One Canada, One Nation". While pretending to consider negotiation with the FLQ, the Federal Government moved 7,000 troops into Montreal and, at 4 a.m. on October 16th, on the pretext that the kidnappings revealed a state of "apprehended insurrection" in Quebec, invoked the War Measures Act (later supplemented by the Public Order Temporary Measures Act), under which 2,300 homes of persons suspected of sympathy in any way with the movement for the national liberation of Quebec were raided without warrant and 434 such persons were arrested.

The fact that 90% of French-Canadians are working class renders the situation in Quebec objectively favourable for the attainment of leadership of the national-democratic revolution by the working class, and for the transformation of the national-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. A pre-requisite for the achievement of this Marxist-Leninist revolutionary strategy in Quebec is the leadership of the working class by a Marxist-Leninist Party purged of all revisionist trends. The establishment in August 1970 of the nucleus of such a Party, THE STALINIST NUCLEUS (RED FRONT, August/September 1970; p.2) is thus an event of the greatest importance, to the working people, not only of Quebec and of Canada, but of the world.

### CHILE: THE "PEACEFUL ROAD" TO COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN CHILE

In 1969 a "Popular Unity Front" was formed in Chile between the revisionist Communist Party, the Socialist Party, and four smaller bodies, with an agreed programme, the main plank of which consisted of nationalisation of the key sectors of the economy (for the most part controlled by foreign (mainly U.S.) finance capital) so as to produce a mixed state enterprise/private enterprise economy.

At the elections held in September 1970, the Popular Unity Front became the largest group in the Chamber of Deputies, and in November a P.U.F. government took office, headed by Salvador Allende as President.

Since its inception, the positive measures taken by the Allende government include the nationalisation (with compensation) of the U.S.-owned copper mines (copper accounts for 75% of Chilean exports), the raising of the minimum wage by 66%, the broadening of trade relations with the Korean Democratic People's Republic, and the establishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba and the People's Republic of China.

Although presented by revisionist Communist Parties throughout the world as a shining example of "the peaceful road to socialism", the Allende government is in no way a socialist government of the working class: it represents the interests of the Chilean national bourgeoisie - which seeks to throw off the domination of U.S. imperialism in order that it may itself exploit the working people of the country.

Even from a constitutional viewpoint, the Chilean Popular Unity Front Government is in a precarious position; it holds only a minority of seats in the Chamber of Deputies and can be thrown out of office at any time in a vote of confidence. But the impossibility of it attempting to take "the road to socialism" even if it wished to, is demonstrated by the fact that the armed forces remain in the control of the most reactionary, pro-imperialist section of the ruling class and have the power to stage a military coup to destroy the whole parliamentary system.

Of course, this last factor does not make it impossible for the Chilean working people to establish socialism. But they can do so only by creating their own revolutionary armed force to disrupt and destroy the apparatus of coercion which faces them. But to urge this course would involve repudiation of "the peaceful road to socialism" preached by international revisionism. As Luis Corvalan, General Secretary of the Chilean Communist Party, puts it:

"To hold that armed confrontation is inevitable implies the immediate formation of an armed people's militia. In the present situation that would be equivalent to a mark of defiance to the army". ("Morning Star", December 29th, 1970; p.4).

One can but agree with Corvalan, however, when he says:

"What has happened in Chile is not irreversible". (*Ibid.*, p.4).

In fact, the "peaceful road to socialism" in Chile as everywhere, is simply the road to counter-revolution!

### ITALY: THE ATTEMPTED FASCIST COUP

In December 1970 the "National Front", a fascist body headed by Prince Junio Valerio Borghese, working in conjunction with the American C.I.A. and the Greek ruling military junta, attacked the Italian Ministry of the Interior in an attempted fascist coup. The attempt was unsuccessful.

### BANGLA DESH

Ever since the formation of the state of Pakistan by the British imperialists, the 75 million Bengali people of East Pakistan have been ruthlessly exploited, in colonial fashion, by the wealthy (mainly Punjabi) ruling class centred in West Pakistan, 1200 miles away, and controlling through the military dictatorship of President Yahya Khan the state apparatus of coercion of Pakistan.

In recent years the national bourgeoisie of both East and West Pakistan have been able to build political parties representing their respective interests:

in the East the Awami League, headed by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman;  
in the West the Pakistan People's Party, headed by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto.

The programmes of both these parties had a similar anti-imperialist content: nationalisation of the banks, of transport and of foreign-owned firms; the development of co-operative farms; an independent foreign policy, including withdrawal from SEATO and CENTO.

But while the national bourgeoisie of East Pakistan wished to end their colonial status, so that the Awami League demanded autonomy for East Pakistan within a federal state responsible only for defence and foreign affairs, the national bourgeoisie of West Pakistan wished to retain the oppression of the East for their own benefit as capitalists, so that the programme of the Pakistan People's Party rejected autonomy and demanded a strong, centralised state.



In the elections held at last in December 1970, the Awami League won 151 seats out of 153 in East Pakistan, giving them an absolute majority of 151 seats out of 291 in the new National Assembly due to meet in Dacca this spring. Constitutionally, the people of East Pakistan had "wcn" autonomy.

On February 17th, 1971, however, Bhutto announced that his Pakistan People's Party would not participate in the National Assembly "in view of the fact that they were in a minority". On March 1st, Yahya Khan declared that, in view of this boycott, the opening of the National Assembly would, "in the interests of democracy", be indefinitely postponed.

As demonstrations and a general strike against this decision spread throughout East Pakistan and Rahman publicly denounced it, Yahya Khan banned the Awami League, arrested Rahman as a "traitor", and ordered the Pakistan army to "restore order" in East Pakistan.

By the middle of April Yahya Khan's largely Punjabi army had succeeded in occupying the main urban centres of East Pakistan, after an orgy of bloodshed and burning during which, on March 26th, the "sovereign independent state of Bangla Desh" was proclaimed.

The second phase of the war of national liberation of Bangla Desh is now beginning - taking the form at first of a guerilla war by the Bengali national liberation army against the better-armed, more numerous forces of the oppressing army. It is a just war, and victory will bring about the dismemberment of the artificial state of Pakistan and lay the basis for re-drawing the national boundaries of the Indian sub-continent on correct, ethnic lines.

### ETHIOPIA: THE ERITREAN STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION

The African "Empire" of Ethiopia has the dubious distinction of being the most backward country in the world, with 93% of its 18 million people illiterate and an average income per head of only £23 a year.

Since the Second World War, Ethiopia has been a semi-colony of United States imperialism, although nominally sovereignty is in the hands of the despotic Emperor Haile Selassie in the capital, Addis Ababa. Ethiopia has been the largest recipient of US "aid" on the African continent (\$ 147 million from 1953 to 1969); its army and police are trained and commanded by U.S. and Israeli officers; and the U.S. military base at Kagnew is the largest in Africa.

On their liberation from Italian imperialism in the Second World War, the million Eritrean people were arbitrarily forced - by decision of the then-US-dominated "United Nations" - into federal union with Ethiopia, but with their own "autonomous state". In May 1960 the Ethiopian government forcibly dissolved the Eritrean state, and converted Eritrea into a mere province ruled directly from Addis Ababa.

The Eritrean Liberation Front was formed in 1956, and in recent years has taken up armed struggle for the national liberation of Eritrea. Its armed forces number some 2,000 and they are armed mainly with small arms received on credit from Libya.

In December 1970 the Ethiopian government declared a state of emergency throughout the country, and imposed martial law over most of the "province" of Eritrea. Since then two-thirds of the Ethiopian army of 40,000 has been deployed in Eritrea.

In January 1971 a communique from the headquarters of the Eritrean Liberation Front in Damascus claimed that its armed forces controlled the major part of the rural area of Eritrea.

### EGYPT: THE SADAT COUP

Since the death of Nasser, two conflicting trends have emerged within the Egyptian capitalist class - each standing for a different method of trying to solve the problem of the continuing occupation of Egyptian territory by the troops of their U.S.-dominated neighbour, Israel.

One section, headed by former Vice-President Ali Sabry, favoured the adoption of a phoney programme of "socialism" as a pretext for completely subordinating Egypt to Soviet neo-imperialism in an alliance which would force Israel to retreat from her present positions.

The other section, headed by President Anwar Sadat himself, favoured confederating Egypt with Syria and Lybia, in order to offer to subordinate this confederation to US imperialism in return for US pressure on her Israeli puppets to withdraw their forces.

The US imperialists having indicated their interest in this second line of approach, the President dismissed Ali Sabry on the eve of the visit to Egypt by US Secretary of State William Rogers, at the beginning of May 1971.

Soon afterwards several hundred prominent persons associated with the pro-Soviet faction within the capitalist class - including Ali Sabry; the Secretary-General of the ruling "Arab Socialist Union", Abdul Nur; six Cabinet Ministers, including the Minister of Defence, General Mohamed Fawzy, and the Minister of the Interior, Sharawy Gomaa - were arrested in the name of "preserving the independence of Egypt from a coup engineered by a foreign power".

Apprehensive for the safety of their massive economic and military investments (more than half of Soviet foreign "aid" has gone to Egypt), the Soviet neo-imperialists immediately despatched a high-level though "unofficial" delegation to Cairo headed by President Podgorny. The Egyptian government was pleased to sign a 15-year "Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation" with the Soviet Union, and to use it as blackmail to further persuade the US imperialists to pressure their Israeli puppets into a peace settlement acceptable to the Egyptian capitalist class.

### UGANDA: THE BRITISH COUP

In recent years military coups against African states designed to restore them to a semi-colonial status have for the most part been engineered by the American Central Intelligence Agency. With the decline of the economic and military strength of United States imperialism, however, British intelligence agents have begun to step out of the shadows.

At the Commonwealth Conference which ended on January 22nd, 1971, a leading opponent of Heath's proposal to sell arms to racist South Africa was President Milton Obote of Uganda, who since 1966 has headed a regime representing the interests of the Ugandan national bourgeoisie.

On January 25th, 1971 the regime of President Obote was overthrown by a military coup led by the commander-in-chief of the Ugandan army, General Idi Amin Dada, in conjunction with the British secret service and the Israeli military mission in Uganda.

Two days later, on January 25th, Amin declared that Uganda would remain in the Commonwealth despite the British government's attitude to South Africa. He praised British imperialism for its "sound administration" of Uganda in the past, and declared that the new government would do everything possible to maintain friendly relations with Britain. The former administration's programme for the nationalisation of foreign firms would be dropped.

On February 2nd, 1971 General Amin proclaimed himself President.

The new military dictatorship aims to build a basis for its support among the Buganda tribe, the largest tribe in Uganda, by restoring to its notoriously pro-British-imperialist chiefs the privileged position they enjoyed prior to the advent of the Obote administration in 1966. In pursuance of this aim, the new government flew back for reburial in Kampala the body of the late Kabaka (King) of Buganda, Sir Edward Mutesa, who died in exile in London in 1969 of alcoholism.

### GUINEA: THE INVASION

In November 1970 Portuguese troops, together with West German intelligence agents and mercenaries, invaded the west African state of Guinea from neighbouring Portuguese Guinea in an effort to overthrow the regime headed by President Sekou Toure. The invasion was defeated, and in January 1971 Guinea broke off diplomatic relations with the Federal German Republic in consequence of that state's participation in the invasion.



# THE GROWTH OF OFFICIAL RACISM

The British monopoly capitalist class, like all minority exploiting classes, has long followed the dictum of the Roman slave-owners to "Divide and Rule". It seeks to divide office workers from manual workers, younger workers from older workers, male workers from female workers, Protestant workers from Catholic workers and Jewish workers, and black workers from white workers.

Until 1962 the propagation of white racism was largely left to unofficial fascist-type bodies serving the interests of monopoly capital, while governments at least pretended to maintain the fiction that all citizens were "equal before the law". The passage of the first Commonwealth Immigration Act in 1962 raised the pernicious doctrine of white racism to official level, since when Labour and Conservative governments have competed as to who can show themselves toughest on this question.

The latest action in this field, and the most comprehensive to date, is the Conservative government's 1971 Immigration Bill. The Bill and its associated draft regulations attempts to disguise its racist character by differentiating Commonwealth immigrants into "patrials" (who have a father or grandfather born in the United Kingdom) and "non-patrials" (who have not). The definition is designed to establish that the overwhelming majority of "patrials" will be white-skinned, while the overwhelming majority of "non-patrials" will be black-skinned.

"Patrials" are accorded the right of abode in Britain, "non-patrials" are not. The latter may be admitted on a temporary basis (initially up to a year) provided they are in possession of a work permit for a specific job. The Bill provides for the deportation of any "non-patrial" who fails to observe the provisions of the Bill (which include registration with a regular reporting to the police), or who becomes an in-patient in a mental ward; it provides also for the deportation of the families of persons ordered to be deported. The police are entrusted with securing observance of the law - a task which will include stopping "suspected persons" in the street to inspect their papers, a practice little different from that in South Africa under its notorious Pass Laws.

One of the most significant features of the Bill is the provision to issue work permits to a "non-patrial" for a specific job, so that if he ceases to be employed in that job he becomes liable to immediate deportation. This gives, in effect, the power of deportation to the employer of any "non-patrial" who might fail to serve

him in loyal "Uncle Tom" fashion.

The clause which particularly delighted Enoch Powell is Clause 29 concerning "voluntary repatriation". He saw in this "the seed and hope for the future", that is, he saw it as a step in the direction of "compulsory repatriation", i.e. deportation, of black people already permanently resident in Britain.

Like all divisive laws, the Immigration Bill affects not merely the black "indentured" workers against whom it is specifically directed, but the whole British working class. It needs to be fought, tooth and nail, by all workers, black and white, who understand the elementary fact that a blow against one section of workers is a blow against all workers, that the way forward lies only in building the militant solidarity of the whole working class.

## FOOTNOTES

A report issued in November 1970 by the European Commission of Human Rights states that the British Government delegation admitted to the Commission that the British Government's 1968 Immigration Act was "racially discriminatory in intention and effect". The Commission rejected the British Government's contention that such discrimination was "justified".

In March the Rev. Colin Davis was forced to resign from the BBC's religious programme "Thought for the Day" following his remark that under the new Immigration Bill three out of four of Britain's "patron saints" would have qualified for deportation as "non-patrials".

In April the Home Office and Police began a drive to deport "illegal immigrants". Hamat Lakhani, Assistant Secretary of the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants, said in Leicester on April 6th:

"We are getting a great many reports of police knocking on people's doors at night and telling them to get out".

## "PHILIP, GO HOME!"

In a recent encounter in Scotland with Italian photographer Ray Bellisario, who makes his living by taking "unofficial" photographs of the British Royal Family, Prince Philip is reported to have shouted: "Why don't you go back where you came from?" To which Mr. Bellisario replied: "Thank you", in Greek.



# THE CENSUS CASE: REGINA V. SMITH

(Its clearly defined racist implications, together with what the Registrar-General himself has admitted to be its "gross intrusion into privacy", caused many "heads of households" to refuse to cooperate with the 1971 Census. While RED FRONT believes that, in case of prosecution, the court should be used as a political forum, nevertheless, for those who are reluctant to part with £50, the following imaginary report of the case of Albert Smith, charged with a breach of the Census Act 1920, may be of interest as an additional legal defence).

When Albert Smith, of Coronation Street, Stalybridge, was charged at Stalybridge Magistrates' Court with a breach of the Census Act, the only witness called for the prosecution was a census enumerator, Mr. N. Parker. Mr. Parker stated that he had attempted, on April 22nd, 1971, to deliver a census form to the defendant at 10, Coronation Street, Stalybridge; the latter had, however, slammed the door in his face, so that he had been compelled to push the form through the letter box of the front door. On the evening of April 27th he had returned to the same address in order to collect the completed census form, but the defendant had shouted "No", and had once more slammed the door.

When the witness endeavoured to present as evidence a document produced by the computer at the Census Office purporting to show that no census return had been received in respect of Smith or in respect of his address, the defendant, who was not legally represented, objected on the grounds that such a document, produced by a computer, was legally admissible as evidence in a court of law only, under the Civil Evidence Act 1968, in civil cases, but not in criminal proceedings such as the present case. After consultation with the Clerk of the Court, the Magistrate (Lieutenant-Colonel Hawes-Bickerstaffe) ruled that the evidence was inadmissible.

The defendant then undertook a lengthy cross-examination of the witness for the prosecution.

Q. Would you tell the Court, as briefly as possible from your own personal knowledge, my geographical whereabouts during the twelve months prior to Census Day, April 25th, 1971?

A. I do not know.

Q. Then would you tell the Court, from your own personal knowledge, my geographical whereabouts during the twenty-four hours before, and the twenty-four hours after, Census Night (the night of April 25th-26th, 1971)?

A. I do not know.

Magistrate: I fail to see how this is relevant to the case.

Smith: I would draw your attention to Section 3 of the Census Order 1970, under which the 1971 Census has been taken. This states:

"A census shall be taken for Great Britain on the 25th April 1971 and for that purpose returns shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this Order with respect to:

a) all persons in Great Britain (ie, on Census night, April 25th-26th, 1971) and

b) all other persons (being persons usually resident in Great Britain to whom paragraph (c) of column (2) of Group 1 ... of Schedule 1 refers".

Paragraph (c) of column (2) of Group 1 of Schedule 1 relates to:

"Every person ... who is usually resident in the dwelling or the part of the dwelling but who does not spend census night there".

Since the witness for the prosecution has admitted that, from his own personal knowledge, he does not know my geographical whereabouts during the twenty-four hours before and after Census Night (April 25th-26th), the prosecution has failed to establish that I was in Great Britain on this night. And since he has admitted that, from his own personal knowledge, he does not know my geographical whereabouts during the twelve months prior to Census Day (April 25th, 1971), the prosecution has failed to establish that I am a person usually resident in Great Britain.

In other words the prosecution has failed to establish that I am a person with respect to whom, under the Census Order 1970, a census return shall be made.

Magistrate: And that is your case?

Smith: Why no; I have hardly begun to cross-examine the witness as yet.

Magistrate: Very well.

Q. In the course of performing your duties as an enumerator, how many people have you observed in bed within the premises known as 10, Coronation Street, Stalybridge?

Magistrate: That question appears to me to be both irrelevant and insulting to the witness.

Smith: On the contrary. The question is essential to the case. (To witness): Would

you please answer the question?

Q. I have never observed anyone in bed at that address.

A. Or sleeping on the floor?

Q. No.

Smith (to magistrate: I would draw the attention of the Court to Section 5(1) of the Census Order 1970, which lays down the persons prescribed to make the return in connection with Form H for "private households" shall be:

"the head, or person for the time being acting as the head, of each private household occupying any dwelling or part of a dwelling."

Now the accepted legal definition of a "dwelling" (as laid down in Attorney-General v. McLean (1863), 1 H & C 761) is:

"a place in which some person or person habitually lives and sleeps".

The witness has admitted that he has never seen anyone sleeping at the premises known as 10, Coronation Street, so that the prosecution has clearly failed to establish that these premises constitute a dwelling, and therefore that a return in connection with Form H for private households is required to be made from that address.

Witness: I must point out that I made enquiries from the people at No. 12, Coronation Street ...

Smith: What the people next-door may or may not have said is hearsay, and not admissible as evidence. What is the legal definition of "the head of a household"?

A: So far as I know there is no legal definition.

Q: In fact, the Registrar-General has stated publicly that there is no legal definition of "head of a household" and that each household must decide for itself whom to regard as "the head" for census purposes?

A: I believe that is so.

Q: Then, in the case of "private households" how do you determine who is the "head"?

A: By asking a member of the household.

Q: That is the only way to find out?

A: As far as I know.

Q: So that if a member of the household refuses to tell you, you have no means of knowing who "the head" of that household is?

A: No. But there is a legal requirement



to answer that question.

Q: You are, I presume, referring to Section 17(1) of the Census Regulations 1970, which states:

"Every prescribed person shall give to the enumerator such information as he may reasonably require for the performance of his duties under these regulations".

A: Yes, I believe that is the wording.

Q: But who is the "prescribed person" who is required to give the enumerator such information? This is laid down in Schedule 2, Column 1, paragraph a, in the case of private households, to be:

"The head or person for the time being acting as the head of every private household".

Consequently, if a person answers the door to you and does not tell you who the household regards as its "head", you have no means of knowing?

A: No.

Q: And since you have no means of knowing who "the head" of the household is, you have no means of knowing whether the person who refuses to tell you is "the head of the household" or not?

A: No.

Q: So that you have no means of knowing whether a breach of the Census Regulations has been committed in this respect or not?

A: No.

Q: Now, you state that on April 22nd you pushed a census form through the letter-box of the front door at 10, Coronation Street?

A: That is so.

Q: When did you last see this census form?

A: At the time I pushed it through the letter-box.

Q: Not since?

A: No.

Q: So, from your own personal knowledge, you cannot say whether the form has been completed or not?

A: No. I only know that you refused to give it to me when I called to collect it.

Q: But the Registrar-General has publicly stated that it is in order to send in forms by post - for example, to the Census Office?

A: That is so.

Q: Have you personally examined all the census forms received at the Census Office?

A: No. But the computer ....

Q: The computer is not here to be sworn. And it has been ruled that a document produced by a computer is inadmissible in this case. Since you admit that you have not personally examined all the Census forms received at the Census Office, you cannot swear from your own personal knowledge that no form has been received at the Census Office in relation to myself?

A: No.

As this completed the case for the prosecution, the defendant then submitted that there was no case to answer and that it should consequently be dismissed. When this was refused, the defendant then opened his defence, saying:

Section 8(1) of the Census Regulations

1970 states:

"A prescribed person shall comply with instructions contained in such form" (that is, in Census Form H).

What are these instructions?

They are simply:

- 1) to "complete this form"; and
- 2) to "have it ready for collection on Monday 26th April.

In other words, this regulation lays no legal obligation on a prescribed person to deliver the Census form to the enumerator or to anyone else. It merely requires him to complete the form and to have it ready for collection.

The prosecution has produced no evidence to show that, in the case of the Census Form H left at 10, Coronation Street, this has not been completed; nor has it produced any evidence to show that it was not ready for collection on April 26th.

It may be argued that Section 12(2) of the Census Regulations 1970, which states:

"the enumerator shall ... collect all forms of return delivered by him"

may be interpreted as implying an obligation on a prescribed person to deliver a completed census form to the enumerator.

Not only is such an obligation not laid down in the Act, the Order or the Regulations, but this interpretation is clearly negated by the statement in Census Form H, which forms part of Schedule 3 of the Regulations and which states:

"Anyone who wishes can ask the enumerator or local Census Officer for a personal form which can be returned to the enumerator or local Census Officer".

Were the obligation on the enumerator to collect all forms delivered by him (Section 12(2) of the Census Regulations 1970) to be interpreted as laying an obligation on persons making returns to deliver them to the enumerator, then the advice in Schedule 3 that returns may be sent to the local Census Officer would be illegal.

If a prescribed person does not deliver a completed census form to the enumerator, then clearly it is merely not "reasonably practicable" for the enumerator to collect it.

Section 5(1) of the Census Order 1970 lays down that:

"The head, or person for the time being acting as the head, of each private household ... shall make a return".

But "a return" in accepted legal terminology means simply "a document", and making a return means "completing a document". That "making a return" does not also mean "delivering" that return to some other person is clearly established by the wording of the Census Act 1920 (under which both the Census Order 1970 and the Census Regulations 1970 are made). This differentiates in several places between "making" a document and "delivering" it. For example, Section 8(1) of this Act reads:

"If any person ....

being a person required by any Order in Council or regulations made under this Act to make, sign or deliver any document, makes, signs or delivers, or causes to be made, signed or delivered, a false document, he shall be liable ...." etc.

To sum up, neither the Census Act 1920, nor the Census Order 1970, nor the Census Regulations 1970, lays down any legal obligation on the head of a household to deliver a completed census form to anyone, so that the head of a household who does not deliver a completed census form to an enumerator has committed no offence.

I submit, therefore, in conclusion, that the prosecution has clearly failed to establish:

1) that I am a person in respect of whom a census return should have been made;

2) that the premises known as 10, Coronation Street, Stalybridge, constitute a dwelling occupied by a private household;

3) that I am the head of a household;

4) that I am a prescribed person who is obliged to give the enumerator any information or complete a return;

5) that a census form has not been completed by me or was not ready for collection on April 26th;

6) that no form in regard to myself has been received by the Census Office;

7) that even were I the head of a household and had failed to deliver a completed census form to the enumerator or to the Census Office, this constitutes a breach of the law.

Mr. H. Butterworth, Counsel for the Prosecution, summing up for the Crown, argued that if the defendant's submissions were accepted, they would bring the whole machinery of the Census - as well as of the law - into ridicule. He submitted that, in spite of the legal ambiguities to which the defendant had cunningly drawn attention, the whole spirit of the Census Act 1920, and of the Regulations made under it, made it obvious that the intention of the framers was to make it compulsory for persons to deliver completed census forms whether to the enumerator or to some other appropriate authority.

The Magistrate, Lt. Col. Hawes-Bickerstaffe, after conferring at length with the Clerk of the Court declared that he felt convinced that the defendant had shown a most regrettable lack of cooperation with the authorities in relation to the Census, which all conscientious citizens recognised was essential to enable Her Majesty's Government to carry on its work of elevating the social welfare of the people. Nevertheless, this was not a court of morality, and it must be admitted that the Crown had failed to establish that the defendant had been guilty of any offence against the law; he must, therefore, be acquitted.

The defendant's applications for costs against the Crown was rejected.



NATIONALISATION  
AND DENATIONALISATION

Nationalisation - the taking over of an enterprise by the state - is often presented by demagogues as "a socialist measure". It is true that, after the working class has overthrown the political power of the capitalist class and established its own political power, its own state, then indeed the taking over of an enterprise by this state is a socialist measure. But this, of course, is by no means the situation in contemporary Britain, where the state is the machinery of rule of Big Business, of monopoly capital; here nationalisation is in no way a socialist measure; it is a measure to enable capitalism to work more effectively.

At all periods in all countries, capitalist classes have indulged in measures of nationalisation:

1) where an enterprise has established a monopoly of a product or service essential to the capitalist class as a whole, enabling it to appropriate part of the profits of the other capitalists by means of monopoly prices or charges (e.g., enterprises in the field of transport and communications - railways, postal services, etc. in most developed capitalist countries);

2) where an enterprise provides a product or service essential to the capitalist class as a whole but is unable any longer to function profitably (e.g., coal in Britain).

One of the few points of difference in home policy between the Labour Party and the Conservative Party in recent years has been on the degree of nationalisation which is considered desirable. Of course, a two-party parliamentary system in which the electorate can "choose" between two parties both representing the interests of monopoly capital, requires that there should be some differences in policy between the parties, and the association of the Labour Party with a policy of more nationalisation is to some extent a survival of the old Fabian concept of the construction of a "socialist" society through piecemeal nationalisation. Nevertheless, in recent years the policy difference between Conservative and Labour Parties on the degree of nationalisation which is considered desirable has had a more material basis than that of mere parliamentary demagoguery. This material basis lies in the fact that the Labour Party has come to represent the interests of that section of British monopoly capital which favours continued subordina-

tion to US imperialism, while the Conservative Party has come to represent the interests of that section - now the dominant section - of British monopoly capital which favours breaking free of the past subordination to US imperialism.

The Conservative Party thus favours - and the Conservative government is putting into practice - a policy of denationalising all non-monopolistic sectors of existing state enterprise which are "profitable", in order that this profit may be appropriated by private capitalist groups.

This is the motive behind the selling-off of the state-owned chain of brewery and 203 public-houses in Carlisle (dividend to the state in 1970: £71,000), of the state-owned Skyways Air-Coach concern (trading profit in 1969: £296,000) and of the state-owned travel service of Thomas Cook & Son (dividend to the state in 1969: £280,000). As part of the same pattern, in December 1970 the state-owned British Overseas Airways Corporation was ordered to hand over its profitable routes to West Africa to the privately-owned Caledonian-British United Airways, and in the same month Lord Robens resigned as Chairman of the National Coal Board in protest against the Government's proposals to sell the Board's non-mining assets to private enterprise.

United States monopoly capital, however - the interests of which are represented in Britain by the Labour Party - is less interested in the ability of British monopoly capitalists to make maximum profits than in the financial stability of the British state, which owes them millions of dollars. Hence the Labour Party favours the retention by the state of some profitable enterprises to offset the deficit accruing from the loss-making state enterprises.

In accordance with this picture, the Conservative government's statement that the loss-making sectors of Rolls-Royce are to be nationalised only until they can be made profitable is of significance.

=====

POLICE GAZETTE

Ex-Detective-Sergeant Harry Challenor, retired from the police for framing demonstrators and found to be "insane", is now acting as a paid informer for West Central Police Station.

The Chief Constable of Huntingdon has asked the local council at St. Ives to rename the street in which a new police station is being built.

Its present name: Pig Lane.

-----



# ON LITERATURE

by Andrei A. Zhdanov

(The leading Soviet Marxist-Leninist Andrei Zhdanov was elected to the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. in 1938, by which time he was already an authority on cultural questions. Like the great Soviet writer Maxim Gorky, to whom he pays tribute, Zhdanov was murdered by revisionists.

In these days when revisionist-led Communist Parties everywhere prattle of "art for art's sake", when the literature, music and films which emanate from the formerly socialist countries now under revisionist rule are every bit as decadent and reactionary as anything coming from the older capitalist countries, Zhdanov's speech at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers is as important and topical today as when it was delivered in 1934).

Comrades, permit me to bring to the first Congress of Soviet Writers and through the Congress to all writers in the Soviet Union, at the head of whom stands the great proletarian writer Maxim Gorky, ardent Bolshevik, greetings on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. and of the Council of People's Commissars. ....

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Party is organising the masses for the struggle to destroy capitalist elements once and for all, to eradicate the vestiges of capitalism in our economy and in people's minds, and to complete the technical reconstruction of our national economy. The eradication of vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness means struggle against every vestige of bourgeois influence over the proletariat, against laxity, frivolity or idling, against petty-bourgeois licence and individualism, against graft and dishonesty towards social property.

We hold a trusty weapon to overcome all the difficulties in our path. This weapon is the great and invincible teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, now being put into practice by our Party. Their great banner is triumphant and it is to that triumph that we owe the assembly of this first congress of Soviet writers. Had there been no such victory, there would have been no congress. Only Bolsheviks could bring together such a congress.

The successes of Soviet literature are conditioned by the successes of socialist construction. The growth of Soviet literature reflects the successes and achievements of our socialist system. Our literature is the youngest of all the literatures of all countries and peoples. At the same time, it has the greatest idea-content and it is the most advanced and revolutionary.

There does not exist and never has existed any literature other than Soviet literature to organise the working people and the oppressed in a struggle to destroy utterly any and every kind of exploitation and to shake off the yoke of wage slavery.

There is not and never has been a literature making its basic subject-matter the life of the working class and the peasantry and their struggle for socialism. There does not exist in any country in the world a literature to defend and protect the equality of rights of the working people of all nations and the equality of rights of women. There is not, nor can there be in any bourgeois country, a literature to wage consistent war on all obscurantism, mysticism, hierarchic religious attitudes and threats of hell-fire, as our literature does.

Only Soviet literature could become and has in fact become such an advanced, thought-imbuéd literature. It is one flesh and blood with our socialist construction.

Soviet writers have already written a good number of talented books, correctly and truthfully depicting the life of our Soviet land. We already have several names of whom we may be justly proud. The great body of Soviet authors is now fused with the Soviet power and the Party, having the aid of Party guidance and the care and daily assistance of the Central Committee and the unceasing support of Comrade Stalin. All the contradictions between our system - that of victorious socialism - and the dying, decaying capitalist system, can be distinguished with the greatest clarity in the light of the successes of our Soviet literature.

What can the bourgeois writer write or think of, where can he find passion, if the worker in the capitalist countries is not sure of his tomorrow, does not know whether he will have work, if the peasant does not know whether he will be working on his bit of land or thrown on the scrap heap by a capitalist crisis, if the working intellectual is out of work today and does not know whether he will have work tomorrow?

What can the bourgeois author write about, what source of inspiration can there be for him, when the world, from one day to the next, may be plunged once more into the abyss of a new imperialist war?

The present position of bourgeois literature is such that it is already incapable of producing great works. The decline and decay of bourgeois literature derive from the decline and decay of the capitalist system and are a feature and aspect characteristic of the present condition of bourgeois culture and literature. The days when bourgeois literature, reflecting the victories of the bourgeois system over feudalism, was in the hey-day of capitalism capable of creating great works, have gone, never to return. Today a degeneration in subject matter, in talents, in authors and in heroes, is in progress.

Mortally afraid of the proletarian revolution, fascism is wreaking vengeance on civilisation, dragging men back to the darkest and most barbaric periods of human history, throwing on to the bonfires and barbarically destroying the works of some of the finest men humanity has produced.

A riot of mysticism, religious mania and pornography is characteristic of the decline and decay of bourgeois culture. The "celebrities" of that bourgeois literature which has sold its pen to capital are today thieves, detectives, prostitutes, pimps and gangsters.

All this is characteristic of the section of literature that seeks to conceal the decay of the bourgeois system, seeks in vain to prove that nothing has happened, that everything is as it should be "in the state of Denmark" and that there is as yet no decay in the capitalist structure. The bourgeois writers who feel the state of affairs more acutely are steeped in pessimism, uncertainty as to the morrow, praising the dark night, and lauding pessimism as the theory and practice of art. And it is only a small section - the most honest and far-sighted of the writers - who are seeking to find a way out along other paths, in other directions, linking their fate with the proletariat and its revolutionary struggle.

The proletariat of the capitalist countries is already forging its army of writers and artists - revolutionary writers, the representatives of whom we are glad to be able to welcome here today at the first Soviet Writers' Congress. The number of revolutionary writers in the capitalist countries is still small but it is growing and will grow with every day's sharpening of the class struggle, with the growing strength of the world proletarian revolution.

We are firmly convinced that the few dozen foreign comrades we have welcomed here constitute the kernel, the embryo, of a mighty army of proletarian writers to be created by the world proletarian revolution in foreign countries.



Such is the position in the capitalist countries. The opposite is true of our country. Our Soviet writer draws the material for his work, his subject matter and characters, his literary language and words, from the life and experience of the people of Dnieprostroi and Magnitostroi, from the heroic epic of the Chelyuskin expedition, from the experience of our collective farms, from the creative work now in full swing in the four corners of our land.

In our country the main heroes of a literary work are the active builders of the new life - men and women workers and collective farmers, Party and state workers, engineers, Komsomols, Pioneers. These are the main types and heroes of our Soviet literature. Our literature is imbued with enthusiasm and heroism. It is an optimistic literature, not, it should be said, in any purely physical sense of "inner" feeling. It is a fundamentally optimistic literature, since it is the literature of the rising proletarian class, today the only progressive and advanced class. Our Soviet literature is strong because it serves a new cause - the cause of socialist construction.

Comrade Stalin has called our writers, "engineers of the human soul". What does this mean? What obligations does such an appellation put upon you?

It means, in the first place, that you must know life to be able to depict it truthfully in artistic creations, to depict it neither "scholastically" nor lifelessly, nor simply as "objective reality", but rather as reality in its revolutionary development. The truthfulness and historical exactitude of the artistic image must be linked with the task of ideological transformation, of the education of the working people in the spirit of socialism. This method in fiction and literary criticism is what we call the method of socialist realism.

Our Soviet literature is not afraid of being called tendentious, for in the epoch of class struggle there is not and cannot be any classless, non-tendentious and "apolitical" literature.

And it seems to me that any and every Soviet writer may say to any dull-witted bourgeois, to any philistine or to any bourgeois writers who speak of the tendentiousness of our literature: "Yes, our Soviet literature is tendentious and we are proud of it, for our tendentiousness is to free the working people - and the whole of mankind - from the yoke of capitalist slavery."

To be an engineer of the human soul is to stand four-square on real life. And this in turn means a break with old-style romanticism, with the romanticism which depicted a non-existent life and non-existent heroes, drawing the reader away from the contradictions and shackles of life into an unrealisable and utopian world. Romanticism is not alien to our literature, a literature standing firmly on a materialist basis, but ours is a romanticism of a new type, revolutionary romanticism.

We say that socialist realism is the fundamental method of Soviet fiction and literary criticism, and this implies that revolutionary romanticism will appear as an integral part of any literary creation, since the whole life of our Party of the working class and its struggle, is a fusion of the hardest, most matter-of-fact practical work, with the greatest heroism and the vastest perspectives. The strength of our Party has always lain in the fact

that it has united and unites efficiency and practicality with broad vision, with an incessant forward striding and the struggle to build a communist society.

Soviet literature must be able to portray our heroes and to see our tomorrow. This will not be utopian since our tomorrow is being prepared by planned and conscious work today.

One cannot be an engineer of the human soul without skill in writing, and it is necessary to note that the writer's technique has many specific characteristics. You have many weapons at your disposal. Soviet literature has every opportunity of using all these weapons (genres, styles, forms, and methods of literary creation) in all their variety and fullness, in seeking to make use of all the finest that has been created in this sphere by all previous epochs. From this standpoint, mastery of technique and critical assimilation of the literary heritage of every epoch are tasks that must be executed if you are to become engineers of the human soul.

Comrades, the proletariat is the sole heir of the best in the treasure house of world literature, as in other spheres of material and spiritual culture. The bourgeoisie has squandered the literary heritage and we must bring it together again carefully, study it and then, having critically assimilated it, move forward.

To be an engineer of the human soul means fighting actively for craftsmanship in words, quality in work. Our literature is not yet meeting the demands of our epoch. The weaknesses in our literature reflect the fact that consciousness is lagging behind economic life, a state of affairs from which, obviously, our writers are not exempt. That is why unceasing work on educating themselves and improving their ideological weapons in the spirit of socialism are the indispensable conditions without which Soviet writers cannot change the consciousness of their readers and thus be engineers of the human soul.

We need great skill in our creative works and in this respect the help of Alexei Maximovich Gorky is invaluable - invaluable the help he gives the Party and the proletariat in the struggle for quality in literature, for craftsmanship in language.

Soviet writers have therefore all the necessary conditions for creating works worthy of our epoch, works from which contemporaries may learn, and works for future generations to take pride in.

All the conditions for Soviet literature to produce works worthy of the adult and mature masses have now been created. After all, it is only our literature which is able to be so closely linked with its readers and with the whole life of the working people as is the case in

the U.S.S.R. This present congress is particularly revealing. The congress was not prepared by writers alone. The whole country prepared it with them. In this preparatory work there were plainly apparent the true sympathy with which Soviet writers are surrounded by the Party, the workers and collective farm peasantry and also the demands the working class and the collective farmers make of Soviet writers.

In our country alone are literature and the writer raised to such heights.

Organise the work of your congress, and the future work of the Union of Soviet Writers, so that the work of the writers accords with the socialist victories achieved.

CREATE WORKS OF GREAT CRAFTSMANSHIP, OF PROFOUND IDEOLOGICAL AND ARTISTIC CONTENT.

BE THE MOST ACTIVE ORGANISERS OF THE REMOULDING OF PEOPLE'S CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE SPIRIT OF SOCIALISM.

STAND IN THE FRONT RANKS OF THE FIGHTERS FOR A CLASSLESS SOCIALIST SOCIETY!

The attention of workers in the field of the visual arts, as well as of all militants and activists concerned generally with the development of a proletarian socialist art, is drawn to the Appeal issued by the Provisional Committee of the Union of Socialist Artists which is enclosed with this issue.

In view of the total collapse of the various forms of pseudo-left avant-gardism which have for so long lorded it in the left movement, and the consequent pressing need to develop skilled cadres in this field so vital to socialist propaganda, RED FRONT feels sure that the Appeal of our socialist artists will find a ready and enthusiastic response amongst all art workers who genuinely wish to serve the cause of the working class and socialism.



# "THE LANDLORDS' CHARTER"

At present there are three types of rent for unfurnished dwellings rented from private landlords:

- 1) Controlled rents, fixed at twice the 1956 gross value; these rents apply only to lower-valued dwellings still occupied by the same family as in 1957;
- 2) Unregistered "regulated" rents, fixed by "private agreement" between landlord and tenant but officially (though rarely in practice) "frozen" at the level of December 1965; and
- 3) Registered "fair rents", fixed by Rent Officers (or, on appeal, by Rent Assessment Committees).

Tenants in "furnished" accommodation (the definition of which is conveniently vague) are uncontrolled, although on the application of the tenant a Rent Tribunal may reduce the rent and grant security of tenure for up to six months. In view of the shortage of accommodation, most tenants pay for "unfurnished" accommodation the rent demanded by the landlord. Of tenants who appeal to tribunals, 80% are no longer in occupation of the premises concerned a year later.

The fact that the rents of "furnished" dwellings are, in practice, uncontrolled has resulted in many formerly unfurnished dwellings being converted to "furnished" in recent years. In London in 1964 18.4% of privately rented dwellings were "furnished"; by 1969 the proportion had risen to 24%.

In the eighteen years from 1951 to 1969 the number of dwellings rented from private landlords declined from 6.2 million to 2.9 million. The latest report on rents, that of the Francis Committee, has been dominated by the idea that the primary function of a rents policy is to check, and if possible, reverse this trend by making it more "profitable" for landlords to stay in business.

The committee concerned, set up by the Labour Government and headed by Hugh Francis Q.C., consisted of three lawyers, one surveyor and one layman - a Labour Party alderman who disagreed with the majority findings and issued a minority report.

The principal recommendations of the Francis Committee, which were accepted in

March by the government, were:

- 1) Rents of dwellings in new buildings should be completely free of control;
- 2) All "controlled" rent dwellings should be transferred to the "unregistered regulated rents" category, i.e. should be made the subject of "private agreement" between landlord and tenant except on appeal to a Rents Officer;
- 3) The official "freezing" of unregistered "regulated" rents (already honoured more in the breach than in the observance) should be abolished;
- 4) Rent Tribunals should be replaced by Rent Officers;
- 5) Rent Tribunals (or their successors) should have the right to increase rents of "unfurnished" accommodation when granting a period of security of tenure;
- 6) Security of tenure (other than that of up to six months granted by a Rent Tribunal or its successor) should not be extended to "unfurnished" dwellings; and
- 7) Dwellings let to students should be completely free of rent control and without security of tenure.

It is interesting to note that the Greve Report on "Homelessness in London", submitted to the Francis Committee as evidence prior to its publication in May, 1971, was kept from the Committee by its Chairman.

## THE NEW "POOR LAW"

The Family Incomes Supplement Act 1971 gives a state grant, called a "family income supplement" to any family whose income is below a certain level but whose chief breadwinner is in full-time employment.

The system involves the fixing of an arbitrary "poverty line", which assumes that a family of husband, wife and one child with a gross income of £15.00 is just above the "poverty line". Thus, to obtain a family income supplement of 0.20 a week, the gross income of a family consisting of husband, wife and children must be £15.85 or less.

It should be noted that the family income supplement is not intended to bring the income of families below the "poverty line" up to the "poverty line"; on the contrary, the supplement is fixed at half the difference between the family's income and the income level of the "poverty line". This is necessary, it is argued, in order to give an incentive to a worker whose family is below the "poverty line" to work harder and longer. It is believed that 160,000 working class families will, if they undergo a means test, qualify for family income supplements; of these 54,000 are fatherless families.

To find a system of subsidies to wages of this kind, it is necessary to go back a hundred and fifty years to the notorious Speenhamland system introduced in 1795, by which the wages of farm workers in southern England were supplemented up to a certain level from the poor-rates. Its result, of course - and this is the intended effect of the Family Income Supplements Act of 1971 - was to encourage employers to pay low wages, and to pass part of the "burden" of wages from the employer to the community.

It should also be remembered that the Speenhamland system led directly to the farm workers revolt of 1830.

## FROM SWINGS TO ROUNDABOUTS

In April 1971 Desmond Donnelly, former Labour M.P. for Penobscot, joined the Conservative Party.

In the same month Richard Marsh, former Labour Minister of Transport, was appointed Chairman of British Rail by the Conservative government.

Perhaps a new development in "pairing" ?



# THE RED FRONT MOVEMENT

There should now be no doubt remaining in the mind of any reasonably developed and politically conscious member of the aspiring socialist movement in Britain but that the period since the installation of the Tory Government last year has witnessed a catastrophic collapse in the level of spontaneous class militancy, and even of the most basic forms of activity, revealed by the revisionist and trotskyite organisations and groups. For the past 25 years or more, these "socialist" and "communist" organisations have dominated the working class movement, and the sum outcome of all the tons of paper, all the high-flown promises and assurances of easy victories "just around the corner" has been a series of betrayals - on every fundamental issue from wages and living standards to internationalist solidarity - which has made the British "left" movement a laughing stock and a byword for corruption throughout the world.

But now the pigeons are truly coming home to roost. For the lowering climate of intensified oppression and rising class struggle which is now looming makes for uncomfortable weather for these political lounge-lizards. So now - CPGB revisionists, trotskyites and maoist "left" revisionists alike - are scurrying to their funk-holes to await a kinder season. Where today are the rabble-rousing, demagogic speeches, the false optimistic forecasts, the promised "mass movements" of "solidarity", for "peace, democracy and socialism" which but a few months previously were to be heard on every hand? Where now the loud trumpeting of infantile petty-bourgeois "protest" which flourished stridently in the fetid hothouse of Wilson's permissive Britain? Having fulfilled their diversionary and divisive role of provocation, with the first crack of the Tory ringmaster's whip, all have bolted for the wings, from whence - as with the much vaunted campaign of opposition to the Industrial Relations Bill proclaimed by the TUC at the beginning of the year, and to which even the pygmy Gollan attempted to add his avuncular tones - they hope to conduct their wordy battles in an imagined greater security.

Once again, then, the stench of class betrayal hangs thick in the air - that same stench which polluted the political atmosphere of 1931. Today, monopoly capitalism is moving at breakneck speed into an even more devastating whirlwind of crises, more irreconcilable than ever before - and, now as then, the vultures of reaction are sharpening their claws, ready to swoop on the corpse of the traditional reformist-constitutional labour movement, ready to tear from it such pickings as the fascist soldiery of the corporate state will leave them after their monopoly-capitalist masters have enjoyed the lion's share.

We must ask, however: who will be the Ramsay Macdonald of 1971? For the Labour Party is now virtually exposed as a party representing monopoly-capital within the working-class movement - to be precise, that section of monopoly-capital which is dependent upon and looks towards the U.S., as distinct from the West European, monopolies. A little reflection on the above record of betrayal already, at this early stage, perpetrated against the struggle to defeat the Industrial Relations Bill shows that we have to look further to the "left" for our answer: he will, in fact, be found in the whorehouse of modern revisionism and trotskyism, which is increasingly being run jointly by Messrs. Foot, Gollan, Healey, Jordan and Birch of corrupt pseudo-left social-democracy. To expose, isolate and ultimately drive out these new-style class traitors, whose aim it is to emulate Ramsey Macdonald's inception of the National Govt.'s of the '30s by assisting in the operation to rescue labour reformism through erecting a new type of "left" labour party wearing a more acceptable "militant" mask is therefore a primary task of all principled socialists and aspiring Marxist-Leninists. The question, however, remains; how can this aim best be achieved?

Here, the entire experience of the working class in struggle demonstrates over and over again that political propaganda alone, however skilful or hard-hitting its polemics, will not alone suffice to cleanse the Augean stables of revisionism and trotskyism. Still less will the methods of opportunist demagoguery suffice any longer to whip up a short-lived militancy on insecure and unstable emotional-populist foundations. In fact, nothing short of



the mobilisation in struggle of the most advanced and politically conscious levels of the working class, the potential rank-and-file cadre force of the future Marxist-Leninist vanguard party and embryo of the future mass Red Front, the base of the socialist revolution in Britain, and the unleashing of the still unconscious and unrealised, but for that very reason pent up, revolutionary energies of the working class and working people can suffice for this task. The most fundamental question of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary strategy and tactics is: how can this most effectively, most rapidly, most powerfully and in the most principled way be achieved ?

In capitalistically underdeveloped colonial-type or newly-emerged countries in which bourgeois or national-democratic demands have either not yet been won or else only recently been acquired, and in which the relatively early stage of development of capitalism results in a relatively large petty-bourgeois class (primarily peasants), it is the alliance of the working class with this overwhelmingly numerous petty-bourgeoisie which gives the proletarian-socialist revolution - when finally the conditions for its onset out of the preceding national-democratic stage are mature - its mass base. In such a moment of revolutionary transformation, it is the bourgeois stage of the revolution which lends the predominant weight of struggle to the revolutionary movement directed against a mainly external enemy, imperialism - a struggle which can unite all oppressed classes and strata increasingly under the leadership of the young working class until the national bourgeoisie betrays the revolution, as it ultimately and inevitably must. Then the overall conditions are ripe for the working class to assume the leadership of the revolutionary forces and to take all necessary steps to transform the national-democratic into the proletarian-socialist stage of the revolution.

But in capitalistically developed, imperialist countries this path is not possible, amongst other reasons because the petty-bourgeoisie has already been obliterated through the process of class polarisation, and the working class has become the overwhelming majority of the population. As against this, however, the working class tends to become very heavily stratified and its economically better-paid sections tend to become corrupted in the atmosphere of social-imperialism which develops when monopoly-capital attempts to bribe off the top stratum of the labour aristocracy and installs it as a part - and an increasingly important part - of the political forces of the bourgeoisie. In such countries, of which Britain is perhaps the most polarised and stratified, because it is the oldest, the only possible course of development towards the proletarian-socialist revolution is one which bases itself on the need to build, under the overall guidance and leadership of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party, a mass revolutionary front which is sufficiently all-embracing, sufficiently highly organised, sufficiently disciplined and integrated with the Marxist-Leninist vanguard and sufficiently flexibly deployed throughout all levels of the working class as to enable a process leading to and culminating in the elevation of the working class to the position of the leading, decisive class in society to begin to develop. Our fundamental question posed above therefore divides into two more specific, concrete and interrelated questions, the one positive, the other negative: how to incept, develop and lead a process of objective, spontaneous class struggle in such a way that it culminates at a certain stage in the emergence of those two essential components of any successful proletarian-socialist revolutionary movement in a developed monopoly-capitalist country: firstly of a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party, at least in nucleus; and, secondly, the construction, level by level, section by section, of the mass base of the revolution, the Red Front, consisting of highly organised, disciplined and united independent organs of struggle. Both these related components have to be able to lift up once again the besmirched banner of militant class struggle and revolution at the point where the revisionists of right, "left" and "centre" had let it fall in the mud, and of raising it to new heights of scientific, Marxist-Leninist leadership.

Clearly, this process and its outcome depends to a considerable degree upon the objective maturity and level of intensity of the spontaneous class struggle, arising as a consequence of the attempts of monopoly-capital to solve its crisis at the expense of the working masses. But, conversely, spontaneous class militancy alone can never develop of itself into a disciplined, highly organised and integrated revolutionary mass movement.

In a situation in which the revolutionary vanguard of the working class has been liquidated from within and the broad working masses rendered leaderless, how can the traditionally predominant stranglehold of the reformists, the social-pacifists and their "left"-labour, ultra-or "left"-revisionist or trotskyite sycophants be decisively broken



and the process of growth of the revolutionary mass movement, the Red Front, be begun? These tasks in themselves sum up the entire content of the struggle against modern revisionism and trotskyism, and the colossal difficulties which remain to be overcome before the essential tasks of conscious revolutionisation of the working masses in the developed countries can begin are themselves the concentrated product of 30 years of domination of the working class by these selfsame concealed representatives of monopoly-capital of one brand or another.

Two further questions thus arise, of absolutely-fundamental import for the whole future revolutionary proletarian movement in Britain: through what specific forms of class organisation for struggle can the revolutionary mass Red Front be given its essential foundation? And through what precise methods of struggle can the paralysing grip of the "labour lieutenants of capital" be destroyed and the mass of rank-and-file trade unionists and other class conscious workers be liberated for fulfilling some positive role, at whatever level, in the Red Front?

We have only to refer to the M.L.O.B.'s Programmatic Manifesto to find the answer to these two questions. For there, one of the fundamental components comprising M.L.O.B.'s theoretical and programmatic position is that which states the need for a revolutionary mass front of the working class and working people to be built out of the present welter of semi-oppositionist, completely spontaneous local organs of struggle which have sprung up in all main centres of industry as a result of the now complete betrayal of the right-wing trade union leaders. It is further stated there that the grip of the larger reformist unions, as of the Labour Party and revisionist "Communist Party" can only be broken on the basis of the growth of new, militant organs of struggle at every level which will be fully independent of the framework of betrayal erected and led by the "labour lieutenants of capital" and which will grow through a process of winning the support of workers at all levels of class consciousness beginning with the politically most advanced and extending layer by layer downwards and outwards until finally every stratum and every industrial section is playing its part in the generation of overall proletarian class power.

The other strategically vital factor in this process of revolutionisation concerns the need to mobilise the most advanced workers ideologically and theoretically. A part of this mobilisation relates to the need to smash the philosophical foundations of social democracy and reformism, whilst at the same time taking all conscious steps to develop and train skilled and fully competent theoreticians and practitioners of the Marxist-Leninist science of proletarian-socialist revolution. This, of course, forms perhaps the most important single sphere of activity and leadership in struggle of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party.

We see, therefore, that the task of building the first highest-level nuclei of the future revolutionary Red Front is second in importance only to the task of building the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party itself, - and in practice the two are so inseparably linked together as to proceed hand in hand. Recognising the need for the Red Front to be built layer by layer, sector by sector, from the highest and most advanced leading and inception nucleus downwards and outwards until it embraces the vast majority of working people organised in a closely integrated network of independent organs of struggle penetrating into every level of the working class and the fabric of monopoly capitalist society, and linked at every such level with the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party, the general staff of the revolution, M.L.O.B. has from the moment of its foundation sought to bring into being such an inception nucleus. Now, these efforts have born fruit as ultimately they were certain to. For, at a meeting held on July 13th, 1971 the

#### PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED FRONT MOVEMENT

was formed, consisting of workers, working youth and revolutionary students and intellectuals.

The fundamental role of the RED FRONT MOVEMENT within the structure of proletarian-socialist forces in Britain now at an embryonic stage

of development is a dual and complementary one: firstly, it represents the inception moment of birth of the future revolutionary RED FRONT of the working class and working people, the mass base of the socialist revolution; and secondly it functions as a training school in the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, the aim of which is to equip the most advanced, militant and incorruptible elements within the rank-and-file of the RED FRONT MOVEMENT as a whole with a Marxist-Leninist understanding and the ability to apply that understanding to any situation which might arise in the course of revolutionary class leadership in struggle. In this way it acts to prepare these most advanced cadres of the RED FRONT for eventual candidate membership of the nucleus vanguard party, M.L.O.B., itself.

And so ends an entire chapter in the history of M.L.O.B. - a chapter that has revealed in full measure all the tremendous self-sacrifice and devotion to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat of which Marxist-Leninists are capable. This history has also been marked at every stage by all the despicable slander, disruption and sabotage of which those are capable who, in the last analysis, have faith only in the fleshpots of the bourgeoisie and their own ability to sell to the bourgeoisie for the highest price their capacity to organise the betrayal of the proletariat's revolutionary cause whilst disguising that betrayal under the cloak of "Marxism".

With the first beginnings of a fundamental change in the objective situation in all the major imperialist powers and a consequent stirring of militant class feeling, the spontaneous generator of a future revolutionary consciousness heralding the onset of a period of intensifying class struggle in the course of which social democracy and reformism will be swept away for ever, we can now understand the sorry flight into oblivion of our heroes of the revisionist and trotskyite parties and organisations. Even at the time when they are frothing most volubly at the mouth over the loss of pelf and privileges which the Industrial Relations Bill, the forerunner of the future fully-fledged corporate state, will cause them, they are preparing behind the scenes for a retreat into out and out betrayal and finally of collaboration with the repressive organs of the corporate state themselves.

Even whilst the revisionist and trotskyite leaders are preparing for their own demise, the coming period will witness the steady growth of the RED FRONT MOVEMENT, in the revolutionary militancy and discipline of its organs, the quality of its cadres at all levels and the influence it wields amongst all strata of the working class beginning with the most advanced, until it becomes the main vehicle of the future socialist revolution, just as the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party becomes its engine and brain.

We reprint below the PROVISIONAL DECLARATION OF THE RED FRONT MOVEMENT, which was adopted unanimously at the above-mentioned meeting of the Provisional Committee held on July 13th 1971. A Drafting Commission is, however, currently at work producing a full policy Manifesto as well as a draft Constitution and Rules, and these documents will be presented to the Founding Conference, to be held at the earliest possible date in the future.

In the meantime, the Provisional Committee holds responsibility for developing the work of building the Red Front movement, and a comprehensive programme of activities, culminating in the Founding Conference, has been adopted.



RED FRONT

This includes the following :-

two simultaneous courses in the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, in West and South London respectively, with M.L.O.B. tutors and based on the M.L.O.B. syllabus, will begin in the near future.

a fortnightly series of Discussion Meetings on selected questions of urgent or topical significance to the working class movement will begin in the near future. Both the above will be held on alternate fortnights (see Announcement for further details).

the establishment of a RED FRONT CADRES SCHOOL, at which training in such vitally necessary subjects as the History of the British and World Working Class Movement, the principles, strategy and tactics of the revolutionary mass united front (RED FRONT) and the role and tasks of the Red Front cadre in the broad working

class movement will be studied, in addition to practical skills essential to every working class militant, such as public speaking, chairmanship, trade union procedure, etc.

mass work to establish a Union of Unemployed Workers and a Union of Socialist Artists (see separate announcements in this issue of Red Front)

The Political Bureau of the M.L.O.B. calls upon all members, supporters and sympathisers to join in the tasks of building the RED FRONT MOVEMENT into an active, disciplined and democratically centralised revolutionary nucleus of the future mass RED FRONT, with a developing high level of scientific revolutionary consciousness, under the overall guidance and leadership of the M.L.O.B.

We publish below the Provisional Declaration of the Red Front Movement: -

PROVISIONAL DECLARATION

The Provisional Committee of the Red Front Movement, recognising the fundamental truths that a socialist society can only be achieved through the revolutionary action of the working class, and that such a socialist revolution can only be mobilised and led to victory by a revolutionary vanguard party armed with scientific theory, Marxism-Leninism, and standing at the head of a powerful revolutionary mass movement of the working class,

pledges itself to commence the long and complex tasks of erecting these essential organs of the future socialist revolution by adopting as its primary aims:

- a) the establishment of a leading nucleus of militant, class conscious workers and working youth, the RED FRONT MOVEMENT, which will take in hand the building, in sector after sector of the broad working class movement of those independent base organs of struggle, the foundation of a future revolutionary mass movement of the working class which alone can serve to break the decades-long stranglehold of corrupt reformist ideology and practice and develop the long dormant but always potential revolutionary energies of the British working class;
- b) the development of a comprehensive programme of training in the scientific theory of socialist revolution, Marxism-Leninism, and the fundamental principles of revolutionary class leadership such as will equip the most advanced members of the Red Front Movement with the qualities fundamental to a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary cadre, and such as are necessary to merit adoption as a Candidate Member of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party or its inception nucleus.

The Provisional Committee of the Red Front Movement holds that, at the present historical juncture and stage of development in the class struggle in Britain, the sole such inception nucleus of the future British Marxist-Leninist vanguard party is the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain, since it is this organisation alone which has made a principled Marxist-Leninist analysis of the class struggle in Britain and has sought to apply that analysis through a comprehensive programme leading to the victory of the socialist revolution, to contemporary British monopoly-capitalist society. This Provisional Committee will therefore work tirelessly and in close fraternal association under the overall guidance of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain for the achievement of the above aims.

The Provisional Committee,  
RED FRONT MOVEMENT

PUZZLED MAOISTS AND MEMBERS OF THE US-CHINA FRIENDSHIP SOCIETY will find all their questions concerning the "unexpected" Nixon-Mao rapprochement answered in:

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN CHINA

a Compendium of documents issued by the Central Committee of the M. L.O.B. on the Situation in the People's Republic of China. Available from Editorial address: Price 28p (including postage)



# **CHANGE OF ADDRESS:** THE EDITORIAL ADDRESS OF

RED FRONT, and the MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN is now the following:

26, CAMBRIDGE ROAD, ILFORD, ESSEX, ENGLAND

TELEPHONE ENQUIRIES AND APPOINTMENTS: 01-703 0561

## **RED FRONT MOVEMENT**

(PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE)

### AIMS

- (1) To function as the inceptive nucleus of the future revolutionary mass front of the British working class; and
- (2) the broad training school in the science, strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle of the working class which will equip the most advanced and politically conscious workers with that minimum grasp of Marxism-Leninism, the science of socialist revolution, necessary for membership of the emerging and developing Marxist-Leninist vanguard party.

### PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES LEADING UP TO FOUNDING CONFERENCE :

\* Courses in the Foundations of Marxism-Leninism:

West London Area

Fortnightly every Tuesday  
commencing Tuesday August 31st  
1971

Details from The Secretary.  
Tutor: Cde. Mike Baker

South London Area

Fortnightly every Thursday  
commencing Thursday August 24th  
1971

AT: 18 Camberwell Church Street 8 p.m.  
Tutor: Cde. Bernard Charnley

\* Red Front Discussion Circles:

Fortnightly. Details from the Secretary : , Commencing September 7th 1971 8.p.m.

\* Mass Work : Union of Unemployed Workers, Union of Socialist Artists  
(see separate announcements in this issue )

ALL DETAILS FROM:

Provisional Secretary,  
Red Front Movement,  
Cde. Bernard Charnley,  
18 Rodenhurst Road,  
London S.W.4.

The aim of the MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN is to build a Marxist-Leninist Party of the working class in Britain which can lead the British working people to bring about the revolutionary overthrow of the present capitalist state, establish a People's Republic based on the rule of the working class, and build a socialist society based on planned production and the common ownership of the means of production.

Applications for candidate membership should be addressed to the MLOB, 26 Cambridge Road, Ilford, Essex.