

FORUM

FOR MARXIST - LENINIST

STRUGGLE

No. 9. November, 1964.

PRICE 3^d.

CHINA'S NUCLEAR TEST.

China's first successful nuclear test on October 16 fills all lovers of peace and socialism with the same relief which they felt when they heard that the Soviet Union had an atom bomb some 16 years ago. Socialist states, constantly threatened by imperialism, must be able to defend themselves. As long as the Soviet Union was animated by true proletarian internationalism China could depend on her nuclear deterrent. But the growth of revisionist ideology meant the weakening of fraternal solidarity. Technical help was withdrawn and assistance in developing nuclear technology stopped at U.S. insistence. Soviet capitulation to U.S. demands reached rock bottom last year when the Partial Test Ban Treaty was signed.

Far from saving the world from the threat of nuclear war the treaty actually created greater danger by confusing people and lulling them into a false sense of security. The U.S.A. continued to manufacture nuclear weapons and increase its military potential so that Johnson could boast, on the very eve of the Chinese test, of American nuclear superiority being "greater than the combined might of all the nations" with more than 1000 atomic missiles and 1,100 long-range bombers "ready for instant reply". U.S. nuclear-armed ships have been trying to blackmail the peoples of East Asia for the last 15 years and recently have penetrated into South Asian waters. Any country that wants to liberate itself from imperialism is at the mercy of American nuclear bombers and submarines.

The Daily Worker, criticising China's nuclear test, describes the nuclear strength of the Soviet Union as "sufficient to shield the Socialist camp". (Oct. 17) But was it much of a shield when the Democratic

Republic of Vietnam was bombed by the U.S. during the Gulf of Tonkin incident? And what of the ever-increasing Russian Military help to the capitalist government of India which attacked China? No, if the socialist world had to depend on the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union it could not feel too secure. That is why China's possession of nuclear weapons is such a source of relief. Here is a land that has a clear socialist line and now has the capability of defending it, and all thanks to its own efforts - self-reliance to develop its socialist economy and the wherewithal to defend it.

Chinese nuclear weapons strengthen all those countries fighting for their independence from imperialist bondage. China has proved herself a staunch ally of all national liberation movements. Scorning American nuclear blackmail she has supported the peoples of the world in their struggles. No wonder that messages of congratulations and delight have been pouring in from Vietnam, Cuba, the Congo, Indonesia, Zanzibar - and indeed from all parts of the world where the imperialist roots of war are clearly understood. Neither is it surprising that the imperialists are furious at this latest manifestation of socialist strength. And joining in the chorus of disapproval are the various "running dogs" - Tito, Ikeda, Shastri - who submit to American domination but denounce socialist China.

Most important of all, the possession of nuclear weapons has not altered China's Marxist line on the question of armaments. The atom bomb remains a 'paper tiger'. The Chinese Government Statement of October, 16, 1964 used Mao's famous phrase and reiterates the superiority of people over weapons. "We believe in the people. It is the people who decide the outcome of a war, and not any weapon. The destiny of China is decided by the Chinese people, and the destiny of the world by the peoples of the world, and not by the nuclear weapons". Socialist states cannot regard nuclear weapons as a form of intimidation or blackmail. The Chinese repudiate the brandishing of missiles and the empty threats associated with the late Soviet Prime Minister.

China's atom bomb strengthens peace because it reinforces the Chinese Government's efforts to organise a conference of

of the heads of all states for the prohibition and destruction of all nuclear weapons. Throughout their campaign to make people recognise the dangers inherent in the Partial Test Ban Agreement the Chinese emphasised the need to concentrate on nuclear weapons rather than on nuclear testing. Changes in nuclear strategy have enabled the U.S. to make use of the Agreement to enhance its own nuclear power thus proving Chinese criticism against the Treaty. What is needed therefore is the determination of ordinary people throughout the world to outlaw nuclear weapons. Far from criticising China's atomic test all must intensify their efforts, especially genuine socialists, in support of the Chinese proposal for a world conference which will isolate the imperialists and expose their protestations of peace.

L. P. C.

ANOTHER COAT OF PAINT ?

Without any warning on Thursday 15th October, came the news of Khrushchev's removal from office. However, it is clear from the statements made so far that the line of the C. P. S. U. from the 20th CONGRESS onwards still stands. Very little can be said at this stage but Comrades should study statements issued by a number of European Parties including of course, Gollan's article in the Daily Worker of Saturday 24th October.

It is clear from this article that the revisionists in Britain are firmly wedded to the line of the British Road to Socialism irrespective of what may or may not happen in the Soviet Union or elsewhere. The "new" situation does not alter one iota the struggle against revisionism in its many forms. The struggle for Marxism must continue. The exposure must go on and for us in Britain this means the exposure of The British Road to Socialism and the working out of a revolutionary program. So far the events in the Soviet Union appear to be nothing more than manoeuvres and as such are not helpful for the preservation of real Communist Unity.

CAIRO CONFERENCE OF NON-ALIGNED NATIONS.

All Marxist-Leninists in Britain will be overjoyed at the conference of 47 non-aligned nations, which took place in Cairo from 5-10 October, since this conference took the struggle against imperialism and for world peace, a bold and confident stride forward. As the discussions proceeded it became clearer and clearer that the vast majority

of nations involved have come to recognise that non-alignment is quite impossible without waging a sharp struggle against imperialism in all its forms. Why is this so? Simply, that imperialism, either by direct military action or economic penetration, seeks to dominate both colonial and newly independent countries. Therefore any country (e. g. India and Yugoslavia) which fails to put up a fierce resistance to this domination, inevitably becomes more and more enmeshed, more and more subservient to imperialism, chiefly US imperialism. Such a country soon loses any claim to be non-aligned and progressively begins to reflect imperialist political attitudes. Both India and Yugoslavia (who were completely isolated at the conference) provide many rich examples in their open support for the US, for the Moscow Test Ban Treaty, and in their opposition to China. President Tito did his best to lull the delegates by claiming that "only a few strongholds of colonialism remain", and he advised the people suffering under colonialism to pin their hopes on international detente. Tito fought hard for the line of "active and peaceful co-existence among peoples and states", making no distinction between those who oppress and those who are oppressed. Shastri backed Tito and added sharp anti-China attacks.

But for the great majority of the delegates struggle against imperialism was actively supported as an essential condition of genuine non-alignment. It is perhaps true that Soekarno made the most thorough, all-round condemnation of imperialism, at the same time clearly pointing out some important ways to fight it. Soekarno stressed, for example, the breaking of all links with the old order of domination as a pre-condition for democratic advance and economic progress. He advised the peoples to rely on their own resources and most emphatically rejected any suggestion of peaceful co-existence under the yoke of colonialism. Not only Soekarno, but by far the majority of the delegates reiterated the necessity for the struggle against imperialism and all forms of colonialism, and each speaker gave his own special experience and ideas about how to conduct the struggle. Many delegates brought out the fact that a resolute fight against imperialism was a direct contribution to world peace. Nasser urged that the first landmark on the road to peace should be the liquidation of imperialism, and Ben Bella said, "To realise peace it is necessary first of all

to eliminate completely colonialism, nep-colonialism and imperialism."

On the question of how to fight, Nkrumah said, "The only way it seems, to fight and eradicate neo-colonialism is by armed revolution and armed struggle. We cannot co-exist with imperialism." This was because of "ultra-right trends in neo-colonialism which I would designate as fascist imperialism". The aspect of armed struggle was emphasised by Roberto Holden, representative of Angola, when he pointed out that "The time has long gone by when one discussed in Africa the legitimate character of this or that form of struggle. We are not making war for the sake of making war. Armed struggle has been imposed upon us".

Many delegates, when speaking of peaceful co-existence, specifically based themselves on the 10 Principles of the 1955 Bandoeng Conference, which as everyone knows, China initiated and has firmly supported ever since. Most of the delegates emphatically stated that peaceful co-existence did not apply to relations between oppressed and oppressor nations.

The non-aligned nations' conference in fact witnessed a struggle between two lines, and resulted in a resounding victory for the line of all-out struggle against imperialism and for world peace. It represented a most heartening strengthening of solidarity of the peoples against all forms of oppression. The imperialist camp is as a result facing greater odds in its hopeless task.

Readers of this article may be wondering why a straightforward summary of the Cairo conference should be submitted to Forum and what significance it has for the anti-revisionist struggle. The answer is simple: nowhere in the British press has such an account appeared. On the contrary, the Observer (11.10.64), for fear of the truth being known, tried ever so hard to paint a completely different picture. Under the headline "NEUTRALS REJECT CALL FOR ANTI-WEST POLICY", it took the line of trying to make out that anti-imperialism, led by Soekarno, was in a minority and received a setback. It tried to pretend that even Soekarno had important differences with China, and that he only received support from Guinea and Mali "at times". Whereas the Observer claimed, "The fight against Soekarno was led by President Nasser.. Tito.. Shastri.. Bandaranaike"! Of course one can well understand the dilemma of the Observer, representing British imperialist interests. It must at all costs try to isolate Soekarno, in view of active British preparations for war against Indonesia over the territories in North Borneo. The Observer also claimed that "Those

leaders who believe peaceful co-existence is essential not only for the great powers but also in the relationship between them and the 'developing countries' (!) won the day. Making use of the imperialist fairytale that China is against peaceful co-existence, the Observer tried to make out that those delegates who spoke in favour of genuine peaceful co-existence were speaking against China !

One is by no means surprised that the bourgeois press should dabble in such dire distortions, but one might well be surprised that the Worker should aid and abet the bourgeois press in the following ways:

- (1) conference reports never even made the front page,
- (2) there was no editorial comment or feature article,
- (3) the conference was reported in 436 words (!), comprising three short items.
- (4) quotations were selected in such a way as to emphasise the Yugoslav and Indian view of co-existence and to play down anti-imperialist struggle and solidarity,
- (5) on Saturday, 10th October, no report on the conference but a report under the headline "TREATMENT 'INHUMAN' - TSHOMBE",
- (6) prominence was given to a Shastri anti-China speech, without comment,
- (7) Soekarno's speech was not even mentioned, nor even the fact that he attended the conference,
- (8) the only three names reported in connection with the conference were Nasser, Shastri (twice), Tshombe (several times).

The truth is that the Cairo conference was not only a defeat for imperialism but a resounding defeat for Khrushchev's revisionism, which is faithfully echoed by John Gollan and company in Britain. The countries of Africa and Asia are engaged in revolutionary struggle against imperialism; revisionism has become the servant of imperialism.

DEEDS NOT WORDS.

Communist Party candidates stood in 36 constituencies in the General Election and it was claimed that these candidates were "fighting for the real alternative policy for Britain". But this hollow claim is shown up as completely meaningless immed-

ately we focus our attention on three key constituencies, Southall, Smethwick and Perry Barr.

Why were these three constituencies particularly vital ? Simply because in these three places there were candidates putting forward outright fascist policies centring around the question of immigration.

In Southall, Labour retained the seat but the new and alarming factor here was the fact that J. E. Bean of the British National Party (Fascist) polled no less than 3,410 votes. Leaving aside the fact that this is a pretty solid vote, the question naturally arises, "why was there no Communist Party candidate to rouse the widest possible sections of the people in Southall to oppose Fascism and racism ?" In Smethwick we are all familiar with the facts. Peter Griffiths who stood as Tory candidate made his campaign a racist one and it could surely have been anticipated that Patrick Gordon-Walker, notoriously right-wing, would raise no opposition. In fact, Labour Party accepts the Immigration Act.

Where was the Communist Party ? Here, surely, was a constituency to fight ? Here are some of the most exploited workers in Britain, i. e. those from overseas. Here are exploited British workers who desperately need a straightforward class explanation of their own exploitation and difficulties in terms which prevent any section of the ruling class from driving the racist wedge between them and their fellow workers from overseas.

In Perry Barr, the Tory Party won the seat from Labour. The Tories in Perry Barr centred their campaign around racism and having done this issued a leaflet which said that if Labour gets in there would be 300,000 more immigrants in Britain. Thus they attempted to stimulate still further the anti-immigrant vote in Perry Barr.

What must be noted is that in Perry Barr the Communist Party put up a candidate in 1959 but not in 1964. There was no Communist to fight the Fascist candidate in Perry Barr. The first two examples are bad enough as evasions of responsibilities. The last, in Perry Barr, is a deliberate walk out on the revolutionary task.

And yet it was in Southall, Smethwick, and Perry Barr that a battle could have been mounted against the vile tactics of the ruling class.

The cases of Southall, Smethwick and Perry Barr reveal what is often concealed behind the revisionist theories of parliamentarism. When it comes to the point they walked out on all "contraversial" issues. Within the electoral struggle itself, the Communist Party leadership has abandoned revolutionary struggle in favour of attempting to get into Parliament.

(A much fuller analysis of the general election results will appear in next months FORUM.)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

THE PARTY CAN BE TRANSFORMED

One of the basic points made in the pamphlet "Left Opportunism in the Anti-Revisionist Struggle in Britain in 1964" is that the Marxist-Leninist Party required in Britain must necessarily be a new organisation, since it is impossible to transform the Communist Party of Great Britain into a Marxist-Leninist Party.

The authors of the pamphlet correctly expose McCreery as a left-opportunist, with whom Marxist-Leninists differ not merely on tactical questions, but on vital matters of principle. Yet, despite their criticism of McCreery's thesis that a Party is the image of its leadership, on this key question their conclusion is identical with that of McCreery. They differ from him only on the tactical point - - a new Party now or later !

According to both McCreery and the authors of the pamphlet, once there is a majority of revisionists in the leadership of a Party, they are irremovable; the name, the publications, the assets of that Party are lost to the working class at least until the triumph of Socialism.

Yet it is a matter of historic fact that at least until 1953 a majority of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were Marxist-Leninists. This Party has, however, been transformed into one in which a majority of the leadership are revisionists. However, according to the authors of the pamphlet, such a transformation can take place only in a reactionary direction, never in a progressive direction. A majority of Marxist-Leninists in the leadership of a Party can be removed, but a majority of revisionists in the leadership of a Party is irremovable ! This is not Marxism, but defeatist meta physics !

At the present time the revisionists do not dominate the Communist Party primarily by the use of undemocratic manoeuvres against a rebellious membership. They dominate the Party because the majority of the membership accept revisionism as Marxism-Leninism, and there can be no correct way forward which does not recognise this fact.

One of the key tasks of Marxist-Leninists, therefore, is so to organise their political work as to lead the membership of the Party (who did not join the Party in order to betray Socialism and the interests of the working class) to realise from their own experience that the present policies and leaders of their Party are doing just that.

At a certain stage in this struggle, a Marxist-Leninist Party will come into being. It may come into being in one of two ways: either the present Communist Party will be transformed into a Marxist-Leninist Party by the ejection of revisionism and the revisionists at the hands of a politically conscious, angry membership; or a new Party will have to be formed.

If the second course has to be adopted, the assets of the Communist Party will be left in the hands of a revisionist rump, and the situation will be confused nationally and internationally by the existence of two parties, both claiming to be Marxist-Leninist. It follows that the first course is the more desirable of the two ways in which a Marxist-Leninist Party may be formed and it is this course which must be aimed for.

Of course, the revisionists will intensify undemocratic manoeuvres as they see their influence declining. But such measures further assist in the political education of the membership. There is no mysterious law of history which predetermines, as McCreery and the authors of the pamphlet hold, that the revisionists will inevitably succeed in preventing a democratic change in the policy and leadership of the Party. Their success or failure depends, not on their subjective desires, but on objective conditions; and the correctness of our political work in this next period is a vital factor in determining these objective conditions.

To say now, at the beginning of the organised struggle against revisionism in this country, that the revisionists must inevitably retain their hold over the Communist Party, is to say that inner-Party struggle against the revisionists is useless because it is

doomed to ultimate failure. It is a thesis which helps revisionists by presenting them as, within the Communist Party, invincible. It is no less harmful when it is put forward by the authors of the pamphlet concerned than when it is put forward by the disruptive left opportunist McCreery.

))))((((

CLARIFICATION

Various queries similar to some of the points raised in the above article have arisen in the last few weeks or so on (a) the precise role of FORUM and (b) the character of the London Political organisation. It is therefore necessary to clarify once more the political position of both the Journal and the Organisation itself.

Over the past month or so the phrase "new Party" has been used more extensively both in FORUM and elsewhere. It should be restated that neither the Forum Committee nor the L.P.O. understand this as meaning exclusively the setting up of an alternative organisation to the Communist Party of Great Britain. The first article in the first issue of Forum (March 1964) and the statement issued by the L.P.O. in August specifically rejected the line that an alternative party could simply be "set-up".

Comrades should be clear that the "new" Party can only mean a Marxist Party. None at the present time can lay down whether, ultimately, this will mean the actual creation of an organisational alternative to the Communist Party or whether, as a result of inner Party struggle combined with the exposure of revisionism by events to wider and wider circles of the Communist Party, the struggle within the Party will result in the defeat of the leadership as it now is.

At present, the latter possibility seems very remote indeed. Nevertheless, it is the categorical view of the L.P.O. that it would be quite incorrect to rule it out altogether. If this were done, the significance of inner Party struggle would dwindle to nothing and Comrades could justify simply walking out of the Party without any struggle to expose revisionism.

It is the considered opinion of the L.P.O. and Forum that it is

wrong at the present time to pose a "new" as against "old" Party as organisations. The main struggle is for an alternative and Marxist line in Britain as opposed to the British Road to Socialism. The method whereby this line is made victorious cannot be hide bound within limits of the preconceived ideas of what amounts to a relatively small number of people at the moment.

In short it is not correct to aim at pulling as many members out of the Party as possible but to win as many members of the Communist Party for a Marxist line as possible. This is, of course, only part of the story, for to win as many workers irrespective of whether they are Party members or not for this line, is the only way of avoiding the "parlour politics" atmosphere which surrounds the whole anti-revisionist movement at the moment.

The above reasons underlie the decision to set up the L. P. C. in the first place and, subsequently to merge it with Forum. It is impossible at the present time to gain practical experience in an organised manner of work with and among the working class except in a strictly limited region. That is why the L. P. O. clearly defined itself as a regional organisation. This regional designation has nothing to do with having some sort of organisational monopoly within the London area. There are several anti-revisionist groups in London which are not part of the L. P. O. Members of the L. P. O. simply regard some form of organisation as absolutely necessary to gain practical experience of the class struggle and to develop an alternative to the British Road to Socialism out of this experience. Such organisation is most definitely not an embryonic alternative Party (more than 75% of L. P. O. membership are members of the Communist Party). In fact, the L. P. O. welcomes at the present time the proliferation of such organisations which are committed to serious anti-revisionist work. The more comrades begin to learn from the practical problem of work with the masses the lessons denied them by the revisionists, the better.

Just as this practical organisational work is necessary so is the freest possible expression of view points necessary so that as many comrades from as many different backgrounds and experiences everywhere can exchange their views, and thus fertilise the anti-revisionist struggle and create the basis for an ever extending unity. This was the original intention of Forum and this aim it still serves.

A revolutionary line has still to be hammered out and this is

the most urgent task facing serious Marxists at the present time in this country. This cannot, and must not, be regarded as the responsibility of one group. All groups and individuals have a duty to make their points of view and experiences available to all others. This is precisely what Forum came into existence for and still exists for. Its merging with the L.P.O. is a purely local matter of convenience involving (it is hoped) an improvement in efficiency and a strengthening of both the practical work in the London area and the service Forum offers to all comrades wherever they are.

It is high time that the barriers and restraints to discussions and contact were broken down. Revisionists have for years fostered divisions within the ranks of the Communist Party for their own ends. Don't let us perpetuate their evil work. Let comrades come together, either anonymously or otherwise, and push forward the work of creating the basis for a Marxist Party in Britain by inner Party struggle, by public struggle against revisionist betrayals of the working class, by all forms of struggle against reaction and for the working class.

London Political Organisation.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONCERNING.....'TOWARDS A NEW PARTY'

One must agree with the two main points made in the above article which appeared in the October Forum. These are broadly:

- (a) An attitude will have to be taken by the anti-revisionist groups if and when the formal split takes place in the international Communist movement.
- (b) That following this, two way discussions should begin between the groups on the way forward.

Although recent events in Moscow may have changed certain aspects of the situation. It is certain that the new leaders and those whom they represent stand by the 'general' line of the 20th Congress of the C. P. S. U. (B) and all that flows from it. Even if it is not yet clear the basis or form the meeting in December will take.

The contributor is understandably concerned about the situation and has stated there must be no 'hurry'. Therefore the article should be seen as a beginning, as a placing before us of issues. So certain stages and formulations ought to be discussed and clarified.

To state as the contributor does, that after December 15th, there will be no C. P. even nominally is not quite correct. Surely if it is a nominal C. P. now, it will still be a nominal C. P. after 15th December, precisely because it is a formalisation of a split in existence now. Nor will this equal the destruction of the C. P. because it is a 'formal' question! The revisionist C. P. now before December 15th, is objectively committed to supporting reaction and imperialism. After December 15th, this party will continue to support imperialism and reaction.

We must not forget that the British C. P. introduced the "British Road" as long ago as 1951. They were only a C. P. in name then. Therefore they will still be a C. P. in name after December, that is nominally. Formal destruction is not destruction in practice. That it is not a Marxist party holds true for a long period. But as a political party it will still exist after December 15th, not very different to what it is now.

Formation of a Party. . . .

The condition for forming a Communist Party is the uniting of Marxism with the working-class movement. (see the early chapters of Hist. CPSU (B))

The order should be noted. Marxism first. Working-class movement second. Therefore the main task is the fight for Marxism in and among the various anti-revisionist groups. The contributor also makes a similar point. . . .

"Does this prospect alter in any way the line of struggle for Marxism in Britain. ?"

Although he does not specifically state anti-revisionist groups. But Lenin is quite clear. . . .

"Before we can unite, and in order that we may unite, we must first of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation". (Lenin, Se-. Works, Eng. Ed. Vol. 2, p. 45. my emphasis)

It cannot yet be said that clear demarcation lines have been

drawn. The anti-revisionist struggle is made up of various elements. Some elements are merely anti-leadership of the existing C.P., some wander into leftism etc. Can it yet be said that all anti-revisionists, or anti-revisionist groups are Marxist ??

The majority, in the main, der' e, come from, a revisionist party ! With all the contradictions this implies.

What conclusions can be drawn ?

That certain questions cannot be obscured. That it is a fight for Marxist consciousness.

That things must not be pushed together. That we must crawl before we walk.

There must be no running around like a fire brigade. As the British C.P. has done for years.

What is it that creates 'barriers of suspicion, mistrust and political differences between anti-revisionists' (The contributor). It is a lack of Marxism. Marxism which has to be fought for.

'When' a new working class party appears will not solve itself, virtually or otherwise, even given the lines suggested by the contributor.

No amount of 'practical' activity, handing out of leaflets will do this, at present. It is a question of Marxism.

In the British C.P. leaflets were handed out, Daily Workers sold, and an orgy of door knocking took place. For 'practical' activity the British C.P. took pride of place ! Did this make Marxists ? On the contrary. !

Only when we have clarity, when we have 'definite lines of demarcation' (Lenin) can we think about forming a new party.

After the formal split takes place, as the contributor has written a certain stand must be taken. This could probably take the form of an agreed common declaration of all the anti-revisionist groups, or at least a majority.

Two-way discussions to take place. Yes, good ! But this

must not be seen as an organisation problem only. This is to be seen as one way of getting clarity, of fostering a unified Marxist attitude. To educate ourselves into Marxism. From this base can we proceed, from this can we have... 'Lines of demarcation'.

As a practical suggestion, I would like to see formed discussion groups to deal with the points raised in this and the previous article.

ooooo000000000000ooooo

APPALLING.

'Road accidents today constitute a major social problem, comparable with the crime wave', reports a spokesman of ROSPA, quoted in an article in the Daily Worker of 30.9.64.

True enough. The lethal chaos on the roads arises essentially from the anarchic planlessness of our society. It is just one of the many evils for which rampant monopoly-capitalism can be held directly responsible. But if this is the case then a solution to the problem can only be sought through a study of its social origins and this implies a class analysis and a class solution.

Until the 1939-45 period the roads in Britain were adequate for the commercial traffic they were required to handle by industries located in clearly defined regions. Since the war the rapid growth of light industries in previously undeveloped areas and the change in organisation of industries involving the shifting of vast quantities of components to assembly points in the midlands and home counties have materially increased the road 'demand' of hauliers. Transport rationalisation, in the form of the Beeching proposals of last year, has made the roads bear a correspondingly heavier load.

Non-industrial traffic has also increased, not by some

unhappy coincidence, but as a direct result of the ability of a larger proportion of working-class families to acquire their own private means of transport (an aspect incidentally of the buying-off process of capitalism in decay based on the increased exploitation of other sections of the working class, particularly in colonies and former colonies).

When road casualty figures began to make the headlines some years ago reactions from political commentators were sharply differentiated. The capitalist press in general blamed the negligent public, and the socialist press, what was left of it, the road system. Many palliatives have been proposed from the building of motor-ways to increased penalties for traffic offences. The casualty figures go on rising. It has now reached the point where the only daily paper owned by its readers states editorially:

"Not enough is spent on roads, not enough is done to deter reckless and drunken drivers, and not enough is done to ensure that all drivers are physically fit and properly trained. . . . drivers cannot even pass the modest eyesight test. . . . Why have we had to wait until now for anything to be done about this elementary point? It is typical of the government's attitude, and the next government must break with such incompetence and laxity."

One weeps for the incompetence and laxity of the poor Tories. But whose side is the Worker on? While the British ruling class is making every worker a democratic property owner and the Communist Party is abetting it by fighting fiercely for the individual's right to own a car as good as his neighbour's, the slaughter will go on. What is the Party trying to suggest? That it can organise the country more efficiently than the Tories in the interests of Toryism?

The people have to be told that instead of millions of family cars there should be a really comprehensive system of public transport - but that this solution will only be possible

under socialism and by socialist planning. The Daily Worker will not support this because it would involve telling its readers that socialism in Britain will not be built around the great capitalist virtue of individualism (in essence Khrushchev's 'goulash and trousers' argument'). In the great struggle for socialism the working class will undoubtedly develop quite different aspirations from those foisted on them by capitalism.

THE POSTMEN'S STRIKE BY A POSTAL WORKER

The Union of Postal Workers is about 180,000 strong and is divided into grades of which that of the postmen is by far the largest. This year for the first time in their history, the postmen went on strike. The story of the strike provides a classic example of the way in which even a small-scale revolutionary situation is attacked and subverted by all the forces of reaction in British politics; and most horrifying of all, gives an insight into the degree of reaction among those sections of the community which purport to be solidly behind the working class in its struggle against the capitalist state.

For seventy years the postmen have remained passive, bludgeoned, perhaps, into an acceptance of the civil service maxim that a public servant has no right to strike. We may regret their inactivity during the General Strike of 1926; a cut in communications might have made all the difference when the country was in a state of national revolution. Let us be thankful, however, that they have at last gained the political maturity to realise that militant action is the only way to gain any advantage whatsoever in a capitalist system. But they have learned this basic lesson the hard way; their fight to secure a more adequate weekly wage stretches back over months of futile negotiation through the "proper channels", a fight which only reached its climax in the summer when it became clear that, as long as they kept on working, neither the Union Executive nor the government, nor anybody else

$\frac{2}{3}$ cared a damn whether they were given satisfaction.

By a process of arbitration other grades which constitute the rest of the body of post office workers had been granted, and timidly accepted, a yearly rise of $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ over three years. The government had offered the minimum, the Executive had not complained, the other grades remained passive and the increase was instituted without as much as a murmur of discontent except on the part of the postmen who had the guts to refuse the miserable sum offered and stick out for something more substantial. Negotiations dragged on and on until, on July 10th, fed up to the teeth with waiting for something that was never going to happen, the postmen took the future into their own hands and came out on unofficial strike. What happened? They were denounced by the government for their irresponsible action; this was to be expected. They were denounced by the Executive of their own union for 'damaging their cause', and only the Daily Worker, bless its feeble heart, of all the press was on their side. And yet, in this position of strength, what did the Daily Worker do? Precisely nothing! A situation that needed explanation in simple Marxist terms was left, for the postmen themselves to sort out. First and foremost, the Worker should have denounced the U. P. W. Executive, and in particular Ron Smith, whose job on the Board of B. O. A. C. is a sinecure presented by the government for his active support of their regime. It should have demonstrated that the Executive, with a few exceptions, is not representative of the men they pretended to represent; and finally, it should have shown that the Executive of the U. P. W. protects both itself and the government by having endowed itself with the prerogative of deciding and conducting all forms of industrial action. At one blow, the postmen hit the government and the reactionary executive where it really hurt. An enormous portion of political power was in their hands. And yet, typically, at the moment they were

readiest to strike they were also least prepared. They had virtually no strike funds and what they had would have paid each man fifteen shillings a week for no more than a fortnight. Money had to be borrowed from other sympathetic unions. Meanwhile a further strike was proposed unless the government submitted to their terms. The executive had no choice, but to tag along with the rank and file and in its position of a buffer, take all the punishment from its own members and the government.

All the time the dice were being more and more heavily loaded in favour of the postmen; their one day strike and the ban on overtime meant that in a short space of time the whole system of communications was being choked, and being strangled with it was the whole industrial complex of the country. Only Bevin held out even against the pleas of his fellow capitalists who realised, only too well, that the amount of money they were losing in terms of orders was considerably greater than anything the government might have to pay in wages. Finally only one day away from the strike, under pressure from the government and from the executive, both of whom feared a strike like the plague, a hasty compromise was reached and the strike called off. An interim settlement of $6\frac{1}{2}\%$ "pending investigation" was agreed upon and yet another worker's movement was sold down the river. But not entirely perhaps. Recent events in which the executive under the management of Ron Smith has contrived to expel from its membership those militant enough to vote against the cancellation of the strike, have infuriated the London postmen whose representatives they were. Action has been threatened and will certainly be instituted unless the executive revokes its decision. Furthermore, unless the government acts upon its promise to make the postmen's pay comparable with industrial wages, the men will strike again and this time they will be more prepared.

And what was the attitude of the Daily Worker to the final settlement? Did it attempt to show the almost total failure of this particular phase of the struggle? Of course not!

The settlement was hailed as an outstanding victory for the postmen. Was there any criticism? Not a word! It refused to expose, it refused to accuse the very people who most needed exposing for the traitors that they are. Oh, it "lashed" the Tory party - how brave! It told us that they are crooks, which we already know. What we were not told was who really betrayed the situation. It refused to expose the most dangerous class enemy of all - the enemy that pretends to support the worker in his fight, but in reality sells him into the hands of the capitalists. And why is this? Because this is precisely the policy of that "revolutionary" organ, the Daily Worker. How else is it possible to explain its total lack of analysis, its glossing over of events which amounts to a falsification of them, and finally the downright lies that it printed when the settlement was reached? If this is not revisionism, then what is? There is no better way to kill militancy than to parade total defeat as total victory. No better way to stop a struggle than by pretending that it has been won. And then, when the executive showed its true colours, in the expulsion of its seven London representatives, the Daily Worker suggested meekly that it should "think again". In other words, what Khrushchev is doing for world politics, the King Street press is doing for British politics.

In every case when there is an industrial dispute, the function of a revolutionary newspaper is to analyse the struggle and clarify it in order that the workers may be in a better position to cope; in order that the workers may know who are their enemies. If it does not do this it is guilty of everything of which the reactionaries are guilty. Guilty, because by its very silence it condones all treachery.

It is time, therefore, that the postal workers should know who are their enemies, if they do not know already,

and what action to take. It must be explained to them that an executive that refuses to call out the whole union when a political fight is in progress is more interested in strike-breaking than in winning a battle for its members (The U. P. W. Executive adamantly refused to call out the telephonists because it was fighting on the side of the government all the time). The Ron Smiths of this world must be shown up for the rats that they are and the Daily Worker, because it persists in taking the same side, must be exposed as well for the treachery of its pseudo revolutionary polity.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

THE GREAT DECEPTION.

Just how illogically do the revisionists present their case, was witnessed in the Daily Worker Saturday October 10th, issue for all to see.

Screaming headlines...

"Tories Shaking in Shoes.".....

Continuing with a report from Peter Zinkin of a John Gollan speech at Newcastle-on-Tyne..... In a call to "Vote for Communists, and support Labour M. Ps. everywhere else,"

He said that the 'country' (my quotes) wanted an end to the arms race, an expansion of the social services and an attack on the monopolies".

Not only does he give the impression that these things might be possible if we get these betrayers of the working class into parliament, but he also says that 'the labour leaders were pulling their punches', giving a false impression of the role of the labour party. And in a typically bankrupt way says "thus it was essential to win the biggest possible vote for the Communist candidates", ignoring the fact also, that the labour party has no punches to pull, and does not represent the working class.

After continuing with reports of 'blows' to the Tories, one is astonished to find that revisionist Peter Zinkin slips, and ends his report with an undeniable fact, giving the lie to John Gollan's remarks... 'The Tories were shaking in their shoes at the prospect of defeat.' Namely that the Economist, a City journal, (which represents the interest of an important section of the ruling class, in a leading article on the elections, said... "The first question for Thursday is whether the Conservatives have surely earned a further term: that must be doubted; Labour-and Mr. Wilson-will be the better choice for voters to make on Thursday."

A fine example of revisionist leadership hotch-potch!

- a) What with labour party leaders 'pulling punches' .
- b) What with Tories calling on the population to vote labour.
- c) And what with the revisionist C.P. calling for support of a party which ignores it.

Seriously, who really is eager to represent the population in the 'House', and with this utter confusion who can blame the abstainers for abstaining, and 'Don't Know's', for not knowing.

P.S.

The above article was written and sent in before the elections took place, the writer wishes to add the following:-

After only five days of office, the Labour Party's new minister of Labour, a Mr. Ray Gunter, has already shown his hand, and proven how little he and the Labour party represent the working class.

He said... 'An unofficial docks strike could only lead to anarchy.' A typical bosses statement!

The Daily Worker's second leading editorial on the following day had a surprised and 'pained' air about it.. But any true Marxist newspaper or journal, would not only not be surprised, but would expect such actions from Social Democrats, and warn the workers beforehand!

The following publications are available from "FORUM"

A reply to James Klugman on Peaceful Co-existence	6d.
The National Liberation Movement Today. (A reply to Dutt and others)	1s
Statement on John Gollan	6d.
Revisionism and Imperialism	1s

Chinese Publications:

The Origin and Development of the Differences On the Question of Stalin.	6d.
Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?	6d.
Apologists of Neo-Colonialism	6d.
Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace Peaceful Co-existence - Two Diametrically Opposed Lines.	3d
The leaders of the C. P. S. U. are the Greatest Splitters.	6d.
The Proletarian Revolution and Khrushchev's Revisionism, On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism.	6d.
Whence the Differences - A reply to Thores and others	6d.
The Differences between Cde. Togliatti and us.	6d.
More on the Differences between Cde. Togliatti and us.	1s6d.
A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement	1s
A Comment on the Statement of the C. P. U. S. A.	6d.
The Struggle between two Different Lines at the World Congress of Women	6d.
Workers of the World Unite - Oppose our Common Enemy.	6d.
The Truth about how the Leaders of the C. P. S. U. have allied themselves with India against China.	6d.
The Fighting Task Confronting Workers in Philosophy and the Social Sciences.	6d.

THE JOURNAL EXISTS:

- (1) to open a forum for all views and experiences of comrades inside and outside the Party, Long denied expression by the revisionist leadership;
- (2) to help carry out the work of exposing revisionist errors in the class struggle in Britain, and develop inner-Party struggle, thereby assisting in the international struggle against revisionism;
- (3) to carry this out without dictating a 'line', and in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist principle of gathering the revolutionary forces - a task never carried out by the revisionist leadership;
- (4) to exclude all Trotskyist views as disruptive of this hard task;
- (5) to preserve anonymity (a) to protect comrades in the Party from attack by the revisionists (b) to avoid the suggestion of leadership by any contributor, or contributors who are able to name themselves since at this early stage of the struggle complete equality of exchange and mutual criticism are necessary.

THIS IS YOUR JOURNAL - USE IT.

PLEASE TAKE OUT A SUBSCRIPTION NOW: Rates 6/- a year post free, payable by P.O. (blank) or cash to FORUM, 41 Atholl Mansions, South Lambeth Road, London, S.W.8. Also contributions and correspondence.

.....

PLEASE TEAR OFF AND SEND TO ABOVE ADDRESS.

I enclose £. s. d. as subscription/donation to FORUM, formonth(s)/year.

NAME.....)
 ADDRESS.....) Optional.
)
)