

30p.

MICHAEL McCREERY

THE WAY FORWARD

**A Marxist-Leninist analysis
of the British State, the CPGB and
the tasks for revolutionaries**

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



Introduction	3
Destroy the old to build the new	11
Organise at the place of work	24
The Way Forward	28

Working Peoples Party of England

FIVE ORGANISATIONAL PRINCIPLES

1. Serve the people.
2. Unite all who can be united against the main enemy.
3. Active members only.
4. Maximum initiative for members.
5. All officials subject to immediate recall by members.

POWER TO THE PEOPLE!

WPPE South
54g St. Giles High St.,
London, W.C.2.

WPPE North
15 Elsham Green
Fawdon
Newcastle-on-Tyne 3.



Michael McCreery, the WPPE
and the break with Reformist 'Communism'

by Paul Noone, General Secretary, WPPE

It is almost ten years since Michael McCreery led the CDRCU (Committee to Defeat Revisionism for Communist Unity) in its clear ideological and political break with the CPGB (Communist Party of Great Britain). During the late 1950's the split in the International Communist Movement became obvious and because of its nature irreconcilable. On the one hand was the revolutionary line of mass political mobilisation, national liberation struggles and peoples war, as outlined by the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of China; on the other side the revisionist or reformist line of "peaceful coexistence and all-round cooperation" with imperialism, parliamentary electioneering

boosted as the road to socialism. This was expounded by the Khrushchevite Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its allies. The CPGB had been officially pursuing such a line at least since 1951 and the publication of its programme "The British Road to Socialism" — still, with trivial alterations, the CPGB programme today!

As the international debate in the Communist Movement sharpened, so the struggle of the two lines intensified with the CPGB. McCreery and other comrades who were then members of the CPGB had been trying to develop a revolutionary line in opposition to the King Street, full-time-official bureaucracy. Contacts were made in several branches but party officials prevented effective opposition and refused to allow articles and letters in the party press or speakers in branches to broadcast anti-revisionist views to the rank-and-file.

The Break

In 1963, Gollan as secretary of the CPGB finally intervened in the Sino-Soviet ideological dispute, accusing the Chinese Party leadership of being racialist and "warmongers". McCreery and his comrades agreed that this was now the time to make a public statement as communists, repudiating Gollan's statement and generally attacking the CPGB line of parliamentarism and sell-out of the national liberation struggles. At a meeting in the "Lucas Arms" in Grays Inn Road, London in 1963, the CDRCU was born and the "Appeal to All Communists", drafted by McCreery, adopted as the group's first official statement. Public meetings were held and the paper "Vanguard" produced. The three pieces by McCreery republished by the WPPE in this pamphlet, formed the kernel of CDRCU's political line.

Destroy the Old To Build the New is a withering attack on the parliamentarist illusions of the "British Road to Socialism", ridiculing the ballot box and a "Labour-Communist" parliamentary majority. It is a trenchant restatement of the Leninist position with regard to the capitalist state and the dictatorship of the proletariat, clearly showing the heightened relevance of Lenin's analysis for us today *because* of the changes in capitalism since Lenin's time.

Organise At The Place of Work. This was originally an address to the London District Committee of the CPGB in 1962. It calls for a replacement of electioneering tactics and party structure based on electoral districts by organisation at the workplace where class struggle is at its most obvious, where working people can be most easily organised, and where working people, providing they are organised, can exercise most power within the capitalist system.

The Way Forward. This, written in January 1964, is in many ways the single most important contribution McCreery made to the development of a revolutionary line in Britain. Not only does he lay bare the ideological, political and organisational revisionism of the CPGB but he outlines with outstanding clarity and succinctness the basic principles that a revolutionary party needs. Proletarian internationalism; dedication to achieving the Dictatorship of the Proletariat by smashing the capitalist state in the revolution led by the workers' *own* organisations; mobilising politically on all immediate issues such as wages, housing, etc., with workers power as the final goal; mobilising the mass of people for action (the "mass line") at the place of work; fighting for positions and progressive policies in the trade union movement as a tactic of the overall struggle, but always opposing the false idea that simply capturing positions in such bodies is the road to socialism; and finally, operating on democratic centralist lines with full discussion within the party to reach full agreement on policy in each new situation accompanied by united action to implement such policy "with each basic unit *itself* translating the general policy into action within its local field of work"

Attacks On McCreery

As a result of this revolutionary initiative, McCreery became the subject of the most malicious personal attacks. Several so-called "anti-revisionists" who had been collaborating or in contact with McCreery for considerable periods prior to the "Appeal to Communists", suddenly developed cold feet *after* the *agreed* decisions of the "Lucas Arms" meeting. They tried to stop the public stand against revisionism being effective and when that failed they resorted to anonymous attacks on McCreery and the CDRCU in their newsletter "Forum".

These individuals and their associates who included a number of persons now prominent members of both the CFB (ML) and the CPB (ML) argued that the anti-revisionist movement should function as an opposition *within* the CPGB working towards taking control of the CPGB! Their attacks on McCreery branded him as everything from a left-opportunist to a police spy. Their chief spokesman was Seltman, who has long since dropped out of Marxist Leninist politics. Many of these critics have since broken with the CPGB organisationally themselves while the CPGB remains staunchly revisionist, all eloquent testimony to the correctness of McCreery's line.

The critics accused McCreery of being elitist, of trying to "buy" a movement with the money he had obtained from his rich family background, and they accused him of setting up a new party prematurely. In fact he did none of these things. "His" money was spent by the

democratic collective decision of the central committee of CDRCU, while his life style and work style were plain, simple and conscientious. He was always prepared to listen to others and never behaved in an arrogant fashion.

McCreery himself never answered personal slander with slander; he always attempted to answer the underlying political attack and at some future date the WPPE will publish the whole correspondence and polemics of that time. It speaks for itself.

As to his desire to set up a new party prematurely, firstly when he died in 1965 no such party had been formed, both the WPS and WPPE were begun subsequently. His attitude can be seen in this extract from a letter sent to the writer of this article in December 1963.

In the New Year regular weekly Marxist-Leninist lectures will be organised. A periodical will by then be appearing. Its role will be organisational, agitational, propagandist. For we are pressing for the establishment of groups in all main industrial centres actively and openly advancing the new line, and regular national delegate meetings to hammer out an agreed policy for Britain. This National Council would be *advisory* [McC's emphasis] during this period of preparation for the establishment of a new, genuine, Marxist-Leninist Party. Not until we have active, self-reliant groups in all main industrial centres can a *Party* be established.

Ten Years On

Why have ten years elapsed since McCreery made his analysis and yet there is still political and organisational confusion and ineffectiveness in Britain?

In this period almost a dozen different "Marxist-Leninist" and "Maoist" organisations have arisen, often based on the "charisma" of various political figures in the trade union or other fields. Most have largely supported the international line of the CPC which, since it is a verbal exercise, is not hard to do. Few have undertaken comprehensive or detailed analysis of the class struggle in Britain. On the home-front most content themselves with simply reacting verbally to attacks by the capitalist government or joining (usually in a sectarian way) whichever leftist bandwagon happens to be rolling at the time. This means largely tailing behind CPGB, Trotskyist or Left Labour initiatives. No one and no organisation save the WPPE and WPS, has even attempted a thoroughgoing analysis of what needs to be done. None have matched McCreery's analysis of ten years ago. This is why we republish his work at this time.

McCreery himself died from cancer in April 1965 after a long illness at the age of 36. This was a great tragedy as he was far ahead of his comrades in political development. Most were still enveloped in ideological, organisational and work-style deficiencies inherited from the CPGB. Most really did not know (and still don't) how to take revolutionary initiative; how to develop class struggle at their workplace or in their communities. The cadres of the WPPE are just beginning to learn after a slow start and a good deal of misdirection from various exponents of the short-cut.

While McCreery was alive the CDRCU developed with groups in London, Scotland, West Yorkshire, Manchester, Cardiff, the Thames Valley and contacts in a dozen places. "Vanguard" reached a wide readership and did much to disseminate criticism of revisionism and develop revolutionary ideas. But after McCreery died, the CDRCU degenerated into an ineffective group without direction, unable to understand what it needed to do, meeting regularly to discuss abstract ideas and paper struggles. Inevitably such organisations splinter. However some comrades developed from the beginnings Michael had made. In *Scotland* the Workers Party of Scotland was formed and has developed steadily, taking important national initiatives in founding the John Maclean Society and organising for the Scottish National Convention involving trade unionists and progressive nationalists.

WPPE

In England progress has been more difficult. The WPPE was formed in 1968 and has, in spite of several politically important campaigns, so far not developed sufficient strength and influence. Our programme was drawn up through full discussion of all members and contacts and remains basically correct although it needs further development and re-emphasis. A current task is the re-drafting of this programme, to make it more useful in developing class struggle.

Initially, the WPPE suffered from the disruption of a leading group of individuals with sectarian and elitist political ideas associated with liberalistic and undisciplined methods of organisation. These persons failed to get active among the people at places of work or in the community, starting with mobilisation for simple demands; but instead they *talked* of revolutionary violence while waiting for revolution to begin spontaneously and expecting the masses in such a situation to turn around and call in a clique of passive dogmatists to lead them! This group of paper Blanquists talked of seizing state power on behalf of the masses and then "*giving*" the masses "socialism". These petty-bourgeois conspiratorial and elitist notions were paraded as "Leninism". It had

nothing at all in common with it. The Bolshevik Party led the masses not simply because of what intellectuals wrote but because the Party shared the life of the people in day-to-day struggles, because it was of and for the masses. It advanced general theories and analysis derived from close attention to real everyday struggles. It did not seek to impose itself. This is the way Lenin, Sverdlov, Stalin, and Orjonikidze worked. It was because of this integration with working people that the Bolshevik Party led the revolutionary masses in 1917. It didn't happen overnight. It wasn't a trick or a 7-day wonder **but a process** growing and developing over 20 years.

The verbal revolutionists usually fail to appreciate the possibilities of class struggle in their own lives, instead they are eager to proffer advice and leadership to already developed struggles, standing as they are on the side-lines. They dismiss their fellow workers at their own places of work or in their own streets as "reactionary" and "useless". Their Marxism-Leninism is an abstract collection of ideas and fantasies reserved for sounding off at political meetings or in publications. It's a hobby like collecting stamps or matchbox tops.

Another common error of the time was to see political campaigns developing through an appeal to "national figures" or the leadership of other "left-wing" organisations to launch a joint "movement" on this or that topical issue. Each such initiative was doomed to failure. A political appeal to political opportunists futile unless they see clear personal advantage in such a campaign. "National figures" and "left-wing leaderships" will *support* any successful campaign (and probably try to pervert it to their own ends) once it is developing strongly and they can no longer ignore it. Their support may serve a useful tactical purpose but gaining it should never become our strategy, nor must we ever surrender the political initiative to these opportunists in any such campaign.

Positive Role

To develop any political campaign, concrete practice in a specific situation is more useful than volumes of theoretical exhortation. Moreover we should start our struggles where we have our cadres and contacts — not try to take over other peoples' struggles which are further developed. Of course we must try to support all specific class struggles as practically and usefully as possible and develop contacts on a basis of mutual respect and help with those involved in struggle. But giving big-mouthed advice from the side-lines in leaflets and public meetings, which attempt to take over leadership of the struggle only alienates those involved in it. We have few cadres and we must use them effectively. We must not rush like bees from flower to flower sipping the nectar of other people's

efforts. We must re-double *our* efforts at our own workplaces and in our own environments, making a detailed analysis of conditions, class contradictions and recognising those specific issues which may be developed in struggle to involve as many working people as possible. We must form working alliances in these struggles with all militants and not seek office necessarily in such movements. Personal involvement and contacts can be sufficient providing political analysis and ideas are clear and properly put over. And we must always advance in a relevant way our general political analysis and the need for working class power, never allowing misguided trust by the people including militants in the legislative processes and institutions of capitalism.

A properly developed struggle in a specific situation can become pacemaker for the whole country and give a political lead to our whole class. The Party in its practical work must set an example for the class to follow. Successful local struggles spark off general revolutionary developments. At the same time party organisation must be kept simple and committees only formed and meetings held to serve practical purposes. We must also collectively delegate tasks to cadres to carry out and not try to do every job by committee. Allow cadres to act responsibly, this is the only way we develop as cadres. Mistakes will be made. This is not disastrous if we honestly admit them and rectify them. If we are afraid to act for fear of making mistakes or prevent any cadre taking initiatives for the same reason, then we will never grow.

SUCCESSSES

The successes of WPPE have always been derived from local activity of a broadly correct nature. It includes the mobilisation of Bengali workers and militants of all races against thug attacks in Euston and the East End of London; the support of gypsies threatened with eviction in Northumberland; mobilisation of building workers on Tyneside against the "Lump" system and during the recent strike; initiatives amongst young people in conflict with the forces of law-and-order in London; helping the destruction of the liberal-establishment misleadership of the anti-racist movement in Britain some 4 years ago; and much work in the NHS, Britain's major nationalised industry, helping to mobilise health service workers and gain the support of trade unionists for their struggle against gross exploitation and also mobilising working people against the private sector in the health service (a very obvious and much despised symbol of profiteering in our society.) On both these latter issues national campaigns involving rank-and-file militants are developing strongly. In all these successful campaigns our cadres worked closely with other sympathetic militants and all recruits to the party were made then.

But above all else our experience both positive and negative over the past five years have served to re-emphasize the correctness of Michael McCreery's initial analysis. In a sense it is through our experiences of these years that we have at last begun to appreciate what Michael was saying and have at last begun to apply it to our own struggles and organisation.

The Need For A Party

The deepening financial and political crisis of British capitalism in the past decade has further facilitated revolutionary developments. The unprecedented rate of inflation and the successive wage freezes which together have caused a real fall in working peoples' living standards; the unbridled speculation in land and property matched by soaring rents and house prices; the attacks on trade union organisation and shop stewards; the immigration laws and devaluation of British passports for Black people; the attacks on the social services and dismantling of the "welfare state"; the continued balance of payments problems caused by the imperialist export of capital for superprofits in South Africa, Hong Kong and other overseas countries coupled with lack of growth, unemployment and total distortion for profit of the domestic economy; and the disillusion with parliament and the Labour-Tory charade. And on the other hand, the working people fight back, miners, dockers, shipyard workers, building workers, railwaymen, council workers, hospital ancillary staff, and even white collar and "professional" workers, draughtsmen, teachers, civil servants — all battling against falling living standards and the owning class freeze and squeeze. More days "lost" through strike action in 1972 than in any year since the 1926 General Strike.

Opposition on a wide-scale to the government's anti-trade union Act; council tenants in mass protests, a few councils defying the government's higher rents schemes; black workers protesting against double oppression in Loughborough and North West London; women pressing with renewed intensity for an end to centuries of discrimination and subjection. Not for a long time have there been so many struggles and so much militancy in this country. The widespread disillusion with parliamentary politics leaves the field wide open for revolutionaries. It also raises the serious possibility of an overtly fascist takeover as an alternative for British capitalism if the situation deteriorates sufficiently.

Now more than ever a Marxist Leninist Party is needed to coordinate struggles and develop overall analysis and policy. Now more than ever the writings of Michael McCreery are relevant.

THE BRITISH ROAD TO SOCIALISM

The British Road to Socialism was first published in 1951. Since then it has been re-drafted, but it still retains those ideas which provoked such controversy when it first appeared. In this programme the main break with earlier Marxist thought lies in the claim that it is now possible for the working-class to *win control over* the capitalist state in Britain, by constitutional means, and then *transform* this capitalist state into one which will meet the needs of the working-class. Thus:

"At a time of mounting class struggle, when the entire working class is brought into action and is supported by other sections of the population, a general election fought on the issue of a socialist solution to Britain's problems could bring decisive results. It could return to Parliament a Socialist Labour and Communist majority and establish a Socialist Government which, with the backing of the people, would begin to carry through a fundamental social change.

In this way, using our traditional institutions and rights, we can transform Parliament into the effective instrument of the people's will, through which the major legislative measures of the change to socialism will be carried. Using the rights already won in the Labour movement's historic struggle for democracy, we can change capitalist democracy, dominated by wealth and privilege, into socialist democracy, where only the interests of the people count . . .

Working class power is the essential condition for far-reaching social change. The programme of a Socialist Government must therefore aim to consolidate that power, and put an end to the political, economic and social power of the capitalist class. Only a working-class state, with the full support of working-people, can carry through the measures that will open the way to socialism."

How is the capitalist state, which serves the interests of monopoly capital, to be transformed into a working-class state, which will serve the interest of the working-class?

"(The Socialist government will achieve the) consolidation of the political power of the working people by ensuring that those in commanding positions in the armed forces and police, the civil service and diplomatic services are loyal to the Socialist Government and increasingly representative of the people; and by democratic electoral reform, democratic ownership of the press, and control of broadcasting by the people."

In other words, the *structure* of the state will not be modified, but there will be a purge of all those in high places whose loyalty lies with monopoly-capital.

Why is this programme controversial? Because it is just this line of argument which Lenin tore to pieces in *The State and Revolution*, written in 1917, and *The Proletarian Revolution and the renegade Kautsky*, written in 1918. Thus, from *State and Revolution*:

"If the state is the product of the irreconcilability of class antagonism, if it is a power standing over and above society, and *increasingly alienating itself from it*, then it is obvious that the liberation of the oppressed class is impossible not only without a violent revolution, but also without the destruction of the apparatus of state power which was created by the ruling class and which is the embodiment of this 'alienation.' The Commune especially proved that *the working-class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes* (my italics M.McC.). The words 'to smash the bureaucratic military machine' briefly express the principal lesson of Marxism in regard to the tasks of the proletariat during a revolution in relation to the state."

Again and again this point is driven home.

"It was Marx who taught that the proletariat *cannot simply conquer state power in the sense that the old state apparatus passes into new hands* (my italics M.McC.). As we have seen, Marx meant that the working class must smash, break, shatter (sprengung-explosion, the expression used by Engels) the whole state machine."

Lenin emphasises, and we in the working-class movement in Britain in particular need to remember, that *democracy is a form of the State*.

"A democratic republic is the best possible political shell for capitalism, and therefore, once capital has gained control of this very best shell . . . it establishes its power so securely, so firmly, that *no* change, either of persons, or institutions, or of parties in the bourgeois democratic republic can shake it.

We must also note that Engels is most definite in calling universal suffrage an instrument of bourgeois rule. Universal suffrage, he says, obviously summing up the long experience of German Social Democracy, is the gauge of the maturity of the working class. It cannot and never will be anything more in the present day state.

The petty bourgeois democrats, such as our own Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, and also their twin brothers, all the social-chauvinists and opportunists of Western Europe, except just this 'more' from universal suffrage. They themselves share, and instil into the minds of the working people, the false notion that universal suffrage 'in the *modern* state' is really capable of ascertaining the will of the majority of the toilers and ensuring its realisation."

It follows that Parliament must not be regarded as the means whereby the working-class win power. In criticising a statement of Kautsky's which read: "The aim of our political struggle remains, as hitherto, the conquest of state power by winning a majority in Parliament and by converting Parliament into the master of the Government," Lenin wrote, "This is nothing but the purest and most vulgar opportunism, repudiating revolution in deeds, while accepting it in words."

The real road to power for the proletariat and its allies, Marx, Engels and Lenin maintained, was not into the Parliamentary cul-de-sac but through proletarian dictatorship. As Lenin wrote in *The Proletarian Revolution and the renegade Kautsky*:

"The formula 'dictatorship of the proletariat' is merely a more historically concrete and scientifically exact formulation of the proletariat's task of 'smashing' the bourgeois state machine, about which both Marx and Engels, in summing up the experience of the revolution of 1848, and still more so, of 1871, spoke for *forty years*, between 1852 and 1891."

The capitalist state machine will be broken up by the working-class, who will use *their own* organisations to achieve this. It is these organisations which will constitute the main weapon whereby the capitalists are overthrown; these and not Parliament. It is these organisations which will form the nucleus of the new working-class state; these and not Parliament. (Although, of course, *once power has been won*, and the dictatorship of the proletariat firmly established, Parliament can be transformed into an instrument of the people's will).

Until the final and decisive struggle for power we cannot be sure just what forms these working-class organisations will take. They may be councils of action, shop stewards' committees, trades councils, or some new form of organisation. But in essence, whatever their form, they will be *centres of working class power* (Soviets); the means whereby the working-class exerts superior force against the capitalist state in order to win power. This is why Lenin wrote, in *Left-Wing Communism*:

"Gallagher . . . fully understands that only workers' soviets and not Parliament, can be the instrument whereby the aims of the Proletariat will be achieved. And of course those who have failed to understand this up to now are hopeless reactionaries, even if they are most highly educated people, most experienced politicians, most sincere Socialists, most erudite Marxists."

On the question of whether this road to Socialism was likely to be a peaceful or a violent one, Lenin was equally adamant. In 1918, when commenting on Marx's view, expressed in the 1870's, that a peaceful transition *might* be possible in England and America, he wrote:

"The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is *violence* against the bourgeoisie, and the necessity of such violence is *particularly* created, as Marx and Engels have repeatedly explained in detail . . . by the existence of a military clique and a bureaucracy. But it is precisely these institutions that were *non-existent* precisely in England and in America and precisely in the 1870's when Marx made his observations. (They *do* exist in England and in America *now!*)"

And in the 1960's have they disappeared?

For this leads us to consider the developments in the world since Lenin's time. We have seen that *the British Road* adopts, on this question of the relation of the state to the proletarian revolution,

an attitude which is identical in essentials with that advanced by right-wing opportunists in the past. But since the 1920's there have been immense changes in the world as a whole and in Britain. Do these changes justify us today in contradicting Lenin's teaching? Let us look at one of the most recent justifications. I quote from James Klugmann's article in *Marxism Today*, of October, 1960;

"Within imperialism, ever more restricted by the growing socialist system, the general crisis deepens. Imperialism is weakened, it attacks all sections of the people—not only the working class, but the peasantry, town petty-bourgeoisie, intellectual and professional people, even the smaller capitalists. Imperialism becomes more reactionary. It tends, more and more, not only to attack the living standards of the people, but to attack the limited democratic rights that the working people have won within capitalism, to renounce national sovereignty, to reject and turn against all that is best and most progressive in its own cultural heritage. It becomes identified with a policy and strategy of nuclear war.

In this situation, more and more clearly, the working class stands forth as the truly progressive force of each nation, the leader in the defence of peace, national sovereignty, liberty and democracy, the cultural heritage. Opportunities arise, in a way that did not previously exist to the same extent, of developing a broad political alliance around the working-class for peace, democracy, independence, living standards and cultural progress. At the same time the ideas of socialism gain ground amongst the working people.

Externally the rise and strengthening of the socialist countries exercises a growing moral and ideological influence amongst the peoples of the capitalist countries. Moreover the stronger the socialist camp, the more opportunity there is for preventing imperialist interventions against countries that take the socialist road, the more opportunity exists for giving economic and cultural aid to the peoples building socialism. Imperialism is no longer able to threaten, blackmail and intervene in the old way.

The Conception of *The British Road to Socialism* was that, taking into account the new more favourable relation of class forces in the world and inside Britain, taking into account the specific traditions and institutions that have developed in Britain, it was now possible for the working class to win around itself a broad popular alliance to win political power, to win a Communist and genuine Socialist majority in Parliament, to *transform* (my italics M.McC.) the capitalist state into a state representative of the interests of the working people, and to build socialism in Britain, not without continuous class struggle, but without armed conflict."

This passage deserves a careful reading. The first three paragraphs outline, correctly, the main development since Lenin's time—the rise of the world socialist system—and the more favourable prospect which this has created for isolating monopoly capital in Britain

prior to its final overthrow, and for preventing imperialist intervention to restore the old order *after* a successful socialist revolution. The prospect of toppling monopoly capital is greater than in Lenin's time; the prospect that the revolution can be achieved with a minimum of violence, and without prolonged civil war, also greater. But even on Klugmann's own analysis the prospect of a constitutional revolution, of a legal transfer of power, is smaller. For he himself emphasises that as imperialism weakens, and it *is* much weaker than it was at the beginning of the century, it "tends more and more . . . to attack the limited democratic rights that the working people have won within capitalism." We all recognise that Parliament plays a *less* important role within the constitution than in the past. If any conclusion is to be drawn from this it is that the possibility of using "the specific traditions and institutions that have developed in Britain" (our constitutional liberties), to win power by peaceful, legal, constitutional means is *fainter* than it was in Lenin's time. If there has been a curtailment of constitutional liberties then constitutional advance to Socialism is *less* likely. In fact the conclusion which Klugmann seeks to draw in the fourth paragraph simply does not emerge from the preceding evidence.

"Imperialism," writes Klugmann, "becomes identified with a policy and strategy of nuclear war." But what does this entail? Greatly increased militarisation of the state. In fact, as all comrades know, the bureaucracy, the military and police, and the propaganda machine, have, together, been immensely enlarged since Lenin's time, as a direct result of the deepening crisis of capitalism. If the need to smash the capitalist state machine was particularly created "by the existence of a military clique and a bureaucracy" in the 1920's *then this must be even more necessary today*. This immense, top-heavy military and bureaucratic apparatus, which has been built up by British imperialism to contain the growing contradictions, which threaten to disintegrate its system, can never be *transformed from within*, by legal means. It must be *smashed from without*, by force.

Let us look at just what is involved in achieving power by constitutional means. "At a time of mounting class struggle, when the entire working-class is brought into action, and is supported by other sections of the population, a general election fought on the issue of a socialist solution to Britain's problems could bring decisive results." What an assortment of wishful thoughts! Consider the situation envisaged by *the British road* in this passage. When is "the entire working class," or even a major part of it, "brought into action?" Only during a widespread, or general strike. There have not been many such situations in British history. The general strikes of 1842 and 1926, the 1919 struggle, described so vividly in Gallagher's *Revolt on the Clyde*, can be cited. They were all *potentially* revolutionary situations, which might have developed into revolution given correct revolutionary leadership of the working class.

At such times, as the capitalists well know, *either* the workers and their allies press on to seize political power and smash the bourgeois state machine, *or* the bourgeoisie re-establish their grip and crush

the revolutionary forces. That class which can exert *superior force*, at the decisive moments, will win the struggle for power. That is why it is essential for the revolutionary leaders to maintain the initiative, preserve the cohesion of the revolutionary class and its allies, exploit every disagreement between different sections of the bourgeoisie, and, vitally important, win over decisive sections of the armed forces.

Hesitation and delay at such a time would be fatal. Yet this is the moment, when the Communist Party of Great Britain, instead of leading a revolution, will call for—a general election! What a farce! What a negation of revolutionary leadership this would be! For such a slogan, such a demand, *surrenders the initiative to the ruling class*. They can then decide whether or not acceptance would best serve their interests. In all probability the demand itself would cut very little ice on either side, and would only serve to isolate the C.P.G.B. from the immediate, and unconstitutional, struggle. It would be like throwing a stone into mountainous seas. The two great classes locked in mortal combat and—the demand for a general election!

But if the C.P.G.P. *could* obtain mass support for such a demand at such a time might the ruling class not decide to follow their lead and hold a general election? For would this not give them a breathing space, of which decisive advantage could be taken? As a necessary preliminary the general strike would have to be called off. No general election would be possible with the country paralysed by a general strike. (One could not even print the ballot papers!) But once the strike is called off, the revolutionary enthusiasm and energy and activity of the masses *must inevitably subside*. Activity is followed by passivity. The masses are no longer controlling events, they are waiting upon them, as is usual in capitalist society. In fact, the class struggle *could* no longer be “mounting,” it would be declining.

During the following days and weeks of the election campaign, the capitalists would close ranks, and unite most of the petty-bourgeoisie, the middle classes, and many of the less class-conscious workers around “the defence of the constitution and traditional British liberties.” For note that this general election will be decided, according to the British Road, on the issue of socialism—for or against a socialist revolution. Day after day the press, radio and television would pour out a flood of calumnies and lies to bewilder and confuse the revolutionary masses. For or against red revolution. Liberty or tyranny. The united front between the workers and their allies would soon crumble. Opportunist leaders would waver, and then turn against a full socialist programme “at this stage.” Before long the ruling class would be in a position to isolate, and strike hard at those who persisted in presenting the revolutionary alternative to capitalism. Indeed the moon will turn blue before we succeed in winning a majority to vote for socialism *within* the legal framework of the capitalist constitution, and with the bourgeois state machine unbroken.

But let us assume this blue moon. Parliament has been captured. The “Socialist” government has been duly summoned to Buckingham Palace, and sworn in. It then proceeds with the task of transforming the capitalist state into a working-class state. The purge of capitalist minded civil and military authorities begins. But they are all capitalist-minded and bitterly hostile to the new government. Will they meekly accept the order to “dismiss”? No-one in his right mind will assume that state monopoly capital would commit suicide. The British Road states:

“The capitalist class cannot be expected to surrender its wealth and power without a struggle. The big capitalists, whose interests are threatened by the advance to socialism, are likely by every means in their power, constitutional and unconstitutional, to hold back the movement. At all stages in the struggle for progressive policies and for socialism, therefore, the working class and progressive movement needs to be vigilant and if necessary to use its political and industrial strength to defeat any attempts by the big capitalists to restrict democratic rights or block the road to democratic advance.

This will be of particular importance when the Socialist Government is established and begins to carry through measures to break the economic and political power of the big capitalists. The extent to which the working class is alert and prepared to use its strength in support of the Government’s measures will determine whether the big capitalists accept the democratic verdict of the people or attempt to resist it by force.”

In this passage we have recognition that the ruling class may use unconstitutional means of checking the revolution if constitutional means do not suffice. But what are “unconstitutional” methods. Quite simply, the use of force, the use of the army, to overthrow the constitutional “Socialist” government. How is this threat to be countered? By mobilising “the political and industrial strength” of the people. But political parties and trade unions cannot stand against an army. There is no escaping the need, at some stage of the revolution, for *armed strength* to back the political and industrial strength of the people. Only *the people in arms* can counter a putsch by the army. To ignore this fact is to ensure the defeat of the revolution. But it is ignored in *The British Road to Socialism*.

It has been said that those who criticise *The British Road* are dogmatists. But dogmatists are surely those who stick to a point of view in the face of all the evidence. A programme which revises basic Marxist teaching on the role of the state, which rejects the accumulated experience of the working class, is dogmatic beyond belief. With such an obviously false perspective is it any wonder that there is widespread reluctance within the C.P.G.B. to accept this document?

The British Road is like one of those medieval paintings, produced before the laws of perspective had been fully grasped. The foreground, our decaying capitalist society, is seen in all its ugliness. In the background a Socialist Britain stands out in full glory. But the

middle distance, the intervening ground which links the two, and should give coherence to the whole picture, is somehow blurred. The perspective of advance is false. For this there is no excuse. The laws of perspective *have* been discovered—by Marx, Engels and Lenin—and we must apply them to Britain.

(Repeatedly rejected for publication in 'Marxism Today,' the monthly journal of the C.P.G.B.)

Two letters on the need to build a Marxist-Leninist Party in England, Scotland and Wales:

Dear Jim,

We can agree that an opportunist faction which controls the Party organisationally has, over a period of years, denied the Press to Leninist arguments, with occasional exceptions, and denied branches the right to hear speakers put the Leninist view on theoretical and practical questions. (That they have a mass base for their line does not alter the fact.) This faction has, therefore, not operated the basic principles of democratic centralism over many years. These principles *must* be operated in order to achieve a correct line and advance those slogans which meet the needs of the Party and the working class in each historical period. We *cannot* arrive at the truth, as a Party, and act upon that correct understanding of objective reality, when the basic methods of Party work are being flouted by the Party leadership (which, through its organisational control over the Party, is self-perpetuating).

The argument therefore, which you advance, that we must work to win a *majority* of the Party to our way of thinking, by working away within the permitted framework laid down by the opportunist leadership, is not a correct one because the means whereby Party opinion can crystallise around a correct subjective understanding of the objective world *do not exist*. The facts on Yugoslavia, India, Albania, etc. are not printed in the Party press and only appear, if at all, in distorted form in the capitalist press. How can the majority ever be won under such circumstances, no matter how rapidly objective conditions develop?

Looked at another way, I am saying that a Marxist-Leninist, a Communist Party, does not yet exist in Britain. Our job is to create one. And that cannot be done without organising, uniting the Marxists to fight the revisionists for the minds of the militant workers, a big proportion of whom remain within the C.P. because of its association with the revolutionary traditions of other peoples, notably the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and because it alone *claims* to stand for a Socialist alternative to Capitalism.

It is necessary to begin by pulling together an alternative leadership to the social democrats who have captured the Party organisation, and that cannot be done without breaking Party rules *as operated by them*, in defence of democratic centralism. To quote Lenin describing what I maintain is an analogous situation:

“It is a fact that the whole of the German Social Democratic Party (and the same is true of the French and other Parties) does *only* that which pleases Sudekum, or which can be tolerated by Sudekum. *Nothing else* can be done legally. Everything *honest*, everything really socialistic that is done in the German Social-Democratic Party is done in *opposition* to its centres, is done by avoiding its Central Committee and Central Organ, is done by *violating* organisational discipline, is done in a *factional* manner in the name of anonymous, new centres of a new Party, as was the

case, for instance, with the Manifesto issued by the German Lefts and published in the Berner Tagmacht on 31st May of this year. As a matter of fact a new party is growing up, gaining strength, and being organised, a real workers' party, a real revolutionary Social Democratic Party, unlike the old, rotten, national-liberal party of Legien, Sudekum, Kautsky, Hause, Scheidemann and Co.

It is necessary to proceed to the building of a revolutionary organisation—this is demanded by the changed historical situation, it is demanded by the epoch of proletarian revolutionary action—but it is possible to proceed in this direction only *over the heads* of the old leaders, the stranglers of revolutionary energy, *over the heads* of the old party, by *destroying it*. (*Collapse of the Second International.*)”

In practice one *cannot separate* the Party from the leadership around which it has been built up over many decades. To talk of winning a majority against them within the rules they operate is to dream of the impossible. You, as an educated Marxist of deep conviction and of strong character, have influenced maybe 50 comrades over recent years, by standing firm as an individual against strong moral pressure, and operating within the permitted legal framework. But how many, who have not chanced to meet you, or other Marxists, within their branch, have been lost to our movement in the past 20 years? Comrades of energy and enthusiasm whose development into Marxists could not proceed without help from those of greater experience. For every *one* that individuals such as ourselves have been able to influence *ten* have been lost to the Movement.

The Social Democratic leadership of our Party will never budge from their general line of *pushing* the existing Labour Movement, Unions, Co-op, and Labour Party, into more radical actions, but always within the confines of Imperialism, within the laws of our capitalist constitution. They will continue to cover this general line of betrayal with a thin ‘Marxist’ fig leaf. This is their role, objectively. (Whatever their subjective motives, objectively they have betrayed the working class). This general line, which they represent, and the organisation which they have built up around them, to implement it, is not Marxist. It cannot be changed from within. We can only build a revolutionary, Marxist Party by *smashing the old party*, by appealing over the heads of the leadership of the C.P.G.B. to all honest militants within the working class movement.

All best wishes,

MICHAEL MCCREERY.

Dear Jack,

Many thanks for your letter. I am sorry that John and Mary don't yet see the need for an alternative Party built around an alternative leadership. Why is this necessary? Because the C.P.G.B. has been built up, at least over the last 20 years, around a group of men whose political philosophy is *Left Social-Democratic*, not Marxist. This radical philosophy was well outlined in Harry Pollitt's *Looking Ahead*, published in 1947. And although it was later withdrawn, its main idea, *implied in all the actions* of the leadership of the C.P.G.B. both before and after its publication, re-emerged in the first draft of the British Road to Socialism, moved by John Gollan and ‘accepted’ by the Party in 1951; full discussion in Party press and Party branches being denied by the leadership then and subsequently.

What is the essential idea around which the political philosophy of these men is built up? It is the idea that it is possible to win working class power by *capturing* the existing machinery of State. Marxists, however, have always held that the capitalist state machine can never be captured, but must be *smashed*. All Socialist revolutions have confirmed in practice the truth of this theory. It is a universal truth.

Stemming from this basic error are all the main false ideas contained in the British Road to Socialism, which motivate *all* the practical actions of the C.P.G.B., e.g. the false idea that the Labour Party must be *transformed* into a Socialist Party before the working class can hope to capture state power. (Left-social democrats unite!); the false idea that the trade unions, organisations with an *economic* aim, have it within their power to transform the *political* character of the Labour Party, tied as it is to the capitalist constitution, hook, line and sinker; which implies that the trade unions can be *transformed* into *political* organs of the working class via the capture of leading positions in them by Communists and Left-Socialists. Either we pursue a general line of turning towards the working class, the mass of the people, to mobilise them for action against capitalism, despite capitalist laws, the capitalist constitution, or we pursue a general line of attempting to *capture* the existing legal organisations, economic and political, in which workers are to be found, with the aim of capturing, finally, the machinery of the state within which they operate. The road to Socialism lies through mobilising the common people for action against capital, not through the capture of existing organs of state. This is not to say that whilst the main aim is to mobilise the masses, to release their great potential, revolutionary energy, we do not at the same time, and *as a result of*, success in this main task, welcome the capture of all existing, legal, positions by progressives. Successes in this field are important, indeed vital, *but* because they advance the main aim, which is to mobilise the common people for action, *not* because in themselves they bring us one whit nearer to working class power.

One must conclude that there is no Marxist-Leninist Party in Britain today, nor has there been for at least 20 years. There is an organisation, the C.P.G.B., which purports to be Marxist, within

which there are many *individuals* with a correct Marxist understanding, but the *organisation* is Left Social-Democratic. This is the *practical* result of implementing radical bourgeois philosophy. There is no real mass line, there is *only* constitutional work, within the legal framework of imperialist Britain. To *restrict* Party work to this is to abandon the aim of revolution, to become an appendage of the Labour Party, itself an appendage of the capitalist state.

In your letter you recognise, and this is the essential and vital point of agreement between us, 'the need to build up a cadre force capable of producing an *alternative* leadership, inside a *real* Marxist Party.' The only doubt I have with regard to this formulation is to the word 'inside.' Leadership is not 'inside' but 'of' a Marxist Party, because a Marxist Party can only be built up *around* a Marxist leadership. You will know that no Social Democratic Party has ever been won for Marxism. The present leadership has built up the Party around itself and in its own image.

Further, all Marxist Parties have had *small* beginnings. It was a *handful* of men who founded the Bolshevik Party, the Communist Party of China, the Cuban Revolutionary Party, etc.

When you write "Do you agree that to the extent to which we win support inside the C.P. now, and when the times comes when we find ourselves in a position to create the real alternative, i.e. a real Marxist Party, that we can be stronger to the extent of saving us time, valuable time for building up a strong cadre force?" you are in effect *postponing* the establishment of an alternative leadership on the grounds that we have not yet a sufficient number of cadres to establish this leadership. This is not true. Marx and Engels were only two, but they regarded themselves, and correctly, as a Party leadership, and fought to win mass support for the correct line they advanced for over 40 years. Today in Britain the knowledge of Marxism is much more widely spread. There are more than two who can *now*, collectively, establish that Marxist leadership which the working class and the working people *must turn to* as conditions deteriorate in Britain. But the *growth* of a Marxist Party can only *follow* the establishment of a leadership, it cannot precede it. In effect you are asking for the impossible.

Can the establishment of a leadership be achieved without a breach of the rules of the C.P.G.B. as interpreted by the revisionists? No it cannot, any more than state power can be won without breaking capitalist laws. The breach of democratic centralist procedure by a revisionist faction *forces* Marxists to unite in defence of democratic centralism—that is the significance of the Appeal which I am proposing you sign. It unites Marxists within the Party in defence of the basic principles of Communist work, through operation of which *collective opinions* can be formed and *collectively acted upon*. The truth can be arrived at in no other way than by observation of the principles of democratic centralism.

When you write "it needs to be remembered that the basic unit of C.P. organisation is the Branch—not the individual" as a reason for opposing the Appeal, your remark only makes sense in the light

of an assumption that the Communist Party is a Marxist Party which is implementing the principles of democratic centralism. But you well know that it is not. The press is now completely denied to us. Branch meetings are completely denied to us. For years, in fact, Leninist opinions and arguments have been deliberately excluded from the Party press and Party branches, and only the *occasional* letter and article has been allowed, to create the illusion that the opposition was weak *and* that it was allowed its say (e.g. one or two of my pieces were allowed, basically because I believe they still hoped to win me, and as a result I have emerged as a known opponent to the revisionist line, but many other comrades have been completely silenced for years, denied the Party press. We can prove this.) But only *if* the Party press is open to Marxist argument can the alternative leadership emerge to challenge the opportunists on a *national* level. While Marxists are restricted to short, *verbal* contributions in their own branches, the alternative Marxist leadership will never, can never, emerge; the minds of the active cadres cannot be reached. Arguments must be hammered home again and again in print and verbally, in order to win conviction on questions of basic theory and on vital practical issues. Closure of the branches and the Party press to us makes this impossible unless we take *extra-ordinary* action. The fraction which dominates the Party calls itself Marxist-Leninist. Then let us expose it for its failure to act in a Marxist Leninist manner. The abandonment of democratic centralism by the Party leadership compels Marxists to expose this betrayal. *If not now, when?* A public statement must be made by all Marxists in the C.P.G.B. and a public campaign launched in England, Scotland and Wales to expose revisionism. The onus of splitting the Party is upon the revisionists, and all militants will recognise this to be so. Many of course, will not recognise this initially; many will not at first understand our action, but sooner or later they will do so, if they remain active and honest, for objective developments will force the truth upon them.

All the best,

MICHAEL MCCREERY.

ORGANISE AT THE PLACE OF WORK

I want to speak on the need to build the factory branches, and on the reasons for past failure to build them. Why do we need factory branches? More correctly, why should we have the bulk of our members organised at the point of production rather than in the localities?

In general, because it is at the point of production that we can most effectively wage the class struggle.

Firstly, our Party is above all the Party of the industrial workers, the organised working class. And all experience shows that those who work in industry just do not find it so easy to undertake political work where they live, as opposed to where they work. The factory branch can meet just after work; and before comrades go home. The local branch usually meets at 8 p.m., and it is more difficult to prise yourself away from a warm fire after you have had a meal and begun to relax after a hard day's work than it is to attend a meeting on the way home.

Partly for this reason, all too often, local branches do not succeed in drawing many industrial comrades into regular political discussion and activity. The result may be a political atmosphere in the local branch which is a little bit out of touch with the realities of the class struggle. And this atmosphere, in its turn tends to discourage industrial comrades from participating in their local branches, so that, for lack of political discussion, they under-emphasize the political, as compared with the economic aspects of the struggle against the capitalist class.

Argument and Agitation

Secondly, it is at the point of production, the place of work, that Communist argument and Communist agitation is most effective. Why?

Because at the place of work you come up against the class enemy, or his stooge, directly, in person. He emerges as a real enemy, not just an abstraction. But only if the political point is made—only if the Communist is there to point him out as a member of the exploiting class.

Because at the place of work we are known to our fellow-workers; not Communists in the abstract, but Joe, who is also a Communist. People listen to friends; listen to work mates more readily than to a stranger who calls at the door.

Because at the place of work there are five days in the week, maybe six, in which one is inevitably drawn into contact with one's fellow-workers; into conversation with them. But unless there is a Party Branch, no matter how small, meeting to plan Communist argument and Communist agitation, these regular contacts will be

so many politically wasted opportunities. It is not as a rule sufficient to leave this to individual initiative, to each individual conscience, it needs the collective, the branch, to encourage and organise Daily Worker and pamphlet sales, leaflets etc. It needs collective effort to ensure that we work in the most effective way to win our fellow-workers to our Communist understanding of the class-divided world of the 1960's.

Leadership

Thirdly, and most important of all, unless we have active Party branches in all the main factories and depots in Britain, branches which have won the confidence of the workers, we shall not be able to lead the working-class into action at the decisive moments in the economic, and still more the political battle against the capitalist class. And when the next potentially revolutionary situation develops—as in 1919 or even 1926—and the possibility of seizing power is placed on the agenda; then above all, unless we can lead the decisive sections of the working-class into action at the decisive moments (general election or no general election) there will be no revolution—but defeat for the working-class; as in 1919 and 1926.

We have had plans to build the factory branches before; introduced at District Congress after District Congress, and National Congress after National Congress for years past. But time after time these plans have crumbled away when it came to the task of implementing them. Very inadequate leadership has in practice been given on this issue by the District and the Executive Committee. In the last five years, for instance, for most of which time I have been on the Central London Area Committee, there has been practically no lead, no plan, no pushing and prodding from the District on this issue.

Symptomatic of our whole approach has been the repeated contrast made in the District Bulletin and elsewhere, between Party Branch and Factory Group. There is no mention of the term group in Party rules—the Branch is the basic unit, in factory or locality. Use of this term inevitably suggests a second-class status for factory branches. I know that many factory branches are very small, and maybe don't meet regularly to plan political activity. But that is no reason for calling them groups (which merely confirms them, as it were, in their inactive state) rather for throwing some energy into helping them develop into active branches.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. About one comrade in nine, in London District, is organised at his or her place of work. Quite possibly this is an all-time low, except for that disastrous period from 1945 when the Executive Committee actually disbanded the Factory Branches altogether. And if you excluded those factory branches that exist on paper in District and Area offices, but don't function as branches, the proportion would be even lower.

What is the reason? It would be correct, in a sense, but a super-

ficial judgment, to blame the comrades in leading positions for their failure to give a firm and sustained lead on this question. What we should rather ask is, why have they failed to give a firm lead? Why has the Party as a whole failed to follow up its good intentions in this matter?

The Constitutional Road

In my view one cannot escape the conclusion that the practical failure to organise at the place of work is inseparably connected with the Party's general policy, its general line of advance as expressed in the British Road to Socialism. If you believe in the possibility of a legal revolution, with a general election achieving a Communist and left-labour majority, which forms a Government, and proceeds to legislate in Socialism, then your Party organisation must tend inevitably towards the localities rather than towards the factories. One cannot escape the fact that a Party based mainly upon the local branches is best able to organise the constitutional fight, best able to wage the fight for electoral advance.

Factory Branches have their place in this picture of constitutional advance towards Socialism, but it is one subordinate to, as it must be, the Party's general line of electoral advance for Communists and left-labour. As the discussion article circulated to branches prior to this Congress put it. "We need to work in a way which will make electoral work the continuous centre of Branch activity, local and factory." One cannot dodge the logic of the British Road to Socialism. The constitutional development of the revolution demands a traditional, electoral-type, organisation for our Party; and the Factory Branch just does not fit neatly into this pattern. The class struggle, which the Factory Branch is best designed to wage, does not fit neatly into the constitutional pattern, it is an unruly beast, forever rearing its ugly head when least expected.

So long as we concentrate almost exclusively upon the constitutional road to Socialism it would be wrong not to recognise the fact that we cannot base ourselves, as a Party, mainly upon the factories. Policy limits room for manoeuvre in terms of organisation much more closely than one might suppose. The latter is determined by the former. Within our Party's present policy I do not believe that we can in practice achieve an appreciable advance in the proportion of our membership organised on a factory basis or work-place basis. It would amount to a re-organisation of our Party which would not best serve the constitutional aims of the British Road to Socialism.

The decision to dissolve the factory branches which was taken in 1945 was only carrying to its extreme conclusion the logic of the constitutional advance to Socialism, with the order to industrial comrades to abandon their factory organisations and get cracking in the electoral field. Partially rectified later, this great mistake has never, to my knowledge, been adequately analysed by the Party; and the correct conclusions drawn from it.

Do we over-estimate the possibility of winning Socialism by Constitutional means? I believe that we do grossly over-estimate it. I do not believe that the second most powerful capitalist class in the world would allow itself to be legislated out of existence, within the framework of the laws, the constitution, which it has drawn up for its own preservation. As the 1960 statement of the World Communist Parties states. "In the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against the people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to Socialism should be born in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily."

Sometimes when I hear comrades talk about the Parliamentary road, the constitutional road to Socialism, I think of the foolish biblical virgins who were caught on the hop when the bridegroom did finally arrive. I think we need to prepare our party more thoroughly for the coming struggle for power—and that means above all building the factory branches.

THE WAY FORWARD

The Communist Party of Great Britain was founded in 1920-21, under the influence of the Russian revolution and of Lenin; with the coming together of several Parties and groups who accepted the main principles of Marxism-Leninism and agreed to merge their separate forces into one Party, which then affiliated to the Third International. So long as the Third International endured, that is until 1943, the C.P.G.B. supported, in the main, the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, propagated these basic principles to the best of its ability, and stood four-square behind the new Socialist state, the U.S.S.R., hope of all progressive mankind. Within Britain, Communists were in the forefront of all class battles, and the Communist Party played an important role in defending the interests of the working people during these years. But it never *fully* mastered dialectical materialism, the Marxist world view, in the sense that it never proved itself capable of *applying* the generally agreed principles of Marxism-Leninism to British conditions, of working out its own independent and correct policies in each historical period. Continually, the Communist International had to correct lack of theory, lack of understanding in the C.P.G.B., which led the Party into error after error.

This basic lack of theory, common in varying degrees to all the West European Parties is well illustrated in the report Piatnitsky, member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International delivered in 1932. It was subsequently reprinted as a pamphlet. *The Bolshevization of the Communist Parties of the Capitalist Countries by eradicating Social-Democratic traditions.* I quote:

"The XI Plenum of the E.C.C.I. recorded the fact that the sections of the Comintern in the capitalist countries lag behind the rise of the revolutionary labour and peasant movement . . . Each country has its objective causes to explain this backwardness. This does not mean, however, that the backwardness is not due in a very large measure to the subjective factor—the failure to utilise the discontent of the great masses of the toilers with the lowering of the living standards, with unemployment, starvation, the burden of taxation, the actions of the Social-Democrats and Socialist Parties and reformist trade union bureaucracy.

"How are we to explain this failure to capture the working masses from the Social-Democratic and Socialist Parties and the reformists, and to consolidate, organise and keep those workers who joined the Communist Parties and revolutionary trade union movements of the capitalist countries?

"It is due mainly to the Social-Democratic and reformist traditions, prevailing in every field of party and trade union work, which are deeply rooted in the Communist Parties, red trade unions and trade union oppositions . . ."

And Piatnitsky illustrates this in a number of fields.

Party organisation

"When the Communist Parties appeared (and they appeared in some countries as a result of secessions and withdrawals from the Social-Democratic Party, while in others, such as Czechoslovakia and France, the majority of the Social-Democratic Party decided to join the Communist International, the remaining minorities constituting themselves into Social-Democratic Parties) they built their organisations exactly after the model of the Social-Democrats . . . (They) constructed their organisations along the same lines as the Social-Democrats, on the basis of election constituencies, along residential lines . . . the organisations of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries were built without permanent organisational connections with the factories . . . During the war, and immediately after it, the factory workers in many countries appointed revolutionary representatives, elected factory committees (such as the shop stewards in England) and even sent representatives to local and National Councils. In this way they were able to realise the advantages of organising at their place of work compared with organisation along territorial lines. But after the revolutionary storm subsided the Social-Democratic traditions gained the upper hand over the forms of organisation approaching the Bolshevik forms of work in the factories. This is the main reason why the Communist Parties . . . rejected at that time the nearly-Bolshevik methods of work in the factories, and are now resisting the adoption of these methods, despite the fact that their superiority to the Social-Democratic methods has already been proven . . ."

Recruitment of Members

"How is the enrolment of members by the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries organised to this day? Members are enrolled at meetings, at great mass meetings. Sometimes even in the streets (in England). A speaker makes a fiery speech, carries away the worker, and the latter submits an application for admission to the Party . . . A large number of applicants disappear in an unknown direction; some changing their addresses, some leave for other cities, some lose their ardour about joining the Communist organisation. Precisely because the admission to the Party takes place not in the factories, not on the basis of the work of the Party in the factories, through the creation of a body of active non-party workers who make themselves conspicuous in the everyday work, particularly during strikes and demonstrations, and from among whom the cell create new Party members, even those whom we have already enrolled leave us . . ."

Democratic Centralism

"In the Bolshevik Party, even under the Czar, when the Party was illegal, we had democratic centralism. The Party organisations did not wait for instructions from the C.C., the regional com-

mittees, the provincial committees and the city committees; without waiting for them they acted, depending upon the local conditions, upon the events, within the framework of the general Party decisions and directives . . .

“Unfortunately, in many Communist Parties there is *super-centralism*, especially in the legal parties . . . The C.C. must supply leaflets to the local organisations, the C.C. must first state its opinion on the events in order that the locals should wake up . . . The local committees must receive “everything” from the centre: that is why the initiative of the local Party organisations is deadened . . .

The Communist Party and the Trade Unions

“The abnormal relations between the Communist Parties and the Communist factions in the trade unions and in all the other mass proletarian organisations are due to two fundamental causes: the Party committees sometimes supplant the mass organisations, they remove the elected secretaries and appoint others, they openly publish in the press such things as: We propose to the red trade unions that they do this or that: that is they act in a way as is very rarely done even by the C.P.S.U. . . . Another cause of the abnormal relations is that the individual members of the Communist Party work in their own accord, disregard the directions of the Party organs or disobey them.

Agitation

“Many of the Communist Parties have not yet learnt to agitate effectively, while the leading comrades acting as editors, agitators, etc., think that since they understand what is taking place it must be more or less clear to the workers as well. And this is the way they approach the Social-Democratic workers. Instead of taking every little act of treachery—where it happened, when it happened, naming the witnesses, citing the exact records, relating just how and when the Social-Democratic workers and reformist leaders negotiated with the Government and the employers and betrayed the interests of the working class, instead of painstakingly explaining this to the Social-Democratic reformist and non-Party workers, our comrades keep repeating: “Social-Fascists and trade union bureaucrats,” and that is all. And they think that having said “Social-Fascists” and “trade union bureaucrats,” all the workers must understand just what is meant by these terms of abuse and believe that the Social-Democratic and reformist leaders deserved them. This only has the effect of repelling the honest workers who belong to the Social-Democratic Parties and the reformist trade unions, since they do not regard themselves either as Social-Fascists or trade union bureaucrats.”

The history of the C.P.G.B. remains to be written. (The present leadership has found it impossible to produce such a history—

the risk of exposing its own line of betrayal is too great). But even a cursory study of the struggles of the inter-war years, and the role of the Party in these struggles, reveals its inability to shake free from social democratic traditions and methods of work, its inability to master Marxism-Leninism *so as to be able to apply it in practice*.

Revisionism

With the final dissolution of the Communist International (in 1943) the Social-Democratic forces within the C.P.G.B. were powerfully strengthened. With the restraining hand from above removed, the Party soon produced clear evidence of its desire to return to the social democratic fold. In 1944 the Party published a pamphlet by Peter Kerrigan, head of the Industrial Department to this day, in which he wrote . . . “It is imperative to have the Communist Party, which represents that section of the movement which is inspired by the economic and political theories of Marx, in the Labour Party.” The need to present the Communist Party as *an alternative* to the Social-Democratic Labour Party, so as to win the masses away from Social-Democracy and for Marxist-Leninist leadership, was completely buried. As William Gallacher, the then Chairman, said to the 1945 Party Congress, “We have got to carry on continuous campaigns in the Labour Movement, in the trade unions, throughout the co-operatives, in the factories, everywhere throughout the country, in order to build up the greatest measure of unity of all working-class and progressive forces around the Labour Government. This is the one sure way of strengthening the forces in Parliament for carrying out the policy the people desire.”

This line of betrayal of working class interests, the argument that it was possible to *transform* Social-Democracy, that it did not need to be *exposed*, emerged from the war years, from the *complete* subordination of the policy of the C.P.G.B. to the democratic, anti-Fascist fight. The *independent* interests of the working class had been forgotten. Contrast this attitude with that of the Party in 1930. R. Palme Dutt, today’s Chairman of the C.P.G.B., wrote in *Labour Monthly* of January 1930 “The workers are urged to believe that, if only the Labour Government would move a point or two to the ‘left,’ all would be well; instead of being assisted to see that the whole line of the Labour Government is the line of capitalism and imperialism, against the workers and that, therefore, support of the Labour Government is necessarily support of capitalism. In this way the ‘left’ and the ‘right’ in the Labour Party are objectively allied parts of a single machine.”

The Labour Party

In the intervening 15 years had the character of the Labour Party been changed in any essentials? No, it was, and is, a capitalist Party, a Social-Democratic Party which purports to serve the interests of the working class, but is, in fact, nothing more nor less than the main instrument whereby the capitalists maintain their

ideological hold upon the working class and thus contain the aspirations of the working class within the framework of the capitalist system of exploitation. That there is, as there has been throughout this century a mass base for Social Democracy in Britain, due to the loot which flows in to this country in immense quantities from the exploitation of the peoples of the colonial and former colonial lands, and part of which is judiciously used to buy off sections of the working people in Britain, explains, in part, the success of the Labour Party, but in no way excuses Communists from the hard task of exposing it, and its imperial basis.

Why then did the C.P.G.B. make the 180-degree turn during this period? Because Social-Democratic thinking, which was *never* thoroughly purged from the Party, but lay dormant, as it were, during the years of the Third International, had effectively captured the Party by 1945. One of the clearest expressions of this thinking is contained in a document issued by the Central Education Department in August 1944, on the subject "Britain for the People." The question is asked: "Does the policy of collaboration between the capitalist and socialist states mean a new lease of life for capitalism?" The answer. "No. The fact that powerful sections of the capitalist class see the necessity for co-operation with socialism is a sign of capitalism's weakened position. Co-operation between capitalism and socialism provides excellent conditions for the advance of all peoples to socialism, for capitalism, in accommodating itself to the existence of socialism, helps the workers to learn from their own experience the need for a change of system." And the document concluded "The Labour movement is not yet strong enough to lead the Nation."

There was resistance, but it was not resistance within the higher echelons of the Party, rather from Party units within which Marxist-Leninists had influence, and from individual Communists who attempted to raise questions of basic theory and practise in the Party press. Thus Marylebone Branch, in the 1945 Congress discussion wrote: "The present form of organisation on a residential basis has not provided the Party with the closest possible links with the people. The *abandoning of factory groups* (my italics M.McC) has not strengthened the Party among the industrial workers." Comrade W. Zak wrote "Of democratic-centralism practically everything has been liquidated, to leave us with the stifling and stultifying so-called democracy of social-democracy, in which the leadership is practically immutable and the membership expected to do as they are told . . . In recent months the leadership of the Party have . . . been leading the Party into the slough of social-democracy."

Radical Appendage

But these and other comrades who recognised and protested at the open appearance of Social-Democratic theory and practise in the C.P.G.B., were unable to check the degeneration of the Party

into a radical appendage of the Social-Democratic Labour Party. By 1951 a new, and outright revisionist programme, the *British Road to Socialism* had been adopted. In this the peaceful, legal transition to Socialism was declared a real possibility in imperialist Britain, and an imperialist attitude openly adopted towards the peoples of the British Empire. Both the socialist revolution and proletarian internationalism were kicked out of the window. Thus; "For real democratic advance, the right-wing Labour leaders must be defeated, the policy of the Labour Party transformed, and a fight waged by a united Labour Movement to elect Labour and Communist representatives to Parliament who will carry through a consistent policy of Peace and Socialism."

Thus, too, on the Empire and Commonwealth. "The enemies of Communism declare that the Communist Party, by underhand subversive means, is aiming at the destruction of Britain and the British Empire. This is a lie. On the contrary it is precisely the Tories and the Labour leaders who are doing this by their policy of armed repression and colonial exploitation." What we should aim at is "a new, close, voluntary and fraternal association of the British people and the liberated peoples of the present Empire to promote mutually beneficial economic exchange and co-operation, and to defend their freedom against American imperialist aggression."

And so, in 1951, this programme of Fabian imperialism was foisted upon the Communists of Great Britain. The man who introduced it to the 22nd National Congress of the C.P.G.B.—John Gollan, present General Secretary of the Party. That subsequent Labour and Tory Colonial Secretaries were to follow John Gollan's advice, and work for this "new, close voluntary and fraternal association" or Commonwealth, within which the special interests of British capital, and all its lackeys, were to be maintained, is a tribute to the prescience of the leadership of the C.P.G.B. It might fairly be claimed that they led the way into the era of neo-colonialism. British imperialism owes much to these men.

In 1957 the *British Road to Socialism* was revised, and for the only time in recent years leading members of the Party permitted themselves the luxury of open disagreement, on this issue. The revised formula which finally won the day was this; "A Socialist Government in Britain can seek to promote close voluntary fraternal relations for economic, political and cultural independence, equal rights and non-interference in internal affairs, between Britain and the former colonial countries and existing Commonwealth countries willing to develop such relations." Palme Dutt, in proposing that "fraternal association" be changed to "fraternal relations," argued that, since 1951, "the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the British Empire have established their effective independence (not merely formal independence) and, as a result, "our formulation for this perspective needs to be less rigid, in order to be appropriate to the present fluid and rapidly changing conditions," and not *appear* (my italics M.McC) to propose the establishment of some new

unitary closed system of organisation to replace the present Empire.” He continues: “British Tory, Liberal and Labour propagandists speak of turning the Empire into a Commonwealth of Free Nations. We speak of turning the Empire into a Fraternal Association of Free Nations. Of course we are most sincerely aware that we mean something very different. But is the difference so obvious to the average colonial, who is often suspicious that all British parties are at bottom much the same? . . . In our formulations in the revised programme we need to be precise in order to prevent the danger of any such misconceptions in relation to what we mean.”

In other words, now that what we proposed in 1951 has largely been achieved we must advance the aim of a rather looser, less formal, arrangement which can still be used to retain the substance of British imperial interests, should the need arise.

The Commonwealth

Dutt is one of the more “far-sighted” leaders. Others are much less radical in their approach. George Matthews, now Editor of the *Daily Worker*, sharply attacked him. “Comrade Dutt says continuation of the Commonwealth is a perfectly possible and reasonable policy in the new non-imperialist conditions. (But) after all his brave words about the virtues of the Commonwealth form of association, Comrade Dutt abandons even this when it comes to the draft of the Programme. I do not myself think that we should use the phrase ‘continuance of the Commonwealth,’ because of its imperialist associations, and because the form of association need not be *exactly* (my italics M.McC) the same when a Socialist Government is in power as when Britain is imperialist . . .

“Thus what (Dutt is) proposing is that we should have the same attitude to the countries of the former Empire as to any other country, as if there were nothing special in the relationship. This would only make any sort of sense if it were argued that all the ties resulting from years of *imperialist* association would disappear like magic immediately a Socialist Government came to power in Britain. But this is nonsense. What will disappear is the *imperialist relationship*. But the economic and political realities resulting from the years of association will remain.”

What a wealth of great-nation chauvinism is concealed within that last sentence! We may be very sure that if and when “Comrade George” becomes the first “Socialist” prime-minister of Britain that he will firmly consolidate those “economic and political realities.” “A Socialist Government in Britain,” he concludes, “should not, and will not be able to wash its hands of the problems arising from the existence of the British Empire. An association on a new basis is needed because of the existence of economic and political realities arising from a long history of imperialist domination.

“It is needed to enable a Socialist Britain to fulfil its responsibilities (note that well-worn phrase) to the former colonial peoples, to help

them develop their countries, and the distortions of their economy which have resulted from imperialist rule, carry through industrialisation and modernise their agriculture. It is in the interests of Britain also, since it would put an end to the huge burdens on our economy resulting from imperialist relations and colonial wars, and enable fruitful trading and economic relations to be established on the basis of equal rights.”

There is nothing here, is there, with which any Labour M.P. could not agree? Equality before the law, with the rich still free to continue battering upon the poor. So, in the event, the rather more cunningly worded “fraternal relations” proposed by Dutt was accepted, and there it remains to this day.

This argument, I repeat, is the *one* argument, in all the post war years, which has ruffled the otherwise monolithic face of the group of full-time officials who dominate and completely control the C.P.G.B. The International Communist movement, and the working class, in Britain and overseas, have nothing to hope for from these men. They were the first “communists” in Europe to advance the prospect of the costly constitutional path to Socialism via the ballot-box; the first openly to embrace Social-Democracy (the Labour Party); the first to advance a neo-colonial attitude towards the peoples of the under developed world; in a word, they have led the way towards that outright betrayal of Communist principles and Communist practise which now characterises so many of the Parties of Western Europe.

Mass Struggle

Paradoxically, because the final aim, the overthrow of capitalism, has been abandoned, and the Party reduced to a “Left-wing” lobby, it cannot call upon the revolutionary energies of the working people, cannot mobilise the masses for struggle on any issue, and consequently fails miserably even in its expressed aim of winning gains for the working class from monopoly-capital. It counts for very little among the British people, and the British capitalists regard it with affectionate contempt.

Once a Party commits itself to a programme of advance towards Socialism by winning votes in local and national elections within the bourgeois Parliamentary democracy it must, inevitably, subordinate all mass struggles to this main aim. A Party which actively mobilises and leads the workers, in industry after industry, in mass action to maintain living standards in face of the employers attacks, alienates “public opinion” in a capitalist society. “Public opinion,” which is largely created by the capitalist press and television is entirely hostile to independent action by the working class. But “public opinion” plays a big part in local and national elections!

There is no third road. *Either* defend, and lead the workers in all their independent actions in defence of jobs and living standards, *despite* “public opinion,” *despite* the risk of losing votes at the next

elections, or suppress mass action for the sake of acceptance by capitalist society, and vote-catching in local and national elections. The first is the revolutionary line, the mass line, the line of a genuine working class Party. The second is the reformist line, the Fabian line, the line of a social-democratic Party serving the interests of the ruling class.

Let us look at some of the immediate consequences of the British Road to Socialism, and the abandonment of a mass line. Seven out of eight members of the C.P.G.B. are organised residentially, so as to be able to wage the electoral battle. For those that are organised on an industrial basis the main field of struggle is held to be, not the factory floor, but the Trade Union branch. (With the Labour Party allegedly controlled by the trade unions it cannot, it is argued, be transformed into a Socialist Party until the Trade Unions have been captured by Socialists and Communists!)

Time and again mass struggles are suppressed for the sake of maintaining "the unity of the left" within the Trade Unions, when a successful defence against the employers attacks would have been possible.

Ask the Ford workers whether, not so long ago, the principle of "one out; all out" was not abandoned, with the support and approval of the C.P.G.B., and sole reliance placed upon official Trade Union-Employer negotiations which eventually proved abortive. Sacked leaders were not reinstated despite months of negotiation.

In the recent dispute in London Transport where was the Communist Party of Great Britain? In support of a wage claim to meet rising prices and defend their living standards the busmen banned overtime for some weeks. The management did not budge. As Christmas approached, and in deference to "public opinion" the official union leaders did their best to get the ban on overtime lifted. But the feeling in many garages was that further action was necessary to enforce the claim. Did the C.P.G.B. give a lead? It did not. Members of the Party in this industry never met to decide what should be done. It was left to Communists, acting upon their individual understanding and initiative, and without support or co-operation from the C.P.G.B., to advance the slogan of "work to rule." This was implemented by one important garage. Others were about to follow suit. Within a very brief period the management made an offer of increased pay. This was, in itself, not sufficient, and might have been improved upon, but such as it was it resulted directly from mass action, and the threat of further action.

The Needs of the People

Examples such as this can be multiplied. In industry after industry, in England, Scotland, and Wales, the C.P.G.B. defaults on the need to advance demands which are in the interests of the workers, and to mobilise the workers for struggle to achieve these demands, by giving a lead which they are willing and able to follow.

Both opportunists of the "left," and opportunists of the right, are incapable of leading the masses in struggle. The former put forward slogans which are too "advanced" for the majority of the workers to accept. The latter advance no slogans at all, and only tail after mass actions which have been initiated by others, in order to claim some kudos after the event.

But the mass of the people are ready to act in defence of their own interests. There is, among the working class, and wide sections of the lower middle class, an increasing bitterness and dissatisfaction with the standard of living and the way of life which capitalist rule permits them. This bitterness is at present largely dissipated in arguments among the people. But, given a correct lead, nationally and locally, it can be directed against the employing class, and win great victories for the working people.

What is to be done? This question is being asked by all honest militants, by all workers and intellectuals who seek to serve the interests of the working people. More and more are coming to realise the need to fight against the policies of betrayal which Dutt, Gollan, Matthews and company represent. The failure of the C.P.G.B. to act in the interests of the working class is becoming more and more openly apparent. In the fight for wages and to maintain living standards, as well as in the fight against the aggressive policies of British imperialism, and its United States ally, the C.P.G.B. has become today an active hindrance rather than a positive help, for it is stifling the revolutionary energies of the working class. Year after year it draws into its ranks as the Party which purports to stand for Socialism, the enthusiastic young industrial workers and intellectuals whose desire is to fight the rotten, dying system of imperialism, and within a few short years it has either convinced them that the Communist Party is just like all the rest, corrupted by capitalism, and driven them out of political activity, or it has converted them to bourgeois politics and bourgeois political methods, taught them that principles are nothing but high-sounding phrases, to be used or discarded as the need arises, and drawn them into *unthinking* routine execution of orders from above in the name of a Communism in which they no longer really believe.

A break with the past is now essential. For twenty years and more individual Communists who have refused to succumb to corruption, or to subside into inactivity, have fought on within, and without, the ranks of the C.P.G.B. for a return to the principles and practise of Marxism-Leninism. They have established beyond dispute that the group of full-time officials who dominate and control the Party are united in their social-democratic theory and practise, that the Party as an organisation is completely integrated with the existing Labour Movement and functions as a ginger-group, forever prodding the existing Trade Unions, the Co-operatives, and the Labour Party, towards more radical, "left" sounding actions, all of which would, if implemented, still leave the framework of imperialism intact. In these tactics of burying themselves within the existing organisa-

tions of the Labour Movement, as an essential step on the road to power, they are at one with the Trotskyists. (Opportunists of the "left" and right unite in practice, on essentials, for the thinking of both reflects the interests of the bourgeoisie.)

Suppression of Truth

In the course of struggle against revisionism over the post-war years, British Communists have also established beyond dispute that the Party press is *not open* to Marxist-Leninist argument; either on matters of basic principle, or on the particular policies advanced by the leadership. For instance, there has never been permitted a full refutation of the revisionist Party programme since it was produced in 1951, and there is deliberate suppression of any attempt to analyse failures in action in the course of struggle on all immediate issues. From such analysis, of course, the truth would break through for too many militant workers and intellectuals. They would begin to *interconnect* the general Social-Democratic line of advance with the repeated failure to give a correct lead on all *particular* issues confronting the working class in its struggle against monopoly capital.

Suppression of factual information which would enable members of the Communist Party to gain a clear picture of the real issues within the international Communist movement, now that the revisionists have taken to public slander of Communist Parties which stand by the basic truths of Marxism-Leninism, and the basic interests of the working class, is persistent and deliberate. There has been no mention of important statements defending Marxism-Leninism made in recent months by the Communist Parties of Vietnam, New Zealand, Indonesia, Korea, Albania, Brazil, and many other countries, and only a few extracts from statements by the Communist Party of China, selected in an attempt to distort the true standpoint of this fraternal Party.

There has been virtually complete suppression of news in the *Daily Worker* relating to the Tito group's restoration of capitalism within Yugoslavia, and its policy of collaboration with imperialism internationally. The Indian capitalists ruthless suppression of the peoples of India, and their armed aggressions against the People's Republic of China, are ignored in the *Daily Worker*. The armed struggles for national liberation from British imperialism of the peoples of North Kalimantan and Oman are also largely ignored.

At the same time the C.P.G.B. emerges with a stream of lies, distortions and half truths designed to bewilder, confuse, and split the working class in Britain from their class brothers in other lands. It is said that Tito has made his mistakes, but that he is building Socialism in Yugoslavia. It is said that Nehru is a well-meaning man, doing his best by the Indian people, that Kennedy is (was) a progressive capitalist, who must be encouraged in his struggle against the real, but unspecified, reactionary forces. And at the same time as these capitalists and their lackeys are prettyfied, a constant barrage of abuse is directed against those who attempt to defend the interests of the working people.

Need for a New Party

If democratic-centralism is dead within the C.P.G.B. If the Party press is closed to the truth on matters of vital importance to the working people, and the policies pursued by the Party run directly counter to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the basic interests of the working people *then it has ceased to be a Communist Party and those who wish to serve the working class must break it with*, and establish a new and genuine political organisation of the working class which *will* operate democratic-centralism, which *will* stand firm by the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and which *will* attempt to apply these principles to Great Britain today. *A genuine Communist Party must be established in England, in Scotland and in Wales.*

Marxism-Leninism will triumph in Britain. The English, the Scottish and the Welsh peoples, who have suffered longer from capitalist exploitation than any people in the world, whose lives have been stunted by capitalism, over many generations, have a deep ingrained hatred of capitalist society. They will finally succeed in smashing the ruling class which has exploited them for so long. But for this they demand a Party which can lead them in their struggle, which will serve their interests, and theirs alone. To build this Party involves the destruction of that Social-Democracy whereby the ruling class attempt to divert the revolutionary energies of the working people and win acceptance of the capitalist system. Whether in its open form, as the Labour Party, or in its concealed form, as the Communist Party of Great Britain, Social-Democracy must be exposed before the people so that they can be won for Marxism-Leninism, which alone represents their interests.

In November 1963 the *Committee to Defeat Revisionism, for Communist Unity*, was set up in Great Britain by Communists who had come to recognise, in the course of struggle against the policies of the Communist Party of Great Britain, that to transform this Party from within, by accepting rules operated by men such as Gollan, Dutt and Matthews, was *an impossibility*. This Committee is now organising a public campaign to expose revisionism, and win the militant industrial workers and intellectuals to understand that a genuine Communist Party *must* be established before advance can be made against monopoly-capital in Britain. We shall, before long, achieve this goal.

Basic Principles

In what ways will the new Party differ from the old? It will be based, firstly upon the principle of proletarian internationalism. Without firm alliance with all oppressed peoples of the capitalist world, and with those who have won their freedom from exploitation, in the struggle against imperialism, there can be no future for the peoples of England, Scotland and Wales. Neo-colonial "economic and political realities" will be ruthlessly exposed. All possible support will be given to those struggling for national

liberation from the British and allied imperialists, and in particular those who have been forced to take to arms, as in Oman, and North Kalimantan. For us, there can be no special "associations" or "relationships" between a Socialist Britain and the countries within the Empire and Commonwealth. All Socialist lands will join hands without distinction.

Secondly, the Party will fight to establish the *Dictatorship of the Proletariat* in Britain. This involves *smashing* the capitalist state machine in a Socialist revolution which will be led by the workers *own* organisations (Soviets). Parliament, the instrument whereby the bourgeoisie maintain their rule, can never be used to win working class power. The role of Communist M.P's is to *expose* the capitalist system, and the fraud of Parliamentary democracy.

Thirdly, the Party will relate the struggles on all immediate issues (wages and conditions of work, housing, against military bases and militarism, for all democratic rights) to this central and final goal, the establishment of working class power. The result of struggles on all immediate issues should be to increase the understanding of the masses for the need to take political power into their own hands.

Fourthly, in the struggles for all immediate aims, and for the final conquest of power, the main line of the Party will be to *mobilise the mass of the people for action*. This demands organisation of the Party *at the place of work*. It is here that exploitation takes place, it is here that the workers are drawn together in common action against capital, it is here that agitation and propaganda can most effectively be organised.

Fifthly, the Party will fight for positions, and progressive policies, in all Trade Unions and Co-operatives, as a means of mobilising the mass of the people for action in defence of their own interests, but it will resolutely oppose the false idea that capturing of positions within the legal organisations of the Labour Movement, and the capitalist state within which they operate, is the road to working-class power.

Finally, not *bureaucratic* but *democratic-centralism* will operate within the new Party. Full discussion within the Party in order to reach agreement on policy in each new situation must be accompanied by united action to implement this agreed policy, with each basic unit *itself* translating the general policy into action within its local field of work. Only when the Party as a whole is capable of understanding the principles of Marxism-Leninism so as to apply them to conditions in Britain, and each unit of the Party is capable of understanding each policy and slogan so as to apply it to its own local conditions, can we give that leadership in the struggle against monopoly capital which the interests of the British people demand.