

Action Centre for Marxist-Leninist Unity

The Communist Party No Longer Exists in Britain

First Published: Hammer or Anvil Editorial, Vol2 No.1 Jan/Feb 1966

Transcription, Editing and Markup: Sam Richards and Paul Saba

Copyright: This work is in the Public Domain under the [Creative Commons Common Deed](#). You can freely copy, distribute and display this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Please credit the Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line as your source, include the url to this work, and note any of the transcribers, editors & proofreaders above.

EDITORIALTHE COMMUNIST PARTY NO
LONGER EXISTS
IN BRITAIN.

THE 29th NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE C. P. G. B. IS OVER ; its outcome completely confirms and validates the many warnings uttered by practically all the Marxist - Leninist Groups and Organisations in Britain throughout the preceding period. At the time, the Editorial of the pre-Congress Special Issue of "HAMMER OR ANVIL" made the following statement :

"Today, as never before in its entire history, the Communist Movement in Britain is faced with a crisis of unparalleled dimensions and significance. Nothing less than the whole future existence of the Communist vanguard Party of the working-class is at stake. The programmatic perspectives of the revisionist clique to be presented to Congress puts forward a line which stands in direct contradiction to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, the scientific ideology and guide to action of the working-class and its Communist vanguard, and which represents a final capitulation to the policies of social-democracy, the ideology of the capitalist class within the working-class movement, by means of which the class enemy seeks to immobilise, disperse, and finally to liquidate the Communist vanguard Party, to deprive the working-class of its indispensable leading force, and thus to secure the continued existence of capitalist exploitation, anarchy, oppression and war for all time

....Should the social-democratic theses and perspectives of the revisionist leadership be approved at the 29th National Congress, then this will have only one consequence of tragic and far-reaching implications for the working-class movement, for all working people in Britain: the culmination of over 20 years of degeneration with its appalling record of corruption, manoeuvring, demagogy, unprincipled concealment and the steady whittling away of the Party's strength and prestige, will have reached its final outcome in the transformation of the once glorious C.P.G.B. into a second Labour Party. The Communist Party will have ceased to exist in Britain."

The policy statement issued by Congress, "Turn Left For Progress" represents this culmination and formalisation of the long-term trend and aims of the revisionist leadership. On page 11 we read :

"It is impossible for our Communist Party to influence British policies in any decisive way unless it influences the trade unions and the Labour Party. We must advance along with the forces of the left."

It is the final sentence which is of typical significance here, and which gives the lie to all the facile and hypocritical phrasemongering on behalf of "unity of all progressive forces", "the movement of left unity", etc. etc., with which the statement is so lavishly bestrewn. For, the Labour Party being that of the three main political parties together

constituting the triangle of the capitalist political framework of deception and fraud, with parliament at its apex, which is primarily concerned with containing working - class political allegiance, and thinking within the framework of the capitalist system, it is obvious that a Communist Party with a serious programme based on Marxist-Leninist principles would see as its main task the need to win the trust and allegiance of the broad mass of the working - class, commencing with the advanced sections, away from the paralysing, anti-revolutionary grip of social democracy, and for the proletarian aims of working-class power and Socialism. In the course of this struggle, the essential unity of all sections of the working people with the potentially progressive intermediate strata would be forged, resulting in the increasing isolation of the handful of monopoly-capitalists and their representatives in their armed state stronghold, depriving them of all opportunities for political manoeuvre, winning over the mass of the armed forces themselves to the side of the revolutionary people, and thus transforming the armed state of the monopoly-capitalist dictatorship from a stronghold into a prison for the monopoly-capitalists.

"TURN LEFT FOR PROGRESS" - AN EMBRYO PROGRAMME.

But this is not all. The perspective first presented by "The British Road To Socialism" and now completed by the new embryo programme, "Turn Left For Progress", is the diametrically opposite one of making the final bid for acceptance by the monopoly-capitalists as a constitutional party of reform and peaceful, gradual change. The last traces of a Marxist heritage and of scientific principle are finally jettisoned, and the perspective which the "British Road To Socialism" presented in a concealed way in terms of seemingly militant, pseudo-Marxist phrases designed to lull the Party cadres and to condition their thinking to the perspectives of reform and the perpetuation of capitalism, has now become the open and unconcealed embryo of a new programme of open and unconcealed "left" social-democracy.

For it is significant that "Turn Left For Progress" has now been hastily published as a pamphlet by Gollan on sale to the public. One is inevitably and irresistibly reminded of a pamphlet which appeared on sale in 1950, entitled "Britain's Road To Socialism", and which just one year later, was presented to the Congress of 1951 as the new programme, the possessive case having been changed into an adjective for form's sake! There is every likelihood that "Turn Left For Progress", suitably upholstered, is to act as a similar foil, and the 30th Congress of 1967, (or even an Extraordinary Congress called earlier) is to be offered another such fait accompli.

For the British revisionists are lagging behind their European partners in carrying through their share of the great international drive to liquidate the Communist Parties. So all-important has been their concern to disguise their true positions and aims, that they have fallen behind the Khrushchevite timetable. It is significant that Dutt, the founding father of British revisionism, opens his "Notes of the Month" in the January issue of Labour Monthly with a reference to the French presidential elections, in which the N.A.T.O. politician and pro-U.S. cold-war ideologue, Mitterand, was given the backing of the C.P.F. - as if to remind their more pragmatic and conservative British partners how much more quickly matters are moving on the Continent. He compares the Mitterand voting figures to the Popular Front Election of 1936, but fails to inform his readers that it is now 20 times more difficult for a Communist candidate to win a seat in the National Assembly than it was in 1936 - and therefore equally more difficult for a Communist government, or a progressive government under any other name, to be voted into power peacefully. Later on, he argues, in support of his picture of phoney "left-unity", that Communists "...would no more dream of endeavouring to impose such a demand (the class to leave the Labour Party for the Communist Party, Ed.) on their fellow left fighters in the Labour Party than it would be reasonable for the latter to demand of the Communists to dissolve their organisation in order to seek admittance to the Labour Party." This, of course, is the familiar trick, common in bourgeois liberalism, of equating political and ideological leadership and persuasion - one of the fundamental duties of all Communist Parties - with physical force which is imposed. What Dutt is really angling after here, what he is really proposing is the

establishment of a "new", "united" political party of "left" social-democracy, in which the alliance between the revisionist C.P.G.B. leadership and the right social-democrat leaders of the Labour Party would be given organisational, as distinct from merely concealed or ideological, expression, in order to meet the urgent needs of the monopoly ruling class.

Today, more than ever before, there is a need for a line of clear and irreconcilable struggle against all forms of class-collaboration, revisionism and parliamentary, legal deception, for the building of a powerful vanguard Party of the working-class which will progressively challenge the ideological and political supremacy of social-democracy and provide the necessary leadership on all fronts to enable ever wider sections of the working-class, commencing with the advanced industrial workers, to take the initiative into their own hands and enter into struggle in defence of working-class rights and immediate demands and to act as the leading force in the fight to defeat the monopoly -capitalist drive towards fascism. Only thus will the paralysing grip of both right and "left" social-democracy be broken and revolutionary unity built, in preparation for the great revolutionary class battles which will usher in the epoch of Socialism in Britain and throughout Western Europe.

As for the intermediate and middle strata who form a relatively large section of the population in capitalist Britain, it is a fundamental feature of the dialectics of class struggle that these will be drawn, inevitably and irresistibly, into the arena of social conflict, and will be come increasingly polarised, as the less privileged sections find their living -standards being threatened equally with those of the industrial working - class and working people generally. As this intrinsic process gets under way with mounting tempo, the middle strata will be drawn towards that of the two major classes, the capitalist class with the monopolists and their state at its apex, and the working -class at the head of all working people, which is seizing the initiative, developing its forces, and making itself the leading force in society.

But the advanced sections of the working - class by hand and brain will only be able to take on this, its historic role, provided that a Party of a new type is built, a Leninist Party capable of acting as the general staff of the revolutionary forces, with the industrial working-class at its core, which proclaims its complete independence from the capitalist political framework of parliamentary deception, declares its determined opposition to the whole bourgeois structure of power and to the social - democratic party of reform and the perpetuation of capitalism, and which rallies the whole revolutionary people behind it in a great united front.

But the C.P.G.B. embryo programme, "Turn Left For Progress", speaks lamely and deceitfully of "advance along with the forces of the left". This means, in theory and in practice, to subordinate the Party to the reformist and pacifist ideology of the Labour Party, to tail along behind the spontaneous petty-bourgeois protest wave, taking the initiative from it, and liquidating the Party in a bid for formal amalgamation with the Labour Party. For the petty-bourgeois left and its protest movement, upon which the Labour Party depends for its leading cadres and intellectuals, far from being the product of C.P.G.B. policies, as the revisionists suggest, are actually but an integral part of the political antagonisms of contemporary monopoly - capitalist Britain and of the growing polarisation of class forces which lies at its heart - indeed they are the form these antagonisms spontaneously assume in the absence of Communist leadership. The "forces of the left" which the revisionists love to prattle about, therefore, represent merely the raw material of social movement and change, which urgently needs revolutionary, united - front leadership to mobilise all progressive sections of the people against the main class enemy, and which the revisionists are betraying every bit as much as they are betraying the fundamental interests of the working-class itself.

The "forces of the left" represent, therefore, the spontaneous surface expression of that objectively determined shift in the balance of class forces which reflects the growing antagonism between the concentration of ever more economic wealth and political power in the hands of an ever-shrinking monopoly-capitalist class, and the equally growing im-

poverishment of the mass of the people, the intolerable accretion of social strains and stresses of all kinds, including the threat of aggressive wars, which announce the onset of the stage of final disintegration of capitalism. This, the most fundamental of all class antagonism can have only one of two outcomes: Socialist revolution and the democratic dictatorship of all working people - or the counter-revolutionary fascist dictatorship of the monopoly - capitalist bourgeoisie acting in the interests of, and as the instrument of, U. S. imperialism. Socialism or fascism - those are the two alternatives. In the epoch of the break-up of the capitalist world system, when the historical initiative is more and more passing into the hands of the revolutionary people, commencing, in our present period, with the victorious anti-imperialist national liberation struggles of the working people and peasantry in the colonial and semi-colonial territories, the role served objectively by the ideology and policies of "left" social-democracy, as propounded by the modern revisionist leadership of the C. P. G. B. and other European Communist Parties, of which "Turn Left For Progress" is a typical example, is to hold back the more advanced sections of the working-class from seizing this initiative by posing as the Party of working-class power and of Socialism, whilst in reality pursuing policies which harness the working-class to precisely those main instruments of the monopoly-capitalist dictatorship - the state administered framework of "reform", the incorporation of the mass organisations of the working-class into the political structure of capitalism, the parliamentary system of disguised dictatorship through elections, the colonial and neo-colonial structure of exploitation and oppression of other peoples and nations overseas, and the increasing surrender of the national economy and machinery of state to the control and supra-national exploitation of the U. S. imperialists - which form the chief means whereby moribund British monopoly-capitalism seeks to win for itself an extended lease of life and to stave off the hour of its extinction at the hands of the revolutionary people.

Only a vanguard Party rooted in the industrial working-class and basing all its policies and guiding lines upon the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism, as concretely manifested in actual policies which, at each stage in the historical process, isolate the main enemy and set forth the main aims and tasks in each field of struggle, will succeed in leading the working people to grasp their initiative in the favourable situation, isolate the handful of monopoly-capitalist exploiters, throw out the U. S. robber-baron, encircle the seemingly all-powerful state machinery of oppression and reactionary violence, and lead the working-class to fulfilment of its historic role as the leading class in society and main force in the future Socialist Revolution.

IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES OF THE 29th NATIONAL CONGRESS OF BETRAYAL AND LIQUIDATION

With the formalisation and completion of the line of class-collaboration and capitulation to social-democracy, an extremely dangerous situation faces the working-class and progressive movement - a situation without parallel in the history of working-class politics in the 20th Century; the independent vanguard Party of the British working-class, the Communist Party, has finally succumbed to the influences of bourgeois ideology within the working-class movement, and has thereby liquidated itself as a Party of the working-class and transformed itself into a component part of the capitalist political framework.

In all the crucial and far-reaching issues now confronting the working-class, in a situation dominated by the intensive preparations of the monopoly-capitalist ruling class to modify the traditional state and political superstructure of British capitalism to prepare for the violent class battles which loom ahead*, and to achieve, through their present representative, the Labour Govt., the complete subordination, economically, politically, and militarily, of British imperialism to the dictates of that chief scourge of the world's peoples, U. S. imperialism, whose main instrument in Britain, the Labour Party and Govt. is, at this very moment when class antagonisms are mounting, when British imperial-

* See "Hammer or Anvil" leading article "MARXISM - LENINISM OR REVISIONISM", "Congress Special Issue", Nov., 1965.

ism is entering into a stage of accelerating decay and disintegration, and when, as a consequence, ever wider and wider sections of working people, youth, students and progressive people generally are spontaneously rising in struggle to engage the class enemy and his various representatives, against the nuclear weapon and for peace and disarmament, against the colonial wars of aggression and plunder, and for unity with their class brothers who bear the main brunt of U. S. imperialism's ferocity and barbarism - in other words, at the very moment in history when the objective conditions for mounting successful class struggles and for accumulating the revolutionary energies of the people are rapidly maturing in British monopoly-capitalist society, the revisionist leading clique of the C.P.G.B. emerges as a detachment of finance-capital and imperialism within the vanguard Party of the working-class, whose role, consciously or unconsciously, is to integrate the C.P.G.B. into the party-political framework of capitalist politics, to act as a second line of defence behind the party of right social-democracy, the Labour Party, and to prevent the development of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of the British working-class.

With the adoption of the revisionist embryo programme, "Turn Left For Progress", the final stage in this process has been completed, and the C.P.G.B. has been finally liquidated as a Communist Party of the working-class and finally transformed, as the culmination of a whole history of accommodation to social-democratic influences extending over at least the last 25 years, into an adjunct of the capitalist system and its reformist / parliamentary / bureaucratic state apparatus.

The lessons contained in this long history of betrayal and capitulation are of fundamental significance to the working-class, to all progressive people, to all who believe that only a Socialist society will eliminate, once and for all time, the class antagonisms, exploitation, wars and attendant unspeakable sufferings of countless millions of oppressed and propertyless workers, peasants and intellectuals all over the world, and who represent the overwhelming majority of the world's peoples. This experience, including its lessons in Britain, must be analysed and the conclusions written into the body of scientific theory, the generalised experience of the working-class in struggle. The ravages of the revisionist betrayal must be made good at the earliest possible moment, the urgent steps taken to hammer out and develop the Marxist-Leninist programme of class struggle and Socialist Revolution which will commence upon the vitally necessary tasks of forging a broad united-front of the working-class and all progressive strata for the mounting of an all-out offensive, in alliance with the revolutionary people in the storm centres of Asia, Africa and Latin America, in the first instance against the international main enemy, U.S. imperialism, and, from the bases thus won, increasingly to take the field against the indigenous class enemy and ally of U.S. imperialism, British monopoly-capital, whose majority section supports the Wilson Govt. and its policies of subordination to U. S. imperialism.

The absolutely indispensable pre-condition for the carrying through of such a programme of broad unity in struggle, however, is the creation of a genuine Communist Party capable of applying Marxist-Leninist theory to the concrete conditions of Britain, of analysing the complex class-relationships and their development in the rapidly changing and intensifying conditions of decaying British imperialism. To re-establish the

LEST WE FORGET !
TO RALLY AND ORGANISE THE FORCES OF MARXISM-LENINISM IN BRITAIN is the most fundamental and the most difficult task now confronting all Communists and working-class militants.

IT IS ALSO A VERY EXPENSIVE ONE !

Additional expensive equipment remains to be bought - particularly a plate-maker to reproduce photographs.

If you have not already taken out a subscription to HAMMER OR ANVIL, please do so without delay (Subscription rates on pg. 2). But we also need your SPARE CASH to help us build the Marxist-Leninist Movement and to make HAMMER OR ANVIL a more effective weapon.

If you have any, DON'T give it to the betrayers and deceivers of the working-class. Use it in the most effective way for the great cause of Socialism and Communism by sending it to:

HAMMER OR ANVIL
57, Manchester Road,
Manchester 21.

Marxist-Leninist Party of the working - class is therefore the main task now confronting all Communists in Britain. We must now consider what are the main contradictions, especially within the Marxist-Leninist Movement itself as it has arisen over the last five years, which stand in the way of realisation of this fundamental aim.

ORIGINS AND BRIEF HISTORY OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT IN BRITAIN.

The origin and development of the Marxist-Leninist Movement in Britain, like its counterparts in other Communist Parties in Europe and the world, bears its own individual marks and features, peculiar only to it. In particular, it has been the extremely protracted and long - standing character of the degeneration of the C.P.G.B., dating as it does from at least the year 1943 and the dissolution of the Comintern, that has been a most decisive factor in the development of our Movement. For the revisionist leading clique of the C.P.G.B., in common with their masters, the British ruling class itself, possess one strength and ability above all others: the ability to conceal their true political and ideological features behind a smoke-screen of adherence to Communist principle, of "creative development of Marxist theory", to apply alternately the methods of phrasemongering and demagogy and ruthless bureaucratic force, to manoeuvre and twist in order to appease and intimidate in turn the militant cadres influenced by and moving towards Marxism-Leninism. Whilst thus posing as a Communist leadership, however, the revisionist leading clique has simultaneously used all kinds of bureaucratic coercion and manipulation of the Party structure in order to isolate, frustrate, disillusion and finally expell all comrades who, at whatever level, came to achieve a more-or-less correct understanding of the revisionist policies. The working - class movement is littered with the remains of once eager and militant cadres whom the C.P.G.B. revisionists have broken and ruined. For a fuller account of the actual history of the C.P.G.B. degeneration since 1943, readers are referred to the Manifesto of the A.C.M.L.U.* The point to be grasped here, however, is that it has been this long-drawn out and carefully concealed history of betrayal which has resulted in the relatively small numerical size of the Marxist-Leninist Movement in Britain, its relative immaturity and lack of theoretical clarity, the absence from its ranks of leading members of national standing - above all, the lack of political and ideological unity which would result from a clear perspective of struggle towards the working-out of a Marxist-Leninist alternative programme based on class struggle and working - class power.

The elaboration of such a programme, however, is and remains the primary task of all Marxist-Leninists. Only by themselves seizing the initiative, establishing that minimum framework of relations between the existing Groups and Organisations as will enable the disciplined and democratic thrashing out of the many complex problems, will the Marxist-Leninist Movement begin to build its cadres and activists, weld them into a single disciplined and cohesive force imbued with a clear political perspective and theoretical clarity, and so prepare for the re-establishment of the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party in the future. Only such a course of action will succeed in wresting the initiative out of the hands of the revisionist leading clique, exposing them before the rank-and-file and the broad working-class militants, and placing it firmly in the hands of the Marxist-Leninists.

It was the publication, on Sept. 18th, 1963, of the now notorious Resolution of the E. C. of the C.P.G.B. on the International Communist Movement, in which the Communist Parties of Albania and China were publicly attacked and slandered, and the immediately ensuing steps taken by the revisionist leadership of summoning aggregate meetings at Branch and District level to "ratify" this resolution, that finally compelled action upon the Marxist-Leninists. The view was held that these two steps, taken together, represented the final abandonment of Marxist - Leninist principle and democratic - centralist procedure, and that therefore the public attacks and slanders had to be answered by a public statement of adherence to Marxism-Leninism and solidarity with those Communist Parties who upheld it firmly.

Continued on Page 28

* Available from Lit. Dept., A.C.M.L.U., 57, Manchester Rd., Chorlton - cum - Hardy, Manchester 21. Price 1/-.

A COMMUNIST PARTY NO LONGER EXISTS IN BRITAIN..cont.from
page 8.

Consequently, in November 1963, representatives of all anti-revisionist groups in Britain met at a Conference in London to discuss the publication of the "Appeal To All Communists From Members of The C.P.G.B." This Conference was convened by the largest of the then-existing groups, the London Committee of Marxist-Leninists, and was attended by some 35 delegates and individuals. A draft "Appeal" was prepared and presented by the London Committee of Marxist-Leninists, and the main political reports were given by Cdes. Michael McCreery and Peter Seltman jointly.

As soon as discussion was opened on the draft Appeal, however, it soon became apparent that a wholly insufficient degree of political unanimity prevailed amongst the delegates to enable the Conference to come to grips with its tasks. The bulk of the delegates, it must be remember-

ed, were meeting each other and coming face to face for the first time in their lives. With the wisdom of hindsight, it is now possible to see that the sectarian error had been committed of appraising consciousness in isolation from practical experience in struggle, of forgetting that a political line of action, however correct, requires careful preparation, if necessary over many months of bi-lateral and multi-lateral consultations and discussions, if the ensuing collective (the Conference) is to really act as a collective and to come to grips with the concrete tasks. For, if democratic-centralism is to prevail as the Communist method of policy-making and organisation, unanimity on fundamental questions is an absolutely necessary pre-requisite. And here, the extremely protracted nature of the development of the revisionist betrayal and its accompanying inner-Party bureaucratic dictat had operated precisely to inhibit and frustrate, first of all the growth of separate groups of anti-revisionists in the various localities, industries, and spheres of mass work, and later, when this could no longer be held back, to prevent their consolidation into a national cadre force capable of taking the initiative and presenting a united challenge to the revisionist hegemony within the Party and the bureaucratic violation and abuse of the Party structure and statutes.

The immediate result of this lack of preparation, of inadequate political unity (the responsibility for which must be shared equally by all participants in the Conference, the present writer included), was that only a very small majority of delegates finally voted for publication of the "Appeal", and the Conference, representing as it did all the then existing forces meeting for the first time to formulate a common policy to create a nation-wide movement, failed to reach agreement.

However, to save what could be saved, the majority section of the Conference, who had voted for publication of the Appeal, decided to proceed with the agreed programme of struggle. It was recognised that the objective situation, characterised as it was by the first steps being taken by the revisionist leadership to liquidate the Party at a time when the class struggle was sharpening, British monopoly-capitalism was entering a new phase of disintegration, and the conditions for mounting successful class battles were beginning to mature, provided only that correct leadership could be given by a Marxist-Leninist Party, required that urgent steps be taken to rally all Marxist-Leninist cadres through the establishment of an open centre which would proclaim the vanguard role of the Marxist-Leninists, mobilise and integrate struggles both within the C.P.G.B. ranks and outside them, link the public propaganda and agitational work with the task of exposing the separate acts of betrayal and bureaucratic dictat of the revisionist leadership within the Party, and so gather the forces, build unity, and prepare for the re-establishment of a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party. The point was correctly made that the C.P.G.B. leadership had virtually completed the transformation of the Party into a "left" type of social-democratic party, had virtually integrated it into the capitalist political framework, and that the entire history of the working-class and Communist Movement offered no single example of such a party being transformed purely from within and under the conditions where the sway of spontaneous petty-bourgeois ideology is backed up by the bureaucratic stranglehold and demagogy which always and everywhere are the methods of rule adopted by social-democrats, back into a truly independent Marxist-Leninist Party of the working-class again. And, indeed, a little thought will reveal the absurdity of such a view, its utterly undialectical anti-Marxist nature.

However, "virtual" transformation of the Party into a "left" social-democratic party, "virtual" integration into the capitalist political framework, is still not complete transformation, complete integration. This may seem like hair-splitting, but the distinction is in reality a vital one. For, from the point of view of the development of the objective conditions, the liquidation of the Party must be complete, must be an objective and demonstrable fact - just as, from the point of view of the development of the subjective forces, the achievement of unity amongst the Marxist-Leninists around a correct programme is also absolutely necessary - before the re-establishment of the Marxist-Leninist Party can be placed on the agenda. Up to that time, the main task is to expose the revisionists, and their class-collaborationist policies before the Party cadres, militants and rank-and-file, to wage struggles within the Party in order to isolate them in their seemingly all-powerful organisational

apparatus, to mount as wide and all-embracing a political propaganda offensive as is possible with the available forces, and to carry these tasks through openly, through an open, but not organisationally rigid, centre of political and ideological leadership, not clandestinely. With the formalisation of the revisionist betrayal at the 29th National Congress, the liquidation of the Party now is complete, and the necessary minimum organisational framework, reflecting political unity amongst all Marxist Leninist Groups and Organisations, now becomes not merely a appropriate and correct, but an urgent necessity.

Whilst, therefore, the fundamental political correctness of the London Conference decisions must be upheld, it must also be recognised that the subjective conditions within the Marxist-Leninist Movement were not at that time ripe, and that those conditions should have been prepared for carefully beforehand and in close conformity with the development of the objective situation and the exposure and isolation of the revisionist leadership.

This original division of the Movement at the London Conference into those who advocated open struggle through an open journal and an open centre, and those who advocated concealed, clandestine work through a clandestine journal and no centre, has had far-reaching and serious consequences for the Marxist-Leninist Movement right up to the present day - is, indeed, only now making its full effects felt. For the situation is a different one today; the C.P.G.B. revisionist leading clique has now demonstrated its fundamental betrayal of the basic interests of the working-class through its embryo programme, "Turn Left For Progress", and its entire platform at the 29th National Congress. The spontaneous growth of the Marxist-Leninist Movement, on the other hand, has now reached the point where it numbers close onto 500 cadres, activists and supporters nationally. The method of clandestine work purely within the revisionist Party has been tried and found lacking - but so also has the sectarian method, representing the majority section at the London Conference, of isolating oneself from the C.P.G.B., renouncing all need to expose through struggle the actions and policies of the revisionist leadership, and to neglect the need to win over the honest militants and cadres in the C.P.G.B., however few these may now number, to Marxist-Leninist ideas and policies.

In particular, the premature example of the London Conference has resulted in a false distinction arising in the minds of many comrades between "open" and "concealed" forms of struggle. It is often assumed that, in advocating the establishment of an open centre and open forms of struggle, the practice of provoking formal expulsion through mere violation of the Party rules is intended - and, indeed, much in the sectarian practice hitherto of the main exponents of this line seems to bear out this criticism. This, in turn, has tended to lend credence to the line of the opposite and mutually exclusive camp - the camp of clandestine propaganda work without a centre. But this apparent proof of the suitability of concealed methods of work is actually quite misleading. For, by open struggle, Marxist-Leninists mean the line of openly challenging the revisionist leadership to open debate on the fundamental issues, of exposing them publicly when they seek to avoid this debate, and of revealing their abandonment of Marxism-Leninism and their violations of democratic-centralist procedure for all to see, in order to compel them either to renounce their revisionist policies and to return to Marxism-Leninism, or else to expose themselves for what they are - betrayers of the fundamental interests of the working-class, of the cause of Socialism and Communism, and of the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism. Merely to break the Party rules, issue a statement of political principles, however correct these may be, and then meekly to accept or even welcome expulsion, means, in practice, to abdicate from struggle, to abandon the task of exposing the revisionist leadership through incepting and leading persistent and many-sided inner-party struggles at all levels, and so of surrendering the honest but not yet theoretically conscious militants in the C.P.G.B. to the tender mercies of Gollan, Matthews, and their sycophant-opposite in unity with the opportunist line of clandestine, conspiratorial work which denies the need to build a united Marxist-Leninist Movement capable of integrating all fronts of struggle, both public and inner-party. Both lines thus end in the same result: the restriction of the tasks to mere publicistic and propaganda work through a journal - the only distinction being that, in the one case articles are anonymous, whereas in the other case they are signed.

Thus there is, in fact, no Chinese wall between open, i.e. public, and concealed, i.e. inner-party, spheres of work; both are necessary and complement each other and to erect a barrier, a false distinction, between the two, is to react spontaneously and superficially to the challenge of Marxist-Leninist inner-party and inner-Movement struggle, to think in a metaphysical, undialectical way. And it is because of this metaphysical division between the two superficial extremes that the revisionist leading clique has been successful to a large degree, and up till now, in maintaining its political initiative and organisational grip, and which has enabled it to choose, more or less unhampered, the most advantageous moment at which to formalise its line of liquidation. It is also the reason why the scope and effectiveness of actual inner-party struggle has been so pitifully weak - such as at Congress itself, when the largest number of votes that could be mustered on behalf of an extremely inoffensive resolution was only 18 - this after two years of propaganda activity by the Groups and individuals adhering to the two mutually opposite lines!

The situation now prevailing in the Marxist-Leninist Movement, and which is the direct outcome and end-product of the original division stemming from the London Conference, is an extremely serious one which must be overcome now. For these two diametrically opposed lines, like all such metaphysical opposites, are in reality but superficial reflections of the spontaneous tendencies towards opportunism and unprincipled compromise on the one hand, and sectarian isolation and skipping over of necessary stages on the other - both are but opposite sides of the same coin.

The resulting disunity and the inactivity and indecision which it breeds has given the revisionist enemy just the vital breathing-space he needed. Under the guise of "experts on China", all kinds of conciliators of revisionism have crept into the ranks of the Marxist-Leninist Movement, who use their bourgeois training and talents to hold it back from struggle, to contain it within legal inner-party bounds, and so to prevent it from building its forces into an independent open weapon of struggle. Thus we see that the structure of bourgeois ideology reaches right into the apex of the young vanguard movement itself, acting to disrupt and to disarm. By advocating the broad, legal frame of academic propaganda, and by condemning all political struggles as "premature", "sectarian" or "trying to seize the leadership", these elements - some of them doubtless sincere and well-meaning enough - are acting as the unwitting tools of the revisionists, whilst others amongst them may even be serving a more sinister purpose. They seek to use the prestige attaching to them as progressive intellectuals in order to lord it in the Movement, to impose their line of legal propaganda "activity", and to preach the illusory perspective of transforming the revisionist Party, peacefully, gradually and over many years, purely through academic discussion and without the need to engage the revisionists in struggle on all fronts. By these means, they are able to pose as "anti-revisionist" from the seclusion of their comfortable studies in Hampstead, holding innumerable meetings on all kinds of esoteric subjects to which only their admirers are invited. They present absolutely no threat to the revisionist leadership, nor are their own sources of prestige within the revisionist Party in any way endangered. These false intellectuals give themselves the airs of Marxist-Leninists, and revolutionary terminology flows smoothly from their lips. Yet they ban with book and candle all discussion of the growth of the Marxist-Leninist Movement, of the actual and pressing political tasks and issues now confronting it at the very beginning of the long and tortuous road towards re-establishment of the Marxist-Leninist Party. Moreover, these "communists" do not hesitate to apply the infamous and discredited method of exclusion and proscription, arbitrarily decided by themselves, against all who oppose them and their bogus, conciliatory pseudo-Marxist line, because they know that the line of open struggle to build and unite the Movement would shatter for all time their false perspectives, which restrain and disunite the Movement, but enable them to shine as erudite Marxists. When it is realised that many of these self-styled "anti-revisionists" who strive to set the tone in the Movement are prosperous businessmen and merchants, some of them with vested interests in the revisionist Party, and the trading and business houses with which it has connections, the truth of the matter becomes clear: these elements offer yet another example of the spontaneous division between middle-class intellectuals and working people which is but a reflection of the class contradictions in society at large, and which has been the bane of British working-class politics for decades.

and enter into fraternal discussions and consultations with one another on the basis of mutual equality and respect for independence.

With these aims in view, the Central Committee of the A.C.M.L.U. invites all existing Groups and Organisations in Britain, as well as unaffiliated Marxist - Leninists, to consider and discuss the Theses for a Marxist-Leninist Programme appearing elsewhere in this issue of "HAMMER OR ANVIL". We invite them to put forward their proposals and amendments thereto or to present their own alternative Draft Theses.

As a simultaneous and vitally necessary measure, we call upon all Marxist-Leninist cadres and activists still within the revisionist Party to engage the revisionists in struggle at all levels, to raise in the Branches, in the District and Area Committees, and in the E. C. itself, all issues on which the revisionist leadership or their sycophants have acted in betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and democratic-centralism, to openly challenge their social-democratic policies and the bureaucratic dictat by means of which they seek to impose their line of liquidation upon the lower levels of the Party, and to join with "HAMMER OR ANVIL" in exposing all instances of corruption, demagoguery, illegal expulsion, unprincipled manoeuvring and evasion and bureaucratic violation in its pages.

Only through taking all these steps simultaneously shall we, the Groups and Organisations who form the nucleus of the Marxist - Leninist vanguard in Britain succeed in establishing jointly and in unity the independent open centre of Marxist-Leninist leadership, engaging in struggle and isolating the concealed class enemy within our ranks and within the broad movement - the revisionists, the conciliators of revisionism, and all who seek to hold back the growth of the Marxist-Leninist Movement into an independent revolutionary vanguard nucleus of the future Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, and thus forging the unity of our Movement around a Draft Programme which is the common work of all, and which has as its central strategy the harnessing of the great revolutionary energies of the working-class and of all working people for the seizing of state power, the establishment of working-class rule and the breaking-up of the parasitic and oppressive monopoly-capitalist state apparatus of violence and deception. The Programme of the future Marxist-Leninist Party must begin the task of welding the revolutionary unity of the working-class, to raise it to the level of the leading class in society, which increasingly holds the initiative in its hands, to isolate and disperse all its class enemies and all open and concealed reactionaries, and to unite around it all oppressed classes and strata in the creation of the truly democratic state structure of working - class power, which will carry through the reconstruction of society on the basis of victorious Socialism and Communism. To this aim our Draft Theses are dedicated.