

REPORT

**INTERIM COMMITTEE
CONSULTATIVE MEETING FOR
MARXIST-LENINIST UNITY**

9-10 Sept. 1978



NOTA BENE

The representatives of all the four organisations constituting the Interim Committee arrived at a general agreement on the concrete form and content of the Report presented here. However, since April 1979, the Finsbury Communist Association representative has chosen to abstain from the work of the Interim Committee and not to reply to its correspondence or letters from fellow members.

Therefore, to avoid any misunderstanding, the texts of the two letters from the F.C.A. and, in reply, two letters from the Workers' Party of Scotland (M/L) as well as the Interim Committee's last letter dated 16th July 1979 are published here for the information of all concerned.

A list of letters and documents received by the Interim Committee is given at the end of the Report.

CONTENTS

Preface	Page 1
Introduction	Page 2
Background Notes	Page 4
Analysis of Contradictions between the Two Lines	Page 8
Struggle on the Ideological and Political Line	Page 12
Draft Proposals for Reconvened Meeting	Page 23
Correspondence with F.C.A.	Page 27
List of Letters and Documents Re M/L Consultative Meeting	Page 33

.....

Presented by INTERIM COMMITTEE:

Members: } Marxist Industrial Group (M.I.G.)
 } 11 Barratt Avenue, London, N22.
 } Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist League (RMLCL),
 } 16a College Crescent, London, NW3 5LL
 } Workers' Party of Scotland M/L (WPSML)
 } 270 Paisley Road, Glasgow G5 8NF.

(Please use organisations' initials only when writing for further information)

.....

PREFACE

The British Marxist-Leninist movement is at present split into separate groups and quite a number of unconnected individuals.

The unity of the Marxist-Leninist movement into a single organisation is crucial for the rebuilding of the proletarian vanguard party.

The proletariat needs the leadership of such a party in order to accomplish the various tasks necessary to bring about socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the first stage of socialism, and to move on to communism.

The unification of the Marxist-Leninist movement can only be established by taking the standpoint of the international proletariat, the exploited peoples and oppressed nations. For those with this standpoint, Marxism-Leninism Mao Zedong Thought is the guide in collective democratic struggle, in criticism and self-criticism and in thus resolving differences to evolve a common ideological/political/organisational line based on democratic centralism.

Upholding the Marxist principle of unity of theory and practice they must collectively work out common concrete policies on immediate problems facing the working class and people and work out organisational forms for united action.

In the Marxist-Leninist movement there are differences on a series of Marxist-Leninist principles; on the relation between theory and practice, on the method of democratic centralism, criticism and self criticism for resolution of contradictions among the people; broad fronts and united front and proletarian leadership, and the national question.

But the key differences at the present time lie in the interpretation of the general guiding line of the international communist movement, -- Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of Three Worlds and its application to the revolutionary struggle in Britain. In other words, there are basically two opposite ideological and political lines - regarding the principal contradiction, the main enemy, stage of revolution and the main political tasks, and many other issues. There cannot be two correct and mutually contradictory opinions about vital issues. One or other opinion stems from an incorrect class standpoint.

We feel that within the time of a weekend, the resumed consultative meeting should concentrate its deliberations on the key question - the ideological and political lines.

The consultative meeting should work out through a Unity Committee a concrete plan for collective discussions on important questions to arrive at a united common stand on how the class struggle in Britain must be prosecuted, thus laying the programmatic basis for a united Marxist-Leninist party.

REPORT OF THE INTERIM COMMITTEE,
MARXIST-LENINIST CONSULTATIVE MEETING

Introduction

1. The Marxist-Leninist Consultative Meeting, convened by the WPS(M/L) was held 9th-10th September, 1978, in London.

The aim and basis of this meeting was explicitly stated in the WPS(M/L) letter, dated 19.6.1978.

These are as follows:

(i) The "consultative meeting to consider how to achieve unity of the Marxist-Leninist forces within the British state."

(ii) "The basis of the meeting must be the application of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung to the situation facing us, particularly in the light of Chairman Mao's Three Worlds Theory and the increasingly urgent tasks which follow from it."

(iii) The basis of participation was "equal status for each organisation."

2.

(1) Representatives from the following eight organisations participated in the meeting:

Communist Workers' League of Britain
Communist Workers' Movement
Finsbury Communist Association
Marxist Industrial Group
Nottingham Communist Group
Revolutionary Communist League of Britain
Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist League
Workers' Party of Scotland (Marxist-Leninist)

(ii) Observers from CWM, MIG, and RMLCL and WPS(M/L) attended the meeting but did not take part in the proceedings. Bangladeshi and Ethiopian comrades also attended the meeting but did not take part in the discussion.

The Birmingham Communist Association, Manchester Marxist-Leninist Group, Working People's Party of England, Workers' Film Association and Indian Workers' Association (GB) had also been invited. The BCA sent some suggestions to the WPS(M/L) concerning the meeting, but failed to attend. The MMLG and IWA(GB) did not reply at all.

The WPPE sent a letter to the WPS(M/L) attacking the line it was taking in the documents 'Defence Against War' and the Joint Communique and Draft Organisational line with the RMLCL, and declined to attend. The WPS(M/L) received a belated reply from the WFA just before the meeting requesting observer status on the second day only. Since their letter indicated that they were a broad organisation rather than an M-L group, the meeting agreed to turn down their request.

The Interim Committee has since considered the question of representation of M-L groups working within broad organisations, however, and believes that these comrades should be invited to participate fully in the resumed consultative meeting and proposed unity committee, not as representatives of the broad organisations but as representatives of the M-L groups working within them.

The FCA had initially indicated that it would be unable to attend on 9/10 September and they requested a postponement to 30 September or later. The WPS(M/L) passed on this request to the other groups but advised against postponing the meeting as late September-October did not suit them and it would possibly inconvenience others who had already made arrangements on the basis of 9/10 September. In the event the FCA were able to come for part of the proceedings.

(iii) But for the CWLB, whose representative felt that the Three Worlds Theory was irrelevant to the objectives of the meeting, all other participating organisations considered this theory as the strategic guide on the international class struggle based upon an objective analysis of the world situation at the present time.

(iv) The CWLB representative further pronounced the consultative meeting a futile exercise. He added that the CWLB stand is clearly stated in their document: "Hey, It's Up to Us!". He refused to express any views on the concrete issues under discussion and departed from the scene even before the first day's proceedings were over.

(v) But for the CWLB, all organisations made written contributions, besides verbal participation on the ideological-political and organisational lines for Marxist-Leninist unity.

3.

(1) All seven organisations found the consultative meeting was useful since it brought out the viewpoints and differences among them into the open. This cleared the decks for ideological struggle for a principled unity. The majority felt that an interim committee should be appointed to prepare a report analysing the work of the consultative meeting, reflecting the two clear lines that had emerged and make recommendations to raise the polemics to a higher level for further consultations.

The FCA, MIG, RMLCL and WPS(M/L) were of the view that such a report should be collectively prepared by all the participating organisations who should constitute the Interim Committee.

The CWM, NCG, and RCLB regrettably chose not to take part in the Interim Committee or share any responsibility for producing the Report.

Hence, the method, analysis, conclusions and proposals in this Report are the responsibility of the FCA, MIG, RMLCL and WPS(M/L) who constituted the Interim Committee.

(ii) At the end of September, 1978, the Interim Committee invited the participating organisations to submit any further written material besides their published views for consideration. Only the FCA submitted their monthly bulletin No. 165 containing the article entitled: "The Next World War."

(iii) In view of the difficulties imposed by long distance travel, ill-health of some members and other commitments, we are conscious of the limitations in the preparations of this Report. However, if it does clearly define the viewpoints and the two opposing policies which in our view it does, then it will be a positive contribution in the struggle for achieving Marxist-Leninist unity.

BACKGROUND NOTES

(i) The treachery of the Khrushchev-Brezhnev modern revisionist renegade clique since the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU in 1956 was a big blow to the gains of the October Revolution in the Soviet Union and a serious, though temporary, setback for the revolutionary struggles of the international proletariat and oppressed people.

(ii) Having usurped power in the party and state, the Soviet bureaucratic bourgeois revisionist clique, on the pretext of opposing "the cult of the individual" launched a vicious attack on the great Marxist-Leninist Joseph Stalin, in order to subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and sabotage the cause of world proletarian revolution and national liberation. To achieve these nefarious objectives the Soviet revisionist clique unleashed their counter-revolutionary wares - "peaceful transition, peaceful competition and peaceful co-existence," and "state of the whole people" and "party of the whole people." Thus they caused a serious split in the international communist movement.

(iii) The Communist Party of China, headed by the greatest Marxist of the contemporary era, Mao Tsetung, boldly faced the challenge of the adverse current of modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist clique as its core. The CPC launched the great struggle in the international communist movement for the defence and advancement of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, thus propelling forward the cause of world proletarian revolution and national liberation.

(iv) The CPC resolutely defended the Marxist principles of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, upholding the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution and the historic role of the

vanguard party of the proletariat during the whole period of transition from capitalism - socialism to communism.

(v) To uphold the unity of the international communist movement, the CPC and other Marxist-Leninist parties resolutely defended the common general line (or programme) as expressed in the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement, adopted by the meetings of communist and workers parties in Moscow.

(vi) The revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement are summarised as follows:

"Workers of all countries, unite; workers of the world, unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries, strive for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the socialist camp; bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory; and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism, and without the exploitation of man by man."

(vii) This general line stood for "forming a broad united front with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as its nucleus, to oppose the imperialists and reactionaries headed by the United States; it is the line of boldly arousing the masses, expanding the revolutionary forces, winning over the middle forces and isolating the reactionary forces."

(viii) The CPC repudiated the treacherous, counter-revolutionary stand of the Soviet revisionists of "all-round co-operation" with US imperialism which the general line had singled out as "the biggest international exploiter, chief bulwark of world reaction and gendarme and the principal source of world war and hence the main enemy of the people of the world."

(ix) The CPC further pointed out that "The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these areas are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centres of world revolution, dealing direct blows at imperialism."

"The national democratic revolutionary movement in these areas and the international socialist revolutionary movement are the two great historical currents of our time. The national democratic revolution in these areas is an important component of the contemporary proletarian world revolution."

"In a sense, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population."

(x) The CPC's document: "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" dated June 14, 1963, was hailed by the Marxist-Leninist parties of the world and other revolutionaries, as their scientific, strategic guide in the situation after world war II, for advancing the cause of world proletarian revolution and national liberation by overthrowing world imperialism.

They undertook the urgent tasks of integrating the Marxist-Leninist principles of the General Line with the concrete practice of revolution in their own countries.

(xi) With the general line as their weapon, genuine Marxist-Leninists on the five continents waged resolute struggle to root out modern revisionism in the various Communist parties, and to firmly build them as proletarian vanguards.

In those countries where, under the revisionist stranglehold, parties had degenerated into out-and-out agents of the bourgeoisie, Marxist-Leninists gave a call for re-establishing genuine vanguard parties.

In such countries, Marxist-Leninists formed new groups and organisations to carry out this task.

(xii) In Britain, under the bureaucratic stranglehold of the Pollit-Dutt-Gollan-Matthews revisionist clique, the CPGB had completely degenerated into a counter-revolutionary organisation, and prevented any possibility of bringing it back onto the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary road by struggle from within.

(xiii) The Marxist-Leninist groups, formed by those expelled from the CPGB or those who broke with the latter, along with new elements, waged a determined struggle in defence of fundamental Marxist principles; proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat; and denounced the revisionist betrayal of the Khrushchev-Brezhnev renegade clique and the CPGB counter-revolutionary leading group.

(xiv) The late comrade Michael McCreery played an outstanding role in denouncing the counter-revolutionary revisionist programme of the CPGB, "The British Road to Socialism." It was under his leadership that the Committee to Defeat Revisionism and for Communist Unity (CDRCU) was established. The CDRCU gave a call for the formation of a genuine Marxist-Leninist proletarian vanguard party in this country.

Unfortunately Michael McCreery died prematurely of cancer in 1965. His life, full of promise, was tragically cut short before he could make a further contribution in the service of the working class.

Following the death of McCreery whose leadership and resources had played a crucial role in these early stages, the CDRCU failed to develop a united approach towards the formation of a Marxist-Leninist party and soon disintegrated into separate groups.

These groups, together with others formed later, contributed to the exposure of modern revisionism as manifested in the "three peacefuls" and "state of the whole people" and "party of the whole people", but lacked a systematic grasp of marxist-leninist theory based on revolutionary practice. Although various attempts were made over the next decade to bring the Marxist-Leninists together, they failed to give up their sectarian group mentalities in the struggle for a united Marxist-Leninist party.

To sum up:

(xvi) The Marxist-Leninists in Britain failed to integrate the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to the concrete practice of the British revolution. In other words, they failed to work out a correct programme - projecting Marxist-Leninist ideological-political and organisational lines, by applying the theory of revolution contained in the CPC document "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement." The Marxist-Leninists confined themselves to limited activities and have remained numerically a very small force, isolated from the working class and the mass of the people. "Mass line" has remained a fanciful slogan.

(xvii) That is how careerists, opportunists and charlatans like Birch could worm their way into the Marxist-Leninist movement.

(xviii) In the absence of a correct proletarian policy, solidity of the party organisation and close links with the working class and people, these opportunists and counter-revolutionary elements relied on "international recognition" to acquire spurious legitimacy, to dupe and win a number of honest but inexperienced members.

(xix) Once again, in the present new stage of revolution, British Marxist-Leninists are confronted with the tasks of working out a programme projecting correct Marxist-Leninist ideological-political and organisational lines, by applying to the concrete conditions of a second world country, the general line of the international communist movement, as represented now by Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds.

(xx) In the present objective situation when the British Marxist-Leninist movement is split into a number of separate bigger and smaller groups, it is our COMMON TASK to unite in the struggle for working out the ideological-political and organisational lines.

Only thus can we re-establish a united Marxist-Leninist proletarian vanguard party to lead the British working class and people to defend their immediate interests as well as to prepare them for the overthrow of the capitalist system of exploitation of man by man.

(xxi) In order to carry out this common task we should follow Comrade Mao Zedong's advice:

"When a task, no matter which, has to be performed, but there is yet no guiding line, method, plan or policy, the principal and decisive thing is to decide on a guideline, method, plan or policy."

in
(xii) It is/the above-mentioned historical background since 1963, that the Consultative Meeting took place on September 9th and 10th 1978 with the task of bringing about the ideological-political and organisational unity of the Marxist-Leninist movement in the present new situation.

The adjourned consultative meeting is to resume in order to carry out this vital task.

ANALYSIS OF THE CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN THE TWO LINES

(i) The Method of the Consultative Meeting.

It is appropriate here to indicate concretely the views of the participants regarding the process of the Consultative Meeting.

The RCLB: "We can take note of certain developments up to the meeting and welcome the fact that we are starting off on a discussion of the ideological-political line of the British and world revolutions. This shows greater clarity in the Marxist-Leninist movement."

"We cannot put down deep roots in the working class without rebuilding the party. We cannot grapple with the problems of the British revolution and the class struggle internationally without that proletarian party."

"The meeting this weekend has had some modest contribution to that work. There has been an increased conviction that unity that will live can only be won round a common ideological and political line. There has been some positive experience this weekend, for active ideological struggle; using criticism and self-criticism can narrow differences of political line between organisations."

CWM:-

"We think it is good that comrades are discussing these things in a serious manner and that these discussions are not taking place in a sectarian manner with name-calling and so on. It is an advance for the Marxist-Leninist movement over activities in previous years and we do hope positive results will come out of it."

Further, "I think all of us have been pleasantly surprised by the way in which debate has gone today. I must confess, coming down with two hours sleep this morning, I was expecting a day of purgatory, and it wasn't."

"If nothing else happened today, I do think that as X said, we have pointed enough holes in each others arguments that we have definitely advanced our theoretical and ideological understanding."

NCG:- "I think the discussion today has been very useful because it enabled us to mutually clarify our positions such as they are. And more important perhaps to reveal how insubstantial the respective positions we have taken with respect to the three worlds theory are; how lacking in foundation of concrete analysis and understanding they really are. I am applying these remarks to us as much as any other organisation."

"I think what we would favour is joint work of a kind where-by a definite plan was formulated of investigation and theorising and struggle on definitions. But I am inclined to the opinion that there has been a comradely atmosphere, a good exchange of views today; that if we simply try and perpetuate that it will result in disunity. One is reminded of the Joint Action Committee."

MIG: "I think the question practically facing us today is how can we take the ideological and political struggle forward, because in one form or another all groups have said that the ideological and political struggle must come first before organisational unity."

"I think that if we make a comparison between this meeting, as the last speaker did, with the JAC, it is a false comparison because at that, within that forum, there was very little discussion on concrete political line. In fact as far as I can recall, there was hardly any at all."

"I think that this meeting, to a degree that the polemic had started, the polemic on ideological and political line had started before the meeting and has continued today. I think that it was a significant departure from the forum of the Joint Action Committee."

(ii) But for the CWLB, which considered the whole Consultative Meeting a futile exercise, the other seven organisations found it was a positive step.

The Consultative Meeting belied the apprehensions of the RCLB and misgivings expressed in their first letter of 19.7.78 and the second undated letter to the WPS(M/L).

The RCL stated: (a) "Your proposal (for a consultative meeting of Marxist-Leninists - Interim Committee) is incorrect:

(b) "These bourgeois, Menshevik tendencies (who will seize on any opportunity to propose any form of organisational unity except democratic-centralist unity and who are prepared to demagogically shout 'unity' in order to avoid a principled struggle which insists that ideological and political

unity must precede organisational unity) will undoubtedly surface again at your proposed consultative meeting...

(c) "The view of those whom you have invited are so widely differing that there is no chance of making progress towards principled ideological and political unity. Instead, there will be interminable circle wrangling and sectarian disputes."

(d) "We criticize the proposal that in addition other comrades can come as observers as ultra-democratic, liberal and impractical and which opens the door to the type of demagoguery which we have witnessed in the past."

(iii) The actual experience of the consultative meeting proved the criticism of the RCLB wrong and its misapprehensions misplaced. The facts clearly demonstrated that the other organisations which were invited, did not initiate "interminable circle wrangling and sectarian disputes."

Further, the attendance by observers did not result in "ultra-democracy" or "demagoguery."

The NCJ felt that planned and thorough investigation on the national and international situation would have to be undertaken before a stand could be taken; that the Consultative Meeting would be an inappropriate body to undertake such work, which should be assigned to "working commissions" as proposed by the CWLB(ML) in their document "Hey, it's up to us!" While no Marxist-Leninist will deny the need for thorough and disciplined investigation, it is noteworthy that the CWLB(ML) whose document published in June 1976 declared the need to..."undertake all the investigation necessary for the drafting of a scientific statement on the international situation in order to locate friends and enemies on a global scale." was unable to participate in the discussion on the international situation. Nor is there any reason why a Unity Committee established from the Consultative Meeting could not establish such working commissions. The objections to the CWLB's "Hey, Its Up to Us" did not stem from the proposal for working commissions to investigate certain questions but from the fact that the whole approach of the document was dogmatic and sectarian and, apart from listing some of the achievements of the Soviet, Chinese, Albanian, Vietnamese and Korean parties, was devoid of any concrete analysis of the situation and problems facing the Marxist-Leninists and the history of their development. This superficial approach led the CWLB to arbitrarily include in its list of M-L organisations groups which evidently were not, and to condemn and even exclude others without offering any evidence.

The CWM, on the other hand, believed that greater progress would be made through bilateral meetings between groups of a basically similar understanding, ie. by a process of mutual selection.

In other words, the struggle for unity would be closed to certain "undesirable" elements, who - conveniently - would not be present either to hear or answer the criticisms made of them. Bilateral meetings can of course break down the fragmentation of the ML movement, but clearly they cannot be advanced as the correct forum for the struggle to unite the movement as a whole.

The CWM and RCLB objected in particular to the participation of the FCA and RMLCL (as well as the CWLB) in the name of criticism/self-criticism. Since it was objected that such matters were not on the agenda of the meeting it was agreed that the whole question of criteria for participation be followed up and put on the agenda of the reconvened meeting. Accordingly the Interim Committee wrote to the CWM and RCLB asking them to substantiate their objections in writing.

In brief, the Interim Committee pointed out that criticism/self-criticism is a method of resolving contradictions among the people in which those criticised have an equal right to be present and reply. The CWM and RCLB were not really seeking to criticise the FCA and RMLCL but to expel them, which is the method reserved for counter-revolutionaries and saboteurs. The relatively minor sectarian objections of the CWM and RCLB should not be allowed to obstruct the resolution of major questions of ideological/political line and the formation of a unity committee. Unfortunately the RCLB have allowed this to happen and insist on using the participation of the FCA and RMLCL as their major reason for boycotting the reconvened meeting, despite their agreement that the experience of the initial meeting had proved positive.

(iv) The Consultative Meeting proved a correct implementation of the method of democratic centralism as taught by Mao Zedong.

He said, (a) There should be full democracy both inside and outside the Party, that is, democratic centralism should be practised in earnest in both spheres.

(b) The question of what is right or wrong, what is correct or incorrect, in our work, falls under contradictions among the people. Contradictions among the people cannot be resolved by curses or fists, still less by knives or guns.

They can be resolved only by discussion and reasoning, criticism and self-criticism. In a word, they can be resolved only by the democratic method, by letting the masses speak out. (In our case, let all the organisations speak out, IC).

(c) Without democracy there cannot be correct concentration because centralism cannot be established where people have divergent views and don't have unity of understanding.

What is meant by centralism? First, there must be concentration of correct ideas. Unity of understanding of policy, plan, command and action is attained on the basis of concentrating correct ideas. This is unity through centralism.

- (d) If a matter is important, it must be discussed collectively, different opinions must be heeded, and the complexities of the situation and the dissenting opinions must be analysed seriously.
- (e) Criticism and self-criticism is a method, it is the method of resolving contradictions among the people and indeed the only method. But if we don't have full democracy and don't practice democratic centralism, this method of criticism and self-criticism cannot be applied.
- (f) "Our centralism is centralism built on the foundation of democracy."
- (v) What are the facts of the situation we are facing? The Marxist-Leninist movement is split into a number of groups. They have divergent views, including on the most important question of ideological and political line or policy. Centralising of their correct views can only be achieved by a collective democratic discussion, and criticism and self-criticism, of clearly identifying the differing views and policies of different groups and thus resolve contradictions among them to achieve unity step by step.
- (vi) Any opposition to collective democratic discussion among the M-L organisations on pragmatic pretexts or because of the existence of divergent views is in fact a refusal to practice democratic centralism.
- (vii) To sum up, the Consultative Meeting is a correct form for collective democratic discussion of views and policies, for criticism and self-criticism for resolving contradictions among them to arrive at common ideological/political and organisational lines for achieving unity. This democratic-centralist process should be continued and developed.

STRUGGLE ON THE IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL LINE

- 1) The Three Worlds Theory and its meaning for communists in Britain.

From the standpoint of the proletariat, Marxist-Leninists ask the question - "Who are our friends and who are our enemies?" Without an answer to this question, purposeful political activity is impossible - engagement in the class struggle at best reaches the level of militant economism.

Quite clearly, unless we have a knowledge of the specific contradictions at play in any situation and the principal contradiction among them, whose existence and development determines or influences the existence and development of the others, our work is aimless and we direct our energies everywhere and nowhere. So our understanding of what is the principal contradiction is fundamental to our analysis of "friends" and "enemies" and therefore our ability to "unite all those who can be united."

For some, the contradictions in British society have been self-evident for decades. To pose the questions "What is the principal contradiction?" and "Who are our friends and who are our enemies?" at this late stage would be churlish. This is unfortunate. For without an objective evaluation of the political forces engaged in the changing situation, the 'leadership' is left behind.

"The objective realities of world class struggle determine the proletariat's differentiation of the world's political forces and the consequent strategy and tactics to be adopted in the struggle."

(The Theory of the Three Worlds;
People's Daily editorial 1.11.77)

Some self proclaimed defenders of Marx and Lenin regard these objective realities as immutable. They fail to see how the fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world develop and are so reduced to repeating the 'tried and tested' formulae of the past.

Historical materialism teaches us that man's thinking generally lags behind reality. As Marxist-Leninists, we have a duty to ensure that ours doesn't.

2) The following introductory section is only a thumb-nail sketch of the development of the fundamental contradictions upon which Mao's Three Worlds Theory is based. The most consistent exposition of the theory still remains the People's Daily editorial of 1.11.77, subsequently published as a pamphlet under the same title "Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism." We should however bear in mind developments that have and are taking place since the article was written.

Lenin was the first leader of the proletariat to fully comprehend the importance of the struggle of the oppressed nations against imperialism to the proletarian revolution in the developed capitalist countries. The mounting struggles for national liberation and social emancipation convinced him of the ultimate victory of socialism. Indeed he regarded such struggles as a component part of the world proletarian revolution and this led to the adoption of the slogan "Workers of all countries and oppressed nations, Unite."

This differentiation is the basis for Mao's theory as the strategic guide for the world proletariat and peoples of all countries in resisting superpower hegemony and advancing towards socialism.

As a general line for the international communist movement the Three Worlds Theory should - and does - clearly indicate the principal contradiction, the main enemy, the stage of revolution and the general tasks. However, two lines have developed on these issues and hence on the theory itself. We have tried to reflect the main differences on these fundamental issues in the following résumé of the discussion.

3) While the CWM/FCA/MIG/NCG/RCLB/RMLCL/WPS all declared their agreement that the Three Worlds Theory was a powerful ideological weapon and a correct guide for the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement not just in the struggle against hegemonism but in the struggle for the liberation of all nations from imperialism, for the socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and communism, there were two different lines over the crucial question of how the theory should be interpreted and applied particularly to the situation in Britain.

It would have been desirable to reveal all the differences between those sharing the same basic line, but this Report concentrates on drawing the line of demarcation between the two lines which emerged.

Finally, unless otherwise stated, the passages in inverted commas are from the Peoples Daily Editorial of 1.11.77.

"Tremendous changes in the present day international situation and the daily growth of the people's strength in different countries and of the factors for revolution demand a new classification of the world's political forces, so that a new global strategy can be formulated for the international proletariat and the oppressed people according to the new relationship between ourselves, our friends and our enemies." Chairman Mao's theory of the Three Worlds meets precisely this demand."

4) On the International Class Struggle and the Principal Contradiction in the World.

FCA:MIG:RMLCL:WPS(M/L)

The Three Worlds theory first posits the main or principal contradiction in the contemporary world as between the people of the whole world on the one hand and the two hegemonist powers on the other, and recognises that the central problem in world affairs results from contention between the two superpowers.

But secondly, it regards Soviet social imperialism as posing the greatest menace to world peace and the independence of all countries - thus differentiating between the superpowers in the First World. Therefore, although both superpowers are the "arch enemies of the international working class" - Soviet social imperialism is described as "the primary target." The RMLCL/WPS(M/L) joint communique pays particular attention to the latter - reflecting the development of the present situation. "Soviet social-imperialism is the main enemy of the peoples of the world at the present time."

CWM: NCG: RCLB

The main enemies of the peoples of the world are the two superpowers; the main force opposing them is the Third World and so the principal contradiction in the world (in the view of the NCG and RCLB) lies between the oppressed nations of the Third World and the Superpowers.

On the Relationship Between International Class Struggle and National (ie. Domestic) Class Struggle

CWM: NCG: RCLB

The Three Worlds theory is a strategic guide for the conduct of international class struggle, rather than domestic class struggle. The fundamental question for the proletariat in developing a strategy for the latter, particularly in the advanced capitalist countries is "Who holds state power?" Whose class interests does the economic base serve and who controls the state forces of repression.

"Invariably, in the vast majority of cases, if not in every case in the world, the principal contradiction is not with the two superpowers."

(RCLB speaker)

It was said that contradictions exist between the class struggle in each country and the class struggle which takes place internationally, and that the Three World Theory, although helping us to distinguish between friend and enemy on a world scale, doesn't necessarily help us to see who are friends and enemies in each country.

"We must not forget the class struggle in Britain while grasping the Theory of the Three Worlds." (RCLB)

FCA: MIG: RMLCL: WPS(M/L)

While recognising that the Three Worlds Theory considers the world situation as a whole, the fundamental change in the balance of world forces has had a decisive impact upon the internal class struggle and exerts a very strong influence upon the development of the internal contradictions.

The three Worlds Theory helps us to distinguish friend from enemy not only on the world scale, but nationally also:

"The Three Worlds Theory is a weapon of class struggle. In the international arena the relations between states constitute the international class struggle and the principal forces are the superpowers on the one hand and the countries of the Third World on the other.

"In the national context, the class struggle exists independent of our will and the two main class forces are finance capitalists and the industrial proletariat. The national class struggle is conditioned by the international situation; it is in fact inseparable from the global class struggle." (MIG)

This is particularly the case in Europe - the focal point of Soviet social imperialism's strategy for world domination. Mao's theory has relevance to the conduct of the class struggle nationally precisely because it is a comprehensive summing up of the various fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world.

"Where our dogmatists err on the question (of cognition) is that on the one hand they do not understand that we have to study the particularity of contradiction and know the particular essence of individual things before we can adequately know the universality of contradiction and the common essence of things and that, on the other hand, they do not understand that after knowing the common essence of things, we must go further and study the concrete things that have not yet been studied or have only just emerged. Our dogmatists are lazy bones. They refuse to undertake any painstaking study of concrete things, they regard general truths as emerging out of the void, they turn them into purely abstract unfathomable formulas, and thereby completely deny and reverse the normal sequence by which man comes to know truth. Nor do they understand the interconnection of the two processes in cognition - from the particular to the general and then from the general to the particular. They understand nothing of the Marxist theory of knowledge." (Mao - On Contradiction)

- 5) On the Second World in General and Britain in Particular:
It's role in the International Class Struggle
-

FCA: MIG: RMLCL: WPS(M/L)

"In the era of imperialism the struggle of the oppressed nations against imperialism is part and parcel of the world proletarian socialist revolution and so, at the present time, is the struggle of the second world countries against superpower hegemonism."

(WPS(M/L) --reply to RCLB and NCG)

The developed capitalist countries of the Second World have a dual character, standing in contradiction with both the First and the Third World. However, their position in the world is becoming increasingly determined on the one hand by the struggles of the oppressed countries and nations of the Third World for national liberation, political and economic independence, and on the other, by the increasing interference and threats by the Superpowers, particularly Soviet social imperialism. The main trend is therefore unity of all the forces in the world in stepping up the struggle against superpower hegemonism.

In other words, the contradictions between the Second World and Superpower hegemonism become dominant and those between the Second World and the oppressed nations secondary and subordinate.

CWM: NCG: RCLB

A united front of the world's peoples against the Superpowers does not include the monopoly imperialist bourgeoisie in a Second World country such as Britain. The British monopoly capitalist class are a parasitic excrescence which should be removed.

The 'oppression' suffered by the Second World merely consists of the denial by the Superpowers of the chance to oppress others as much as they would like. The contradictions between the First and Second World do not signify a relationship of oppression.

"The class nature of the British imperialist bourgeoisie determines that Britain plays a very servile role to both US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism while continuing to try to exploit and oppress the nations of the Third World instead of allying with them against the two superpowers..." (RCLB)

"Britain is one of the least likely candidates among the Second World countries for a united front of Second and Third World countries against superpower hegemonism." (NCG)

6) On the Principal Contradiction in Britain and the Stage of Revolution

It can therefore clearly be seen that the understanding communists have of the international situation is fundamental to their analysis of the domestic situation and the tasks which they set themselves as leaders of the proletariat. This understanding is reflected in the political line and the concrete policy proposed, by which measure the would-be leaders may be judged.

CWM: NCG: RCLB

The principal contradiction in Britain lies between the British monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

"In Britain today does it really conform to facts to say that the contradiction between the people and Soviet social imperialism plays the leading and decisive role? No. Events in Britain are not mainly determined by this contradiction. On the contrary, events in Britain are overwhelmingly determined rather by*the British imperialist bourgeoisie and the working class." (RCLB)

*(the contradiction between)

"The monopoly capitalist class of Britain is still the main enemy of the British working class, the enemy it struggles with every day. Thus the main contradiction in Britain is between the British monopoly capitalist class and the proletariat." (CWM)

"The main internal enemy of the working class in Britain is the British monopoly capitalist class." (NCG)

The contradiction between the people of Britain and the Superpowers is an important but secondary contradiction, and the correct and dialectical way to integrate the struggle against the Superpowers with the class struggle is to treat the struggle for national independence as an important but subordinate part of the socialist revolution and that the best contribution the working class in Britain can make to the world united front is to seize state power.

FCA: MIG: RMLCL: WPS(M/L)

In Europe in general and Britain in particular, a revolutionary situation does not exist. The situation may be "ripe" for revolution in as much as monopoly capitalism as a mode of production is holding back the development of the forces of production, that the economic system is subject to periodic crises of an ever deepening nature, that the capitalist class is forced increasingly to intervene through the state apparatus and unable to guarantee the livelihood of the working class and people that live under its domain; that as a political and social system it stifles the growth of man's consciousness and is based upon an antagonism of class interests that is irreconcilable. In these senses the situation has been "ripe" for revolution since the time of Marx and Engels.

But the monopoly capitalists are still able to govern, and even though they can less and less continue to govern in the old way, their political hegemony has yet to be challenged by an organised proletariat led by a mass revolutionary party.

Similarly, it is not disputed that the countries of Western Europe face an increasing threat from the Soviet Union of aggression and possible annexation. Such an eventuality would deny the peoples of Western Europe the right to determine their own future - and almost certainly postpone the advent of social revolution. For there can be little doubt that Soviet social imperialism would unleash a ruthless suppression of Marxist-Leninists and progressive people in Western Europe.

In resisting Soviet social imperialist aggression, there is therefore a common interest between what are basically antagonistic class forces within the advanced capitalist countries.

"Therefore while rallying the broad masses in the sharp struggle against oppression and exploitation by domestic monopoly capital and for democratic rights and a better life, the proletariat in the Second World countries must hold high the banner of national independence, stand in the van of resistance to the threats of aggression from the two Superpowers, and especially from Soviet social imperialism and under certain conditions unite with all those who refuse to succumb to Superpower manipulation and enslavement and actively lead or take part in the struggle. This will also help promote the revolutionary situation in these countries." (Peoples'Daily Editorial, 1.11.77).

So it is correct to say that the stage of revolution in Britain is that of:-

"the defence and consolidation of independence against the two Superpowers" (FCA)

"although historically, from the point of view of the proletarian world revolution, the next stage of the development of productive forces, of social development, of the relations of production - will be that the working class will overthrow the bourgeoisie and a classless society will be established through the stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat." (RMLCL speaker)

Upon Unity and Struggle; a United Front Against Superpower Hegemonism in Defence of Independence

What are the possibilities for the proletariat to form a united front with other classes in Britain against Superpower hegemonism and under what "certain conditions" should it unite with all forces refusing to succumb to superpower hegemonism?

FCA: MIG: RMLCL: WPS(M/L)

A united front against Superpower hegemonism must include those elements within the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie whose interests are directly threatened by

by Superpower contention for Europe. As this threat comes principally from Soviet social imperialism, we must distinguish between their supporters here.

"Within this united front both at the international and national level, the proletariat must maintain its independence and initiative."

(RMLCL/WPS(M/L) Joint Communique)

"Certain conditions means primarily that the working class must put certain conditions on its cooperation with the bourgeoisie, ie. it is not a policy of all unity and no struggle..."

The conditions put forward in the joint WPSML/RMLCL communique are defence of national independence, respect for the Third World, democracy and the living standards of the mass of the people."

"Furthermore both the united front and these conditions on which it depends can only come about as a result of the proletariat struggling with the bourgeoisie to bring them about." (WPSML Reply to NCG and RCLB)

The fundamental facts upon which the proposal of a united front is based are that Soviet social imperialism is bent upon reducing all Europe to a colony and Europe's revolutionary forces, and Britain's in particular, still have serious weaknesses.

The focus of the struggle with the British bourgeoisie is the strengthening of national independence: (1) by ensuring the maximum mobilisation of the people to counter aggression, by struggling for a self-reliant economy to meet the people's needs including that of national defence and (2) by opposing appeasement policies.

"Without the material basis for independence, national sovereignty is a pipe dream. A self-reliant economy, one which in the main can meet the needs of the people in Britain and enable us to conduct mutually beneficial trade with other countries, rather than to rely on the import of essentials, is central to our ability to plan our own future." (MIG)

The other European states both within and outside the EEC are all potential members of the united front and therefore this will necessitate closer political, economic and military cooperation between them.

Our position towards the U.S., which is strategically on the defensive, must be different from our attitude to Soviet social imperialism. While endeavouring to strengthen European self-reliance, we should recognise that U.S. imperialism is a force which can be utilised in the defence of Europe. The content of the struggle against U.S. hegemonism will be determined accordingly:-

"in order to strengthen the economic, political and military unity of the European countries, the main focus of Soviet social imperialist designs and superpower contention, whether within the European Economic Community or outside, the democratic and patriotic forces must fight against the hegemony of US imperialism to achieve relations of equality and mutual benefit." (WPS(ML/RMLCL Joint Communiqué)

CWM: NCG: RCLB

Recognition that the principal contradiction in Britain between the proletariat and bourgeoisie necessarily implies that our efforts should be primarily directed to resolving this contradiction.

"You talk about uniting with our own bourgeoisie. This is something we should never do. In certain circumstances, such as an invasion by the Soviet Union, it would be correct to make an alliance with the bourgeoisie, or to build a united front with all elements of the ruling class who take a stand basically favourable to the people... Should conditions be put forward for the united front be won, we should still not 'unite' with the bourgeoisie, only cooperate." (CWM)

The RCLB, on the other hand, whilst not wishing to write off the possibility of a united front which includes the bourgeoisie, nevertheless feels that it would be "a severe right opportunist error" to put forward this proposal now.

Until the proletariat has grown considerably stronger in its leadership, a unity with the bourgeoisie will be a relationship of complete subordination to it, and will only serve to make the already strong party stronger. The concept of the united front of the worlds' peoples does not imply that the bourgeoisie in the Second World countries such as Britain will form any part of that united front.

National independence will only be gained for Britain under socialism:-

"We would consider for example that there are very grave dangers that any serious attempt at national independence by the British bourgeoisie in its monopoly state, in its international monopoly state, could only be done in exchange for crushing restrictions on the liberties of the working class... That coercion will come in the form of fascism." (CWM speaker)

In conclusion the Interim Committee, while reiterating its commitment to the interpretation of the Three Worlds Theory outlined above in the FCA/MIG/RMLCL/WPS position, suggests that the polemic on these questions can be developed to a higher level through the concrete application of the Three Worlds Theory to the development of specific policies on immediate problems facing the working class and its allies.

DRAFT PROPOSALS FOR REPORT TO RECONVENED M-L MEETING

In order to unite all Marxist-Leninists in a single proletarian vanguard party based upon democratic centralism and taking into account the particular features of Britain as a multinational state; for the implementation of the agreed general line for a broad united front to oppose the menace of Soviet social-imperialism and super-power hegemonism; to defend national independence and democracy and promote social progress; and thus advance towards the socialist revolution, dictatorship of the proletariat and communism, it is agreed that:-

- 1) as the first step towards this, in order to centralise correct ideas on the basis of democracy and overcome sectarianism and small group mentality, to establish a Unity Committee consisting of leading cadres from each participating organisation on the basis of equal representation;

- 2) that the first task of the Unity Committee be to draw up a statement on the general ideological, political and organisational line on the basis of the discussions at the consultative meeting for submission to the participating organisations; that the common line having been agreed, all majority decisions of the Unity Committee will be binding on the constituent organisations without prejudice to the right of any minority to reserve its position and express its opinions;

- 3) that the Unity Committee establish a Secretariat to facilitate and expedite its work between committee meetings;

- 4) that the Unity Committee strive to lead and co-ordinate the activities of the member organisations on the basis of the agreed general ideological, political and organisational line;

- 5) that, as well as the maximum programme for socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and communism, the Unity Committee draw up a detailed minimum programme for the Party on the basis of investigations to develop specific policies to guide the working class in their immediate struggles against monopoly capital on the following questions:-
 - (a) the struggle to build and lead a broad united front of all those opposed to the menace of Soviet social-imperialism and and superpower hegemonism, their social-fascist fifth column and all policies of appeasement, in order to defend national independence and sovereignty;

- b) the struggle to defend and extend democratic rights and liberties and for the democratisation of the state at all levels for the maximum participation of the people;
- c) the struggle to develop a working class economic and industrial policy which will push for the fullest possible utilisation, on the basis of self-reliance, of our domestic, industrial, agricultural and scientific potential in the interests of national independence and the welfare of the people;
- d) the struggle for the right to national self-determination, including the right to secession and the formation of independent states, for the peoples of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales by establishing democratic self-government within a voluntary federal union;
- e) the struggle to strengthen and democratise defence on the basis of maximum mobilisation of the people against aggression;
- f) the struggle to defend trade union rights and defeat bureaucracy and social-fascism within the unions;
- g) the struggle against racism and racial discrimination in the fields of immigration, employment, housing etc., as well as against the propaganda and violence of the racist-fascist organisations, and for the protection of national, religious and racial minorities;
- h) the struggle for the revolutionary and patriotic education and organisation of students and youth;
- i) the struggle for equality for women at work, in the home and in all spheres of life;
- j) the struggle to support and unite with the peoples and countries of the Third World against hegemonism, imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and zionism, and for a new international economic order, together with their struggles for national liberation, democracy and social progress;
- k) the struggle for the economic, political and military union of the European peoples and countries, including the EEC, in cooperation with other second world countries and the USA, on the basis of independence, equality, mutual benefit and non-interference in each others internal affairs, in order to resist the menace posed by Soviet social-imperialist aggression and superpower domination, and thus put off the outbreak of war;

1) the struggle against revisionism of all types and for the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, particularly the Theory of the Three Worlds; for the establishment of close fraternal relations with fellow Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations in other countries, including the justly prestigious Communist Party of China, on the basis of equality, mutual support and non-interference in each others internal affairs;

6) that the Unity Committee be open to membership by any Marxist-Leninist organisation supporting the common line. Individual comrades not belonging to any organisation should be encouraged to join one and in any case will be welcome to express their views and criticisms to the Committee and support its activities;

7) that initially the Unity Committee be financed by a mutually agreed minimum contribution from all member organisations;

8) that on the basis of the above and the experience of the common struggles on mass fronts and within the Unity Committee and its constituent organisations, a central Congress should be convened for the reconstitution of the proletarian vanguard party, the adoption of the programme and constitution and the election of the Central Committee.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH F.C.A.

In publication of this correspondence, the name of the F.C.A. representative is replaced by the letter X. Only the two letters of the WPS(M/L) are published here, with which the M.I.G. and RM/LCL are in full agreement and adequately cover the issues raised by the F.C.A. Besides, the text of the Interim Committee's letter, dated 16.7.1979 is also published. The F.C.A. has not replied to it either.

F.C.A. Letter dated 2 May, 1979.

Dear Comrades,

In his letter of 28 September 1978 the secretary of the Interim Committee outlined its purpose as follows:-

"The Interim Committee has the strict task of reporting on the Consultative Conference meeting 9/10th September and will do so by reference to the published views of the participating organisations and the contributions made by their representatives on the subject matter under discussion."

This purpose has gradually been broadened until the Interim Committee now sees itself as the initiator of a Unity Committee where decisions will be reached by majority voting.

You will recall that we put forward our position on the formation of a Marxist-Leninist party in our letter of 15th August, 1978. Here again is the section relating to the maximum programme.

"SHORT OUTLINE OF PROPOSED PARTY'S MAXIMUM PROGRAMME FOR BRITAIN

- (a) Ending of all overseas exploitation, in particular, of exploitation through the unequal exchange of equal amounts of labour
- (b) Self-determination of Cornwall, Ireland, Isle of Man, Scotland and Wales
- (c) The dictatorship of the proletariat"

What goes for a party goes for a Unity Committee where decisions are reached by majority voting.

The above three points are not negotiable; nor can we accept that they be hidden or submerged in any way. They must be proclaimed openly.

We must therefore ask you to state whether you agree with these three points or not.

At the same time we note that we and you have a common strategic approach, namely, opposition to Russian imperialism and superpower hegemonism.

Accordingly, even if you disagree with the three points we still want to take part in any joint activity against Russian imperialism such as that envisaged by the British Committee for the Lisbon Conference on the Russian Imperialist Menace. Yours fraternally, FCA.

WPS(M/L) Letter dated 4.5.79

Dear Comrades,

In reply to X's letter of 2.5.79, I would first of all like to point out that at the consultative meeting itself last September it was agreed that "the interim committee will prepare a report and recommendations for a resumption of this consultative meeting and which would seek to secure the organic unity of the Marxist-Leninist movement. Meanwhile, reports will have been submitted by their representatives here to their constituent bodies and which might wish to offer further observations to the Interim Committee," (my emphasis), see page 19 of final transcript No.5. So I think X is wrong to put a construction on (the Interim Committee Secretary's) letter of 28.9.78 which I'm sure he (IC Sec) did not intend and allege that our "purpose has gradually broadened." I must say that I am surprised to find X making this unwarranted allegation which is very similar to the obstructive objections made by the RCLB and CWLB (see RCLB letter of 22.2.79 and article on page 10 of Voice of the People Vol.7. Nov-Dec 1978).

I must also criticise what strikes me as the ultimatum style approach of X's letter and the implication that we have somehow reached breaking point over his three points. Firstly, point (c) - the dictatorship of the proletariat - is already explicitly in the latest draft of the proposals or recommendations. Secondly, point (a) - ending of all overseas exploitation, in particular, of exploitation through the unequal exchange of equal amounts of labour - is already implicit in paragraph 7 point (j) of the draft proposals, in that the fight for a new international economic order, one of the major objectives of which is the ending of this unequal exchange, is supported, if X wants to add the above phrase after the reference to the NIEO that would be all right with me. Thirdly, self-determination for Ireland, Scotland and Wales is already in paragraph 7 point (d); so in my view, the only thing you are really making an issue of is the failure to explicitly extend self-determination to the Isle of Man and Cornwall. I am in favour of self-determination for all peoples - even for those who do not constitute specific nations or nationalities. The question is - how is that right to be exercised. As I understand it, the Isle of Man already has effective self-determination as do the Channel Islands (why not include them?) and, while I support the right to self-determination of the people of Cornwall, I donot believe there is any basis for treating Cornwall in the same constitutional terms as Scotland and Wales. We can argue about this later though.

While I think it is ridiculous for X to make Cornwall and the Isle of Man a breaking point, and I do not think it is necessary to include them, in order to avoid any accusation from him (FCA) that we are against self-determination for Cornwall and the Isle of Man, we could add at the end of section (d) "as well as the right to self-determination of the people of Cornwall and the Isle of Man."

I also take exception to X's attempt to 'downgrade' our relationship to the same level as that we are seeking with the patriotic bourgeoisie. I detect an uncalled for petulance in his tone which suggests a deeper malaise, or annoyance about something. If I am right I hope he will come clean but if I am wrong I apologise and trust you will forgive me for getting the wrong impression.

I trust you will be meeting to finalise the report as soon as possible when X returns...."

FCA Letter dated 4 June 1979.

Dear Comrades,

Thank you for your letters.

Putting disagreements to one side for the time being and judging from your replies we all seem to be agreed on the first long term aim of

(a) 'Ending of all overseas exploitation, in particular, of exploitation through the unequal exchange of equal amounts of labour.'

Unfortunately, looking back over Scottish Vanguard, The Marxist, and the publications of the Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist League, there does not appear to have been any explanation, supported by facts and figures, of what is meant by 'the unequal exchange of equal amounts of labour.'

This matter of ending imperialist exploitation is of the greatest importance.

What do your groups understand by "the unequal exchange of equal amounts of labour?" On what facts and figures is your understanding based? How does it work out in practice?

As far as serious politics is concerned, it is the public standpoint of a group which counts, not private assurances to other groups. Supporters and readers, have a right to know what is going on.
Yours etc. FCA.

Letter from WPS(ML) dated 20.6.79

Dear Comrades,

Since, despite repeated requests, X has failed to agree to a meeting to resolve outstanding differences and finalise the draft report and proposals, we feel that the rest of us have no choice but to go ahead without him.

Apart from the need to get on with things, circulate the drafts and reconvene the meeting before a year has elapsed, our main reason for coming to this conclusion is that it appears to be what X himself is angling for.

We met his initial 'precondition' for a meeting, namely a reply to his 'three points', but instead of then arranging a meeting he proceeds to try and provoke a time-consuming correspondence by raising additional questions which could be discussed at a meeting.

On top of this he has published correspondence in 'Finsbury Communist' in such a way as to make it appear that we have somehow broadened the purpose of the Interim Committee and that we are against the dictatorship of the proletariat, the ending of all overseas exploitation and self-determination for the nations within the UK state - because his readers will not have seen the draft report and proposals which he is supposedly criticising.

In fact the only outstanding issue is that of self-determination for Cornwall and the Isle of Man. X has not explained what, in his view, this implies - whether it includes the right to secession which the rest of us are against including in the draft proposals with respect to Cornwall and the Isle of Man.

Apparently aware that this will look like a pretty lame excuse for refusing to unite round the drafts, X is casting around for additional pretexts. In this connection his snide comment about alleged 'private assurances' concerning the ending of all overseas exploitation is quite fatuous since we are discussing matters which are to be openly published in the report and proposals.

Furthermore, how sincere is X when he says in his letter of 2 May 1979 that 'even if you disagree with the three points we still want to take part in any joint activity against Russian imperialism such as that envisaged by the British Committee for the Lisbon Conference on the Russian Imperialist Menace?' Yet he told no-one of the conference he recently attended in Germany on that very subject so that we could not even send a joint message!

We also heard that last month when he felt unable to meet with (fellow members of the Interim Committee), he was for part of the time in Scotland.

taking the trouble to make at least one 'political' visit - yet he never contacted us - despite the golden opportunity to discuss his objections to the drafts.

Of course X is quite free to go wherever he wants without informing us but his deliberate avoidance of meetings (and opportunity for joint work against Soviet social-imperialism) can only lead us to question how serious he is about resolving differences and achieving unity. We cannot allow his obstructionism to sabotage our work. If it is agreed to go ahead without him we can draw up a joint statement to be appended to the drafts explaining why it had to be so. Yours etc.

P.S. With regard to X's letter of 4 June 1979, we agree that "ending imperialist exploitation is of the greatest importance." This is clearly stated in the draft report and proposals (and in our own Manifesto and other publications). The ending of imperialist exploitation involves more than just the ending of 'unequal exchange of equal amounts of labour.' It is not surprising that the latter phrase does not appear in our publications since, as far as I know, it is X's own formulation.

We take it to mean two interrelated things; firstly that, due to the industrially developed countries' monopoly of advanced technology (partly developed on the basis of capital accumulated from the exploitation of the Third World) they can produce goods more cheaply on the whole than the Third World (ie. more goods for the same amount of labour), and, secondly, that on top of this the Third World is charged inflated prices for its imports from the developed countries while being underpaid for their exports, due to the developed countries' domination of world trade, finance and monetary system. Obviously there is more to it than this (eg. the people of the Third World are paid less for their labour power) but if X is not satisfied with this basic definition it is up to him to clarify it - after all it is his formulation not ours!

While denying that we have no opposed imperialist exploitation in our publications, we agree that these issues have not been adequately dealt with - but then what has or even could be by such small groups as ours with such limited resources? The reason we are all trying to unite into a single Party is because we are aware of the inadequacy of the separate groups. (eg. however correct our various formulations of how imperialism exploits the Third World, what use will it be to anyone in the Third, Second or First World if there is no united M-L Party to effectively mobilise our people - particularly the working class - in support of the Third World?) We should certainly learn from and criticise and teach each other whether on the question of exploitation of the Third World (or the national question in the UK) or anything else. But we shouldn't use each other's alleged short-comings to obstruct unity - as the RCLB have done.

For example, we stick to the criticisms we made over two years ago of what we regard as X's racist stand over immigration when he said, among other things, in Finsbury Communist Numbers 142 and 143 that "the imperialist countries, with large numbers of workers already on the dole, can no longer freely admit immigrants from the Third World." We wrote him two letters saying amongst other things that it is one thing to have a policy restricting immigration generally, but that it is racial discrimination to apply it only to the Third World or New Commonwealth as the bourgeoisie prefers to call it. (eg. apparently X's "equal" treatment for the Third World is to apply only to dead labour, commodities, and not the living variety. In fact he supports the extension of discrimination against Third World manufactures to include discrimination against Third World immigrants). But since he is not objecting to point 7 (g) of the draft proposals and has therefore presumably seen his mistake, we are content to leave the working out of the details of this policy to the Unity Committee.

The draft proposals are meant to be an outline statement of the basis for unity with detailed policies and formulations to be worked out later. If we all start insisting on 100% agreement with our own detailed formulations now the whole thing will break down. I think X understands all this perfectly well. So is this what he wants?"

Interim Committee Letter dated 16.7.79 to F.C.A.

Dear X,

We regret that you did not attend the Interim Committee meeting yesterday of which you were notified by (WPSML). You did not even bother to intimate to us that you would not be able to attend for whatever reason.

However, fulfilling its obligations, the Interim Committee decided to circulate its Report in a fortnight's time to the Marxist-Leninist organisations expected to participate in the reconvened Consultative Meeting.

The Committee noted your persistent refusal to meet fellow members of the Interim Committee to discuss and iron out your differences with them and your failure to attend its meeting.

Under these circumstances it was agreed to request you to submit your views or differences in writing within a fortnight's time on any issues relevant to the Report. These will be circulated along with the Report.

Looking forward keenly to your reply,

Yours etc.

for the Interim Committee.

LIST OF LETTERS AND DOCUMENTS RE THE
M/L CONSULTATIVE MEETING

WPS Circular 19.6.78
" " 17.7.78
" " 7.8.78
" " 28.8.78
WPS/RMLCL Joint Communique 15.7.78
WPS/RMLCL Draft Organisational Line 15.7.78
RCLB Open Letter to WPS 19.7.78
FCA on the Marxist Leninist Consultative Meeting 15.8.78
NCG's Commentary on the WPS/RMLCL Draft Organisation Line, Aug.78
NCG's Statement on M/L Unity, Sept.78
MIG on M/L Consultative Conference 4.9.78
RCLB's Second Open Letter on M/L Consultative Meeting, Aug.78
RMLCL Open letter to M/L organisations participating
in the Consultative Meeting for Unity, 6.9.78
WPS reply to RCLB and NCG, Sept. 79.
(For a Broad United Front Against Soviet social-imperialism
and Superpower Hegemonism to Defend National Independence
democracy and the people's Livelihood.)
CWM's Open letter to WPS and RMLCL, September 1978
Interim Committee's Letter to RCLB and CWM, 18.10.78
CWM's reply to Interim Committee, December 1978.
Interim Committee's reply to CWM, January 1979.
RCLB reply to Interim Committee, 22.2.79
MIG/WPS reply to Interim Committee, April 1979
RMLCL: Reference documents on (i) Fundamental Propositions
and Some Important Principles of Marxism
(ii) Essence of Three Worlds Theory
(iii) Marxist Theory on Stages in a Revolution and the
Position of RCLB.