

THE COMMUNIST

6^d

August 1968

Number 18

Lenin On National Parties

(AN EXPOSURE OF THE DISTORTIONS OF THE W.P.P.E.)

In September 1966 the "Irish Communist" carried an editorial article by Angela Clifford, "On Working Class Organisation In Ireland and Britain". In this article it was shown that the I.

c o n t e n t s	
	page
Lenin On National Parties.....	1
Automation	12
More Social-Fascist Trickery.....	14
All	
All Correspondence to be addressed to:	

D. Laurie,
32 Montpelier Grove,
N.W.5
Communist Workers Organistn

C.O. (Irish Communist Organisation) had been implementing the national principle of party organisation, where Leninism applied the state principle of party organisation. Lenin never tired of stating this principle. In the Irish Communist Editorial two quotes were given from articles of a general nature on the national question. The first, from "Critical Remarks On The National Question" (1913) reads in part:

"As long as they live together in one state, the Great-Russian and Ukrainian workers jointly uphold, with the closest organisational unity and

concert, the common international culture of the proletarian movement, and show absolute tolerance on the question of the language in which propoganda is conducted, or on purely local or national peculiarities that are taken into account in this propoganda. Such is the absolute demand of Marxism. All advocacy of the segregation of the workers of one nation from those of another...is bourgeois nationalism." (First underling ours)

2.

The second is from The Socialist Revolution And The Rights Of Nations To Self-Determination (1916):

"...the Socialists of the oppressed nation must, in particular, defend and implement the full and unconditional unity, including organisational unity, of the workers of the oppressed nation with those of the oppressor nation. Without this it is impossible to defend the independent policy of the proletariat and their class solidarity with the proletariat of other countries in face of all the intrigues, treachery and trickery on the part of the bourgeoisie."

The smallest territorial entity that can be called the "British state" is the United Kingdom state. The U.K. is governed by one centralised state machine. That being so, the Leninist principle would require a centralised organisation of all workers (of all nationalities) in the U.K., in opposition to this state. Of course if there were found to be insuperable obstacles in practice to the establishment of such a centralised party, something less would have to be accepted. But in the first place a determined struggle to establish a centralised party was obligatory.

The U.K. includes England, Scotland, Wales and N. Ireland. The I.C.O., of course, was primarily concerned with the latter. We will not here go into the line of reasoning which led it to suggest that a centralised party for Britain and Ireland as a whole was required.

Thus in Sept. 1966 the Irish Communist sharply drew attention to the Leninist principle of party organisation in multi-national states. At that time there was no suggestion in the British anti-revisionist movement that separate national Parties for English, Scottish and Welsh workers should be established, though the fact that national questions existed in Scotland and Wales was widely recognised. But shortly afterwards the Scottish Workers Party made its appearance, and the London Workers' Committee began to talk about forming an English Party. Neither of these groups made any reference to the I.C.O. proposal, nor did the A.C.M.L.U. and the C.D.R.C.U. when they challenged their position. All four simply ignored the Leninist principle. There was some argument as to whether Scotland and Wales were nations or nationalities, but all three applied the national principle of Party organisation (the A.C.M.L.U. stated the correct but did not apply it.)

Members of the I.C.O. in London continually drew the attention of the L.W.C. (and, after Oct. 1967, of the 'October Organising Cttee' as the LWC became) to the Leninist principle and urged them to account for themselves with regard to Leninism. Even though the L.W.C./O.O.C. regarded its views on national parties as one of the main distinguishing features of its position, and

held that the failure of the Comintern to establish national parties in Britain as an important psource of British revisionism, it made no attempt to account for its position with regard to Lenin's statements on the question. Not until April 1967, on the eve of the "inaugural Congress" of the W.P.P.E., did it condescend to publish a statement: "Lenin on National Parties", (Workers Broadsheet. April).

In this article the statement made by Lenin in the two articles quoted by the I.C.O. (articles of a general nature, written in 1913 and 1916, when his main work on the national question was done) are simply ignored, and it is maintained, on the basis of extracts from articles written in 1902-3, that Lenin favoured the formation of separate national parties within the same state. It makes no attempt to relate these to the general principles quoted by the I.C.O., and leaves it to be understood that Lenin's writings are highly contradictory on this point. In fact there is no contradiction, and Lenin's 1916 position is in this respect identical with his 1902 position. The appearance of contradiction is created by the most brazen piece of trickery so far attempted by a group purporting to be anti-revisionist. Since this trickery involves quoting out of context, and misquoting some space will be required to expose it. But it is necessary to expose it.

* * * *

The L.W.C. maintains that, while "there were many different races" within the Tsarist Empire, most of them "while seeing themselves as different, still regarded themselves as politically a part of Russia. They saw the need to unite in one party to fight as one for the socialist revolution". But there were a number of nations "which had no other ties with Russia than a common oppressor. They saw the need to form independent parties for their own nations..."

"Lenin's attitude to independent national parties was naturally different for these two distinct groups of nations. He upheld the need for those distinct nations (?) who saw themselves as part of the all-Russia proletariat to organise in the one party ... He also upheld the right of those colonised nations with no other tie than that of being ruled by the same regime, to organise in separate parties." (p20)

Now let us look at the following paragraph in detail:

"In 1903, all the nationalities had separate parties, and Lenin held that: 'Autonomy in questions specifically concerning the proletariat of a given race, nation or district, implies that it is left to the organisation concerned to determine the specific demands to be advanced (...), and the methods to be employed'." (C.W. Vol7. p95)

4.

The dots between brackets have been inserted by us. At this point the LWC has omitted, without acknowledgement, six words which occur in the original, and which if published would have given the game away. These words are "in pursuance of the common programme" (our emphasis).

Lenin's position, which has been distorted out of all recognition by the LWC, is as follows:

"The Social-Democratic programme only sets forth the basic demands, common to the entire proletariat, irrespective of occupational, local, national, or racial distinctions." But these distinctions mean that "One and the same point in the programme will be applied differently depending on differences in conditions of life, differences of culture, differences in the relation of social forces in different parts of the country, and so forth. Agitation on behalf of one and the same demand in the programme will be carried on in different ways and in different languages, taking into account all these differences. Consequently, autonomy..." (the sentence misquoted by the LWC follows.) "The Party as a whole, its central institutions, lay down the common fundamental principles of programme and tactics; as to different methods of carrying out these principles in practice and agitating for them, they are laid down by the various Party organisations subordinate to the centre, depending on local, racial, national, cultural and other differences." (C.W. Vol. 7 p 94/5 The Position of the Bend in the Party.)

Lenin asks: "Is there anything unclear about this conception of autonomy?". There wa n't --until the LWC began to rewrite Lenin in a pathetic attempt to enlist his support for their position.

The LWC takes Lenin's writing against federalism and in support of centralism in Party organisation covering the workers of several nationalities under a single state, and, by quoting sentences out of context and dropping clauses out of sentences, tries to suggest that Lenin was a federalist. Could there be more brazen dishonesty than that? It is one thing to disagree openly and honestly with Lenin and give reasons for doing so. Nobody is claiming that Lenin was infallible (though it is worth noting that none of the Lenin-critics have shown him to be wrong in any essential matter, and that none of them have been honest in their approach to his work). But it is an entirely different matter to pretend to agree with Lenin, and then to engage in deliberate distortion of his writing to make him appear to say the opposite of what he actually said, as the L.W.C. does.

To prove beyond all reasonable doubt that the LWC has engaged in deliberate distortion of Lenin, and has not made a genuine

5.

mistake, in the foregoing section, we will deal with other distortions of a similar nature which occur in the very short statement of the L.W.C. A second distortion occurs on p21:

"Those parties representing the proletariat of nationalities which considered themselves a part of All-Russia, wished to join forces with the R.S.D.L.P. Lenin, while he saw the desirability of the merger, had doubts as to whether it was the right time:

'We cannot but favour the representation of all (the original reads "all", C.W.O.) nationalities at the Congress, but at the same time we must remember that we can think of expanding the nucleus or allying it with other organisations, only after the formation of this nucleus has been completed..... Until we have ourselves become united organisationally and have firmly set out along the right path, amalgamation with us has nothing to give all other (this should read "all other") nationalities'. " (C.W. Vol. 6 p324)

The LWC here suggests that Lenin was resisting pressure from the workers of other nationalities in the Russian Empire to form a single working class party with the Russian workers. But when we refer to Lenin's article we find that he is dealing with a statement issued by the Jewish Bund. Far from resisting a demand from the Bund to become part of the R.S.D.L.P., Lenin points out that the Bund "on the basis of a decision of the Party Congress in 1898, (i.e. 5 years earlier C.W.O) was affiliated to the RSDLP" (p319). And he criticised the Bund for ignoring the Party Organising Cttee! "we must protest emphatically against the Bund coming out with a separate statement in the press, since such action is an infringement of the most elementary rules governing the joint conduct of revolutionary activities and especially organisational activities." (p320)

The real aim of the Bund was to reverse the decision of 1898 to affiliate to the Party, and instead "to enter into a federative alliance with it" (p321), but it had not the courage to state this aim honestly, and discuss it honestly.

"We shall tell the Russian proletariat, and shall specially repeat to the Jewish proletariat, that the present Bund leaders are committing a grave political error... We fought against the urge towards terrorism... We are convinced that the nationalist passion too will vanish. In the end the Jewish proletariat will understand that its most vital interests demand the closest unity with the Russian proletariat in one party..." (p322)

Far from demanding the formation of a common party for workers of all nationalities in Russia, the Bund wanted to disrupt the already existing Party, and found another on a federal basis:

6.

"By formally advancing the "right" of "all" nationalities to found the long-ago-founded RSDLP, the Bund manifestly confirms that it is precisely over the question of the notorious "federation" that it has raised the whole issue" (P 324. "rights" is in quotation marks because, "in general, we do not indulge in talk about "rights" in the cause of revolution except in cases of dire necessity" p321: a very appropriate piece of advice for the groups in the British anti-revisionist movement.)

* * * *

The L.W.C. quotes three lines from Lenin's "On The Manifesto of The American Social-Democrats". It does not quote the following:

"As to the Caucasus, in view of the extremely diverse national composition of its population, we shall strive to unite all the local socialist elements and all the workers of the various nationalities". (p328)

* * * *

The L.W.C. quotes a few lines from Lenin's "The National Question In Our Programme". It does not quote the following:

"....undeterred by chauvinist and opportunist heckling, we shall always say to the Polish workers: only the most complete and intimate alliance with the Russian proletariat can meet the requirements of the present political struggle against the autocracy.... What we have said on the Polish question is wholly applicable to every other national question. The accursed history of the autocracy has left us a legacy of tremendous estrangement between the working classes of the various nationalities oppressed by that autocracy. This estrangement is a very great evil, a very great obstacle to the struggle against the autocracy, and we must not legitimise this evil or sanctify this outrageous state of affairs by establishing any such "principles" as separate parties or a "federation" of parties. It is, of course, simpler and easier to follow the line of least resistance, and for everyone to make himself comfortable in his own corner... So long as the injuriousness of estrangement is not realised.... there is no need for the fig-leaf of "federation"... That being the case, it is better to let the lessons of experience and of the actual movement prove that centralism is essential for success in the struggle waged by the proletarians of all nationalities oppressed by the autocracy against that autocracy" (p463 Our emphasis)

It is clear why the L.W.C. did not quote that: it refutes its entire position on the "national parties". Furthermore, the L.W.C. quotes the following two sentences from this article :

"That programme in no way precludes the adoption of a free

and independent Polish republic by the Polish proletariat^{7.}(...)
It merely demands that a genuinely socialist party shall not corrupt proletarian class consciousness, or slur over the struggle". (Vol 6 P460)

A clause is omitted without acknowledgement where we have inserted the brackets. Lenin's sentence here continues "even though the probability of its becoming a reality before socialism is infinitesimal" (our emphasis). Also omitted is Lenin's sharp criticism of the Polish Socialist Party and its leader, Pilsudski. The P.S.P. was a national Polish Party justifying the organisational separation of the Polish workers from the workers of other nationalities in the Tsarist Empire by referring to the right of national self-determination. These two omissions are highly significant in view of subsequent developments.

Polish national independence was established after the socialist revolution in Russia in March 1918. The leader of the independent Polish state was the leader of the Polish Socialist Party, Pilsudski, whose line on national Party organisation was sharply criticised by Lenin in 1903. Pilsudski went into alliance with the imperialist states against Soviet Russia, and invaded Russia with a Polish Army in 1920. Until his death in 1935 he was the leader of a fascist dictatorship in Poland. Pilsudski's later fascism was implicit in his splitting of the Polish workers into a national party in the 1890's. It is not for nothing that the other name of fascism is "national socialism".

* * * *

It is clear that the W.P.P.E. has engaged in a deliberate distortion of Lenin's writings in order to make it appear that Lenin upheld the federative principle of Party organisation, as against the centralist, in multi-national states. In fact Lenin was a consistent centralist in this matter and in every article quoted by the W.P.P.E. he opposed federalism. The W.P.P.E., in its attempt to split the workers in Britain into separate national Parties, is in fact following the principle which the Jewish Bund, Pilsudski and others set up in opposition to the Marxist principle. And, it should be stressed, that while attempting to split the workers under the British state along national lines the W.P.P.E. contributes nothing, and has not attempted to contribute anything, to an understanding of the historical development of the national question in Britain. Only the C.W.O. and I.C.O., who adhere strictly to the centralist principle of Marxism, have attempted to do this.

(We have not dealt with the WPPE assertion that Lenin did not apply an objective standard in this respect (i.e. unity in a common organisation with a common programme of all workers opp-

8.

ressed by the same state, with autonomy in implementing the programme in the different national conditions), but a subjective standard (i.e. unity of the workers in the Tsarist Empire who "saw themselves as part of the all-Russia proletariat," and separation for those who saw themselves as being separate.) We must admit that we are not familiar with every article in Lenin's Collected Works, but it seems highly improbable to us that he ever stated such a view. Anyhow we are not in a position to deal with the assertion until the WPPE states its grounds for it.)

* * * *

Most of the articles misquoted by the WPPE were written by Lenin in the period before the 2nd Party Congress in 1903. At the Congress Lenin continued his forceful opposition to federation: "Federation is harmful because it sanctions segregation and alienation, elevates them to a principle, to a law". (Vol. 6 P486). And in his Draft Resolution on the Bund: "that the Congress emphatically repudiates federation as the organisational principle of the Russian party..." (p470). There speaks the man whom the WPPE represents as a federalist!

* * * *

In Workers Broadsheet, June 1968, we read: "...the WPPE recognises that a mistake was made at the very foundation of the CPGB in 1920, the theoretical and practical achievements of James Connolly and John Maclean, both acclaimed by Lenin, were not heeded as they should have been.

"We recognise that England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland are four nations, not one, and that therefore each requires, and will certainly soon develop, as already in Scotland and now in England, its own revolutionary party," and these four parties will later develop "a Federal Party of the British Isles". (P1/2) A leading member of the WPPE, at an OOC meeting last March, stated that the 'mistake' referred to here was a major cause contributing to the development of revisionism in Britain.

Now, it is well known that Lenin played a leading part in the formation of the CPGB. He was familiar with the history of Britain, and with the contemporary situation in Britain in 1920. He was also aware (and few other Marxists of the period were aware) that the national question had not, despite appearances, been finally solved in Britain. (See State & Revolution.)

When the WPPE says that "...the theoretical and practical achievements of James Connolly and John Maclean, both acclaimed by Lenin, were not heeded..." in the formation of the CPGB, it is clear that these words refer most of all toLenin.

Lenin stood for the formation of a centralised Party in Britain, as he had in Russia. John Maclean stood for the formation of a national workers' Party in Scotland. If the WPPE thinks that Lenin's view was incorrect and Maclean's view was correct, let them say so, instead of searching for verbal ambiguities which suggest (without actually stating) that Lenin supported Maclean's position while the CPBG opposed it. (An assessment of Maclean's position will be found in The Irish Communist, May 1967).

With regard to Connolly: if the WPPE have studied Connolly's writings (certain of which are only now being made available by the I.C.O., and thinks that there is something in them which supports their position, let them. It is our opinion, based on a close study of Connolly's writing, and a long acquaintance with the L.W.C./W.P.P.E. that there is nothing in common between either the spirit or the letter of Connolly's position and that of the WPPE, and that their reference to Connolly is mere phrasenohgerik.

* * * *

In a situation in which the ruling class has succeeded in bringing about a "tremendous estrangement between the working classes of the various nationalities oppressed by the autocracy", Lenin did not, as the WPPE alleges, base his policies on this estrangement. He did not say that the estrangement made "federalism" necessary. He carried on a merciless struggle against the federalists, who, instead of basing themselves on the class interest of the proletariat, based themselves on the division of the proletariat along national lines brought about by the autocracy. Without any ambiguity he declared: "we must not legitimise this evil or sanctify this outrageous state of affairs by establishing any such "principles" as seperate patties or a "federation" of parties".

In Britain (excluding the Irish question for the moment) the English, Scottish and Welsh workers have a strong tradition of united action regardless of nationality. In the British working class movement estrangements as great as those which Lenin had to struggle against in Russia do not exist. The anti-revisionist movement which arose as a consequence of the development of modern revisionism did not find itself confronted with a working class movement divided along national lines. But within a couple of years of coming into being sections of the movement began to make themselves agencies for dividing the movement along national lines. These sections can only be considered in this respect to be the vanguard of bourgeois nationalism in the working class movement.

Why has there been this sudden capitulation to bourgeois nati-

10.

onalism by these sections? In our view it is because the leadership of the anti-revisionist movement failed in 1963 to identify the main tasks, and to consciously set about accomplishing them. They failed to answer the question (which was put to them): Is the main task in the present situation theoretical or organisational? Is the working class movement being held back because of theoretical or organisational shortcomings? They either refused to answer this question, or they gave the meaningless answers to it. They rejected the view that the primary task was the development of an adequate theory, and that until the theoretical task had been adequately accomplished no positive practical work could be done. Meaningless phrases such as: "We've had too much theorising: what we need is some practice", abounded.

The theoretical task being in objective fact the main task, and being rejected, it was inevitable that the movement should fragment and that opportunism should find an easy development in it. The "practice" of the various groups which rejected the theoretical task was irrelevant to the needs of the working class movement, and, luckily, had no influence on it. At best, these groups could only have been an added source of political confusion in the working class movement, so it was fortunate that they had no base in that movement.

Their "practice", not being guided by theoretical analysis, was determined by the subjective whims of the "leaders" and by the line of least resistance. It was, therefore, determined by the bourgeoisie. Some groups, under the influence of the growing bourgeois nationalist movements in Scotland and Wales, began to set up "national parties". The "criticism" of these groups by others (i.e. the C.D.R.C.U. and A.C.M.L.U.) expressed the imperialist position. Only those groups who identified the primary task as theoretical (the ICO and CWO) were capable of taking a position on this question which reflected neither the imperialist or the bourgeois-nationalist positions (and it is only these groups which have carried out coherent, systematic work, and have developed their position during the past 5 years).

On the question of theory and practice, as on other fundamental questions, the WPPE and other "Maoist" groups distort Mao's position, and transform Mao from a Marxist into a vulgar social-ist. Mao has never said that in the development of the working class movement practical tasks are always primary. Nor has he said that theory and practice develop (or "should develop" --whatever that might mean) along with one another in a harmonious manner. Mao, on the contrary, holds the orthodox position that the relation between theory and practice is contradictory, that practice always tends to outstrip its reflection in theory, and theory tends to lag behind. When theory lags

behind practice becomes blind and the movement cannot progress until an adequate theory is developed, at least on essential questions. But even when an adequate theory is developed, and there is "unity of theory and practice", this unity is of a conditional nature and will be upset by the further development of practice --which is primary. That is the meaning of the primacy of practice. It is the opposite of the meaning that is given to it by the "practice first" elements (the arm-chair practitioners). It does not mean that there tends to be ample theoretical development in the working class movement, that development is held back by organisational shortcomings and that practical work is therefore always primary.

In view of the hundreds of thousands of copies of the works of Mao which have been circulated in Britain in the past few years, and of the unending sloganising about Mao, it is remarkable that nine anti-revisionist groups out of ten should attribute to Mao a position which is at variance with Marxism, and which is at variance with Mao's own clearly-stated position.

* * * *

Lenin's view on this matter was forcefully and concisely expressed: "In our opinion, the absence of theory deprives a revolutionary trend of the right to existence and inevitably condemns it, sooner or later, to political bankruptcy." (Vol 6, p 88)

In Britain the overwhelming dominance of bourgeois ideology brings about this political bankruptcy with marvellous rapidity. Group after group proclaims its "historic" nature, and passes into oblivion. The W.P.P.E., when confronted with concrete demonstrations of the falseness of its position declares that history will show who was right. This is precisely an expression of political bankruptcy. Is the W.P.P.E. so overcome with megalomaniac delusions that it believes that history will justify its distortion of Lenin's writings?

* * * *

Not only is the W.P.P.E. attempting to split the workers in Britain along national lines, but it is also attempting to split them along racial lines --black against white. Next month we will complete the criticism of the WPPE position with relation to the Black Power movement in Britain which was begun in the June issue of The Communist.

C. W. O.

 * * * * *

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO THE COMMUNIST COST 4/6 for 6 months post-free
 SUBSCRIPTIONS TO THE COMMUNIST COST 4/6 for 6 months post-free
 Available from address on Page One

AUTOMATION

Mr. Gunter has not found much difficulty in replacing the loss of his Labour Minister's job. He is to continue his good work as a part-time director of the Foundation on Automation and Employment (salary up to £1,500 p.a.). The aim of this institution is:

"educating industry to accept automation on the principle that no worker is left derelict." (Fin. Times. 12.8.68)

The directorship is made up of "senior industrialists" and their lackeys --Gunter will be joining amongst other the Lords Carron and Robins. The organisation is financed by an American monopoly capitalist concern: United States Industries which manufactures automation equipment.

One of the Labour Government's main aims has been to encourage increasing monopolisation. But as the capitalists themselves point out, size of itself is not enough. It is only the prerequisite for "rationalisation" and automation.

The last few years have seen an increase in the number of mergers. Now the mergers must be made to justify themselves in the eyes of the capitalist. This means making use of the large resources of the combined monopolies to introduce automated production lines. Automated production will be supplemented by automated distribution (e.g. containerisation) --a field which at the moment is relatively technically backward in capitalist terms. Already the Government itself is giving a lead in the public sector (e.g. one-man buses, automated ticket collection and sales on tubes, rationalisation in steel industry, even productivity schemes in council labouring.)

The whole aim is to continuously intensify the exploitation of labour power, so that the quantity of commodities produced by the individual labourer increases continuously. The British ruling class has been aware of this coming intensification of automation for many years. It realised years ago that this meant that unlimited supplies of unskilled labour would no longer be needed --that in fact the availability and cheapness of unskilled labour would hamper this change by putting off the development and installation of labour-saving machinery and methods. It also realised that unless this change was made seriously it would lose its position among the leaders of world imperialism.

Therefore various measures were taken to limit future supplies

of labour. Firstly, supplies of immigrant labour were progressively curtailed. This, seen in the light of intensifying automation is not the senseless racialism which it is emotionally described to be by some sections of the labour movement. It is sound capitalist economics. The only hole for immigration yet to be plugged is from Ireland and to plug this hole in the present situation would be suicide for the British ruling class, for it would cause a terrific explosion in Ireland. Irish immigration will have to be allowed to continue for the moment.

At the same time as greatly reducing the inflow of workers, another source of labour far more useful is being tapped by promoting more attractive pay conditions for women. Married women in particular are a useful part of the labour force for capital. With the development of automation and rationalisation more part-time labour is needed. Also certain areas of repetitive, monotonous work is reserved for women. Women can be made redundant more easily than men. The development of a more efficient and pleasant mode of contraception, i.e. the Pill, releases these internal reserves of labour for capitalist exploitation.

Militant reaction by workers to redundancy is staved off by redundancy bribes in the form of redundancy pay.

Organisations such as that Mr. Gunter has joined are set up to popularise automation amongst smaller manufactures as well as amongst certain important sections of the state machine such as the educational and propaganda sections.

The question arises whether the workers who are made redundant will be absorbed into the rest of the economy. With large sections of industry sacking workers (or failing to take on new workers as they expand), will there be a pool of unemployed labour again? The capitalists themselves realise that to return to the methods of pre-Keynsian capitalism would be to court revolution in England. It is for this reason that they have planned for this change in their system so carefully. However, it remains to be seen whether the contradictions in the system will allow their carefully laid plans to achieve their aim.

Angela Clifford

MORE SOCIAL-FASCIST TRICKERY

The social-fascist Finsbury Communist Association, which holds that the class interest of the British working class lies in supporting imperialism and sharing in the surplus-value extracted by imperialism from the colonial workers --and which has been jeering at the working class and neighing its approval of attacks on the working class by various petty-bourgeois, anti-Communist elements-- has recently issued a document in which it alleges that the C.W.O. "absolutely refuse(s) to show how Britain is benefiting from cheap food and raw materials from abroad. They dare not tell the British workers that the Afro-Asian-Carribeab countries will bring this exploitation to an end" (This quote is from a document called "The Black Man's Burden" by the F.C.A.: the first F.C.A. publication we have seen for 6 months, since the F.C.A. refused a subscription to the "Finsbury Communist" from a member of the C.W.O.).

Having farked a confrontation with the C.W.O. position at meetings of the Anti-Revisionist Front last year, and having disrupted the Front when it failed to gain acceptance for its social-fascist line, the F.C.A. now resorts to outright lies. A glance at the articles on unequal exchange and the international division of labour published in The Communist and The Irish Communist will show how blatant these lies are.

What the CWO did was refuse to support the underhand attempt by the FCA to propound the ideas of Herbert Marcuse under cover of phrases about Marxism.

Our articles on imperialist exploitation through unequal exchange were published to refute the argument of the ACMLU (MLOB) that the imperialist exploitation was drying up and the objective basis for a labour aristocracy in Britain had disappeared. We showed that the ACMLU had completely abandoned Marxism. At this time the FCA was developing friendly relations with the MLOB. And when the MLOB attack on Mao was published the FCA declared: "The MLOB has been one of the main bulwarks against the revisionists." (An Open Letter To Comrades of the MLOB). And now..... but why waste any more time on these tricksters!