

# WORKERS BROADSHEET

14

PUBLISHED BY THE W.P.P.E.

FEB '69

## The attack on the Trade Unions

In Northern Ireland last month -- the part of Ireland separated off as still an English colony -- the reality of colonial rule has shown up as what it is, the rule of force, of the policeman's baton with the gun always available behind it.

This is what colonial rule is NORMALLY -- as it is for instance in Hong Kong, as it is in Zimbabwe ruled by Smith and his white settlers under the name of its conqueror, as Rhodesia.

This is also what it could become here in England not for just brown skinned immigrants, but for many millions of us. If working people's DISUNITY allows this bankers' government to continue its systematic disarming of the workers, then police will be beating people up not just occasionally as at present, but wholesale as in Derry.

Wilson is not just trying to reduce the power of trade unions. His Government has been systematically and continuously attacking the workers for the past four years. He is merely taking this attack to its next stage.

### WHY DOES HE DO IT ?

The two most popular views are:-

- (i) that he has to do it to stop the nation getting further into debt and going bankrupt;
- (ii) that Wilson mistakenly thinks it necessary, whereas really it is not, and all would be well if he would take the advice of the Labour Left, of "Morning Star" and "Tribune", and let everyone have a wage rise. (contd overleaf)

## All together at the LSE

Dr. Adams, imported last year from Smith's Rhodesia to be the new Director -- the title is appropriate -- of the London School of Economics, spent his Christmas holidays having a series of steel grills put into the School's buildings, thus making clear to everyone both his own role as a policeman, and that in our present society a university is a prison and is meant to be one.

The students responded by refusing to be prisoners and themselves removed the grills. Dr. Adams called in the police and closed the School.

How solidly students and most of the staff stood together was shown by the very removal of the grills, possible only because LSE opinion was over-

whelmingly against this symbol and sign of imprisonment.

After this eviction by Dr. Adams from LSE buildings, the students and sympathetic staff, meeting at the UIS, continued to show fine solidarity. The Assembly Hall was crowded out and almost unanimous in its support of the four demands:

1. That LSE be reopened.
2. That the grills be not replaced nor any substitute.
3. No victimisation either in court or School.
4. That the professors cease to act as police agents (5 of them had shown willingness to do so). (contd on p.8)



Originally, most people thought that (i) was right — that we must all tighten our belts etc. But this view is rapidly going the way of previous big lies.

Capitalist Britain is certainly going bankrupt, but not through high wages — on the contrary through low wages, low production, and the export of capital. That is the first lesson we have to learn, and it really is not difficult to understand once you realise that Wilson, his Government and the whole press are systematic liars, or at the best self-deceivers, as governments and their press have shown themselves to be in the past.

#### WILSON MISTAKEN ?

The second view, that Wilson is mistaken, continues to be popular with many who ought to know better — that key section of organised workers who are under the influence of the CPGB and its allies. These mistaken workers must be helped to understand that they are being led up the garden, that there is no mistake, but that Wilson and Castle are simply following the only policy that our class system of capitalism knows, the only one it can follow — **THE HIGHEST RATE OF PROFIT.**

The average rate of profit from investments abroad has been, over the past ten years or so, approximately double the average from those at home. So naturally capitalists insist on keeping their freedom to invest abroad, for instance in South Africa or the Bahamas. And Wilson & Co., who want to show the City that they can govern just as well or better than Heath & Co., naturally will not even question this freedom of capital to export itself to the highest rate of profit to its owners, while the rest of us pay the price.

The bankers whose policy Wilson has adopted as his own — just as the Tories did before him — seeing that investment in fascist South Africa or Rhodesia brings more profit than investments here at home, can see only one thing to do; to raise profits here in England to the level of South Africa. But South Africa is a slave state with labourers paid only a fraction of what they earn — with hard fighting for it — in England. So Wilson and his bankers, to keep capital happy in England, are seeking to give industrialists in England a labour force that will accept wages to match those of the slave workers of South Africa.

#### IMPERIALISM -- EXPORT OF CAPITAL

This attack on all workers in England requires of course united resistance by all workers in England irrespective of religion, skin colour or country of origin.

But it is also necessary that the millions of us who are being attacked should understand that it is precisely this imperialist policy of the export of capital that is the direct cause of the financial crisis, which Wilson and his bankers are trying to cure by cutting down production, as the means to reduce wages and increase unemployment, which of course helps to bring down wages.

Why do we call this policy imperialist? Because that is just what imperialism is, the export of capital for profit-making, and it is this imperialist policy that is the direct cause of freeze-and-squeeze.

This is now beginning to be understood, but there are still people who cannot understand that to fight the wage freeze is not enough — we have to offer something better to take its place if millions of sensible people are to be brought to understand the need for **REVOLUTION** — the only way to achieve a change of **CLASS POWER.**

Look at France last year. The workers almost everywhere won a good rise in wages, but how has this helped them? In fact, it hasn't. Prices have risen so much that the workers are no better off at all, and de Gaulle and his millionaires are still in power to prevent any "socialist nonsense".

The only way to planned increasing production is by revolution, by a change of class power from owners to workers. And to get revolution we must take the people fully into our confidence, must explain to them **WHY** we need a revolution, **WHAT** revolution can bring them and **HOW** a revolution can be achieved.

#### REVOLUTION IS NOT CONSPIRACY OF A FEW

It is the action of millions who understand the need to take power from the few who at present dominate only because they are allowed to do so.

**UNITY FOR REVOLUTION** will make revolution irresistible — as it would have been in France last May if only there had been revolutionary leadership, as it would have been in our

(contd on p. 7)



AN OPEN LETTER TO LIBERTARIAN  
MARXISTS

"Without a revolutionary party, without a party built on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and in the Marxist-Leninist style it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its running dogs."  
(Mao Tse Tung 1948)

An important sector of the revolutionary front is being developed by our monthly contemporary "Solidarity", the organ of "Libertarian Marxists with the slogan "Workers' Power".

"Solidarity" has established roots where they matter most, in the factories, and has a line of uncompromising class struggle, together with careful examination of facts and objective reporting in industrial struggles. And our "Libertarian" fellow-Marxists have shown in the past, notably at Kinghill, that they can conduct an actual struggle on a revolutionary issue with success.

So far so good. Now we must see what divides "Libertarians" from Leninists (both sections claiming to be Marxists).

Lenin showed in practice that an organised, disciplined revolutionary party of a new type -- now universally called a Leninist Party -- could achieve workers' power, not merely talk about it. What Libertarians claim is that almost as soon as workers' power was achieved in October 1917, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party began to develop bureaucratic power instead. If the Soviet Union were today developing socialism, we could ignore such accusations.

But since the Soviet Union has, by universal judgment of revolutionaries, ceased to be a socialist or revolutionary force, the accusation that the Leninist Party itself inevitably became bureaucratic and came to represent a new ruling class, must be examined.

First let us remember what our Libertarians seem usually to forget, that a change of class power is a difficult practical task that can be achieved ONLY by revolution, and that revolutions are not carefully executed works of art, but are an acute form of class war involving blood and dirt, violence and the need to control it.

Lenin and Mao Tse Tung are recognised as our greatest revolutionaries -- with an important place also for Fidel Castro -- because they have shown us a change of class power in practice on an enormous scale. For can the most sceptical doubt that the October Revolution displaced the ruling class and brought power to the workers and peasants, even if there is disagreement as to how long this lasted?

Secondly, let us recall Marx's warning that the introduction of socialism must inevitably be a slow process that can only be BEGUN from the establishment of working class power. Marx stressed that this must take the form of a PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP, and claimed this idea as his own main contribution to the science of politics. The acceptance and understanding of the need for proletarian dictatorship is, Lenin pointed out, the test of a Marxist. The true Marxist is a practical revolutionary as opposed to either an armchair theoretician on the one hand, or an unscientific romantic pseudo-revolutionary on the other. It is just such romanticism that our Libertarians are indulging in.

We cannot afford the luxury of waiting while we theorise for maybe a couple of centuries or even a decade or two, for a socialist revolution -- for the forcible removal from power of the IRRESPONSIBLES who have it at present, and the taking of power by the politically most developed section of our society, with the active support of the great majority of the working people. It cannot anyway be done except with such support, and this ensures that it will not be done by another clique of irresponsibles in the name of socialism or anything else.



Revolutionaries are faced NOW with the responsibility of guiding the present rapidly developing revolutionary or potentially revolutionary forces. A crisis leading potentially either to a revolution or to fascism could be upon us at any time. Who foresaw the May 1968 crisis in France? Responsible revolutionary Marxists in France only a few months before the crisis were talking of the need for "many years" before there could possibly be a revolutionary situation. But now who would dare to say that the position of capitalism is safe even for a few months?

Such a situation of advanced revolutionary potential puts a corresponding responsibility on us as revolutionaries, not only to seek socialism, but also to save us from a period of fascism. Nazi Germany of the 1930s is a grim reminder to us of what this can mean.

Our job now as revolutionaries, as practitioners of the science of politics, is to prepare ourselves and the working people of which we are a part, for the practice of revolution, of the forcible seizure of power. And this we can only learn to do by doing it. On this point there is complete agreement between us as Marxist-Leninist-Maoists and the Libertarians.

But where we differ is that we see the absolute necessity for a party on the lines developed by Lenin and Mao, whereas the Libertarians avoid the issue in its positive aspect and merely criticise revolutionary parties where they have made mistakes or alleged mistakes, without putting forward anything more positive than the correct but INSUFFICIENTLY DEFINED concept of Workers' Power.

Of course Marxist-Leninists are for Workers' Power. But we face in all its political implications the question of HOW? It's like the question of putting a man on the moon. It is quite easy to be "for" -- or "against" -- such a proposal, but less easy to say how to do it. There is nothing easier, at least for someone who has understood the need for socialism, than to be for Workers' Power. The decisive question is, how is this to be done?

Marxists since the days of Marx have been both arguing and practising this question of revolution. Marx provided the theoretical basis for the socialist revolution that is already freeing mankind from the dehumanising shackles of class division. In giving his whole life to doing this, Marx saw himself, and is to be seen by us, as above all a revolutionary.

Lenin, developing Marx's thought, provided the Leninist Party as the answer to the question -- how to seize power for the workers?

Just as Lenin developed the revolutionary party beyond anything set out by Marx or Engels, so Mao has developed the Leninist Party to a stage of practical democracy in advance of anything that could be envisaged by Lenin nearly 50 years ago. In doing this Mao has developed the theory of the Leninist Party to a new stage that has borne fruit in the Great Cultural Revolution, while the CPSU, because it deviated from the Leninist mass line, fell into petty bourgeois errors that had something in common with Robespierre and have ended up, as did Robespierre's Jacobinism, in open revisionism. (One is reminded of Napoleon's dictum "There are two kinds of revolutionaries -- those who make revolutions and those who profit by them").

Mao, developing the thought of both Marx and Lenin, has provided the answer to the question: how to develop the power of the workers after the establishment of proletarian dictatorship, and to prevent the return of a new ruling class to power as has happened in the Soviet Union.

It is in such practical terms that we must seek the answer to the legitimate question -- how can bureaucratism be abolished after a revolution that brings a revolutionary socialist or communist party to power?

First we must be clear that a whole class cannot seize power. Only an organised party can lead a revolution, so that the argument among serious revolutionaries should be on the programme for a revolutionary party, not on the question, answered long ago, as to whether such a party is necessary. It is necessary. No revolutionary party, no revolution, whatever may be said by such amateurs of revolution as Regis Debray.

The programme for a revolutionary party is a different matter and requires discussion, and this includes its rules of work. The problem of how to prevent the political degeneration of the leadership of a revolutionary party has of course not been fully solved. We cannot for instance feel confident that without Mao's personal leadership through the 1950s and 1960s China would not have followed the Soviet Union into revisionism and capitalist restoration.



As to the Soviet Union, to say that usurpers took over the leadership of party and state in the 1950s through a Palace coup does not explain how the usurpers came to be in a position to do so. Nor now communists could have prevented it and ensured continuing revolutionary development.

This question of the control and supervision of the revolutionary party in power by the working people remains a central point of revolutionary and socialist theory.

Already in 1927 Mao had written "Every revolutionary party and every revolutionary comrade will be put to the test to be accepted or rejected as they (the rebellious peasants of Hunan) decide".

Lenin had before then inaugurated the policy of public criticism and self-criticism by the Party at all levels, and the Chinese Party have developed this aspect of Leninism to dominate all their work, while the CPSU has long dropped it altogether.

The following words of Mao (1943) well sum up the necessary relation between party and people "However active the leading group may be its activity will amount to fruitless effort by a handful of people unless combined with the activity of the masses. On the other

hand, if the masses alone are active without a strong leading group to organise their activity properly, such activity cannot be sustained for long or carried forward in the right direction or raised to a high level."

Unless the English working people develop their own Leninist Party, history will repeat itself and the present economic crisis, as it develops, will once more leave the present class of social irresponsibles in power.

We are at present fairly rapidly approaching the period of maximum crisis. The English working people probably have not a great deal of time to prepare themselves for it. "Legal Marxists", economist "Marxists", and numerous Labour Party "Marxists" who mistakenly think that Trotsky can replace Lenin, are all active or passive opponents of that building of a revolutionary party which alone can bring victory out of crisis instead of the defeat to which revolutionaries in Europe have by now become almost accustomed.

We Marxist-Leninists do not claim perfection, we are dialectical materialists and know that development must and will continue in all things. We only modestly claim that the thought of Mao, the Marxism-Leninism of today, is the best guide so far available and that no one who understands the need for revolution, as opposed to merely talking about it, will reject the experience of revolution's greatest living practitioner.

Such an attitude can only be compared to that of a contemporary doctor saying he has no use for present antibiotics and establishing a Libertarian group to discuss the production of something better without troubling to examine what has been achieved so far.

However good individual intentions may be, such an attitude can only be described as charlatanry, but we believe our "Solidarity" comrades are not charlatans and will therefore face up to this decisive issue -- what kind of a party do we need for revolution? If this question is honestly examined we believe that any sincere revolutionary is bound to agree that we must start the practice of revolution and socialism from the point which its development has already reached, rather than to seek a supposed truth by examining a most concrete and practical problem as if it were an abstraction. This is philosophical idealism, and like all idealism becomes an excuse for the avoidance of necessary action.

If Libertarians, like us, want to change the world, they must like us, understand this necessity, and seek no other -- necessarily illusory -- freedom.

The slogan of the 1930s "They shall not pass" was inadequate then, and is even more so today. The people are sick of this sick society. It is not enough to defend this phony democracy against the thugs, in or out of uniform, when they beat up Catholic workers in Ulster, or develop Powellism in England. We must attack these attackers, and for that we need a united revolutionary party of Marxists.

Cont from P6 In part-political end of the trans lower, we appeal to all rer of class power, unless Marxists in industry to this aim is incorporated understand that the econ- in the mass line on which omic struggle alone, how- economic struggle is con- ever well conducted, can- ducted. Editorial Board. not achieve the necessary



### A LETTER OF REFUSAL

SERVING THE PEOPLE  
Rod Lee (Wandsworth  
Garage)

The recent threat of militant action by London's busmen over the question of hooliganism on late night buses may temporarily help a longstanding problem. But it will not solve it. This problem varies from incident to incident. In many cases it is due to drunkenness. In others it is the result of frustration on the part of the travelling public. In others again it is the result of bad handling by the conductor. The first and last of these do not have the obvious cause and solution that the second has, although loss of temper is closely related to it.

The obvious cause is bad service and the solution - to get a better one. At its most acute the problem is plain for all to see. At particular times when Bingo halls, dance halls or Pubs and Cinemas close there are many occasions when there are too many people waiting for the same bus. The answer is obvious - run more buses. But this the London Transport Board will not do. They say they cannot afford it and that even if they could, they could not get the crews to man the extra buses.

But they can afford to pay the city moneylenders over £100 million every year - part interest on colossal loans and part BUYING OUT THE PRE-NATIONALISATION SHAREHOLDERS.

London Transport does not serve the people first. The first place will always be given to the city profiteers so long as our present social system is allowed to continue.

Thank you for the invitation to the conference on 2nd Feb. I have discussed your letter with some of my workmates and have come to the conclusion that the line put forward is essentially the same as that of the C.P.G.B.

Whether there would be a deficit in the balance of payments if export of capital was limited, is a moot point. The same applies to your estimate of potential growth rates of the capitalist economy but surely the job of revolutionaries is not to align ourselves with Woodcock and concern ourselves with making capitalism work better. Our job is to intensify the contradictions within capitalist society so that it becomes every more obvious that the entire system is rotten and must be done away with in its entirety.

You write of a National Economic Plan as though this were independent of which class held State power. It is very much like Togliatti's plan to change the character of the state by means of structural changes instead of by destroying it by revolutionary means.

I'm sorry, but I think you are an out and out reformist.  
Best wishes for your early conversion,  
Yours fraternally,

When we have a Socialist system in this country, the working people will get the transport service they need, and not one that squeezes the greatest amount of profit.

Let us all - bus workers and travelling public together - recognise who our enemies are and deal with them as they deserve!

The above letter was received by us recently, unsigned, but with the address of a known and respected North London comrade. We print it as received, as we wish to encourage all possible useful exchange of views between sincere revolutionaries.

The writer, who receives "Workers Broadsheet" regularly, evidently doesn't bother to read it, or he would realise that he invites ridicule by his statement that we have been calling for the institution of a national economic plan within capitalism. As our readers know, we have been saying the exact opposite for 2 1/2 years, namely that only under workers' power will national economic planning become possible.

To state that the line we have been putting forward is that of the revisionist CPGB is as if, in 1917 Lenin's slogan of "peace, land and bread" had been denounced as the line of the pacifists and peasant party Trudoviks. This well shows the sectarianism from which not only the writer, but the whole of the semi-Marxist or pseudo-Marxist "left" has been suffering for many years and which still continues.

The revolutionary party of the working class must on the contrary seek and achieve the widest possible support - to unite all those who can be united against the main enemy who is U.S. Imperialism. Only in this way can we destroy our class and national enemy, the British imperialist clique who have subordinated themselves to the U.S. Imperialists.

Once more we make appeal to all our fellow-Marxists to understand the urgency of such unity (contd on p.5)



JORDAN...IN THE NEW YEAR  
(Middle East  
Correspondent)

Visitors to Jordan often undergo a process of almost mystic transformation a sudden and complete awareness of the concept of the primeval forces, the battle of good against evil, the struggle of oppressed against oppressor.

In this ancient land the modern battle being fought today is that of the Arab struggle against expansionist Zionism. The incredible arrogance of the fascist racialists in Israel, or occupied Palestine as the Arabs prefer to call it, blinds them to the fact that by their own actions they are uniting and strengthening the very people they wish to disperse and demoralise.

The bombing of Karameh on March 21st, 1968, a so-called reprisal against the Palestinian fedayeen and an attempt to intimidate the third-time displaced population of this once pleasant town, had the effect of uniting the peasants, regular military forces and fedayeen into one body which was able, despite severe losses and the complete destruction of Karameh to virtually wipe out the Israeli tank and helicopter forces.

In Irbid, the second largest town to Amman bombed indiscriminately by the Israelis on June 4th 1968 one is also aware of the tremendous unity which now exists in the face of the common enemy. It would appear that the harder the Israeli 'reprisals' the more suicidal the Israeli policy becomes. A peasant farmer, standing on the rubble of what was once his home in Coufra Assad,

a village not far from Irbid, and within view of the crater where twenty-eight of his neighbours lost their lives to an Israeli rocket, said to me "If the enemy bomb me from my home ten thousand times I shall still remain here". Evidence to show that this is the common feeling is the fact that the farmers of this area return again and again to till the soil and replant crops despite constant bombing and the always present danger of landmines.

Their sons and daughters join the fedayeen and their wives give shelter and support to the commandos. The most prominent fedayeen organisation is Al Fatah, which besides its military wing Al Assifa, also has a highly organised political bureau for education and information. Al Fatah enjoys support from virtually every element of the population, although government support is an ill-kept secret. Any leader who is unwise enough to attempt to crush the guerrillas or to impose upon them a settlement other than the return of all Palestinians to their homeland, would be committing political suicide.

The Palestinians and their Arab brothers have one aim and that is to reclaim their territories and establish a future for the generation born in exile. They feel that they owe allegiance to no-one who is not prepared to help them achieve their aim and scorn the Lebanese appeasers whom they consider to be blind to the fact that what happened to Jordan, Egypt and Syria will soon happen to them. Israel has turned greedy eyes to the Lebanon's Litany valley.

Lebanese alarm after the Beirut Airport raid and the embarrassment of American interests in Middle East Airways which were established after the Intra bank crisis placed M.E.A. in financial difficulties, should be observed with considerable interest and some slight amusement along the cease fire line. Will Lebanon, with the aid of its wealthy Lebanese Americans now come scuttling into the arena. If so, once again Israeli mis-information of Arab psychology has backfired.

(continued from p.2)

country in 1926 and again in 1945 if the millions had understood the need and if they had had a party to lead them.

Unity for revolution? how can you hope to get that By showing WHY and WHAT and HOW.

WHY ? because there is no other way. More and more as the crisis continues to develop, millions will see this.

WHAT - is the Workers National Plan, that must be worked out to give people what the people need and want, instead of what gives other people profit

HOW - is by showing IN PRACTICE that the people are not powerless, that on the contrary it is our rulers who are the paper tigers, who will be helpless as soon as they are faced by UNITED MILLIONS determined to take power.



These modest demands clearly united all the anti-reactionary forces, and to win them would be a decisive victory, a great step forward in developing the forces we need for the social revolution that alone can solve student as well as worker problems -- indeed our NATIONAL problems.

Unfortunately the LSE socialist society leadership then allowed itself, with the assistance of some self-styled "revolutionaries" from outside the School, to forget a most elementary principle of revolution -- always to unite all those who can be united against the main enemy.

Who is in this case the main enemy ? Clearly the prison governor Lord Robbins and his appointed office boy, Dr. Adams, supported by "Throw them out on their necks" Mr. Short.

Let's analyse the situation.

Lord Robbins and his Governors, through Dr. Adams as their office boy, have directly challenged all that is alive in LSE, all that really IS LSE, with those prison gates. Robbins has to be defeated and the overwhelming majority of students understand this.

The essentials for such a victory are two:

1. SOLIDARITY in the struggle.
2. EXTENSION OF THE STRUGGLE not only to draw in other colleges and universities throughout the country; but also to arouse PUBLIC SUPPORT of this whole student struggle.

For SOLIDARITY we must above all explain clearly what we are aiming at, so that the advance guard of both students and teachers may not become isolated, as Adams & Co. hope they may.

In all the recent struggles, in America, in France, in Italy, in Germany, in Spain, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in Japan, in the Cultural Revolution of China, and also here in England, the students rebelling against the cultural and political dictatorship of the owning class, have had the active support of progressive teachers and very wide popular sympathy. Until about a year ago students were mostly struggling to improve their own conditions of education and of life. Now it is becoming more and more recognised that the student struggle can only hope to be effective if it links itself to the main struggle against the reactionary policy that is also hitting education

both financially and culturally. Students are recognising that they are either an advance guard for a new society based on work instead of ownership, or that failing this, any student movement can only fizzle out.

This is why students must ally themselves with the rest of the working people, if they are to win their own struggle as students.

It is equally true that the working class has to recognise the importance of the student struggle for its own class aim of the development of a socialist society. Not only must the students join the workers. It is equally important that the workers join the students, understand and support their struggles so that the economic struggle of the workers and the educational struggle of the students may fuse to produce a political struggle of the whole working people for a change of class power, which alone can make possible the development of a new society.

We also believe that this understanding of the need to fight for a socialist society -- which means working people's power -- can only be achieved step by step, and that the present situation gives all students an opportunity to convince themselves that the choice is only

STEEL GRILLS AND POLICEMEN  
OR  
AN LSE FREE FROM FASCISM

All anti-reactionaries must realise that if Robbins, Adams and Short persist in their attempt to make a FASCIST LSE, then reoccupation of the School by force may become the only way left to non-fascist students and staff.

The buildings are after all not the private property of the Governors. They are intended as a university, and the real LSE -- staff and students -- have the right and the duty to RESIST EVICTION.

The alternative is that LSE sinks back into being just a factory for the production of graduates -- the sort of graduates that people like Lord Robbins want to have available

WORKERS BROADSHEET urges all members of LSE, students and staff, to consider this question carefully. LSE has at the moment this goes to press the honourable position of leading the revolt against the sickness of our society. Let us all support their struggle, which is also ours.