The defeat for Western 'democratic' influence in China is the best possible development for frustrating US imperialism's worldwide counter-revolutionary plans and capitalism's arms-race tilt towards World War III.

Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the touchstone on which the real understanding and recognition of Marxism is to be tested.—V.I. Lenin
Counter-revolution finally shows its hand in violent challenge to the proletarian dictatorship of the workers socialist state in China

The bourgeoisie-anarchist influences from Western culture on certain reactionary student circles in Peking were literally asking for a confrontation eventually with China's firm communist path.

Just before the weekend, Louise Something of the Sunday Times revealed in an ESC broadcast that the protest leaders in Tienanmen Square were all determined to continue matters to an all-out fight, even if it meant certain defeat. Without bloodshed, she explained, these student circles felt that their protest would be seen as a feeble pose that would not be remembered, would create no martyrs, and would provide no symbols to build on for the future.

Striped of their hysteria, the capitalist press reports spewed forth furiously to try to stir maxim hatred against the Chinese Peasants Republic, nevertheless let slip enough of the truth to show that the anarchist provocations against the workers state authorities had reached intolerable levels, going beyond the ritual stripping and humiliating of soldiers trying non-violently to impose the martial-law decree, to murderous assaults on military vehicles and individual military, in a conscious escalation of violence to which the army finally had to respond.

But even on Saturday afternoon, there were only signs that Tienanmen Square was the usual spectacle of red flags blowing gaily, but behind the Great Hall of the People, the troops were surrounded by a jeering crowd and the mood was ugly. Occasionally a student emerged holding aloft a captured helmet or shooting off a bloody wound.

Littering the street towards Fuxingmen were half a dozen smashed-up army trucks or buses. Troops were trapped in one. Another was crammed full of gear and an AK-47 machine gun had been erected on top as an exhibition. The stream of cyclists drifting up and down were in high spirits, but there was an air of hysteria.

At about 2pm police loud-speakers had warned the crowd it was illegal to steal equipment from the People's Liberation Army.

Later, by the square, more troops were heard in a crowd by the Revolutionary History museum.... They were surrounded by a crowd of 500 and several were almost beaten to death as they tried to escape. Unaware of this, diplomats brought their families out to watch the troops.

All of this had failed to give us a clarification of what had been done.... We began to run back in fear as the crowd began to set fire to the buses.

A tyre on our jeep had been slashed, but we rummaged down the streets to find the bus burning in and out of the road barriers until we arrived at the Minzu Hotel, where an angry band of youths rioted our jeep, hurling stones and rocks at us until we established our identity.

We dashed across to the hotel entrance, where a crowd was savagely beating a soldier. An officer arrived and, with the hotel and the crowd trying to smash the doors. A police car was burning nearby.

The road was cleared with broken glass and bricks. Just before, a detachment of riot police had been attacked, and the air was thick with tear gas and smoke.

From our window we could see shadowy figures flowing through the dark hulking stones, and after an hour the last trucks moved down. One man slumped off petrol from our jeep and hurled a Molotov cocktail, setting himself on fire. Others smashed open the car and tore the body of a soldier. Then a soldier carrying riot shields were advancing towards Tienanmen Square. It was a little before midnight and the soldiers were met by a large crowd.

There were about 70 or 80 soldiers. Everyone was throwing bicycles, rocks, sticks—anything they could get their hands on at the soldiers. After about 20 minutes of this, the soldiers fired tear gas. There was hardly any wind and the gas hung in the air.

The soldiers retreated towards the Minzu Hotel pursued by students, now an angry mob.

In front of me there was a soldier. Screaming and crying— he was completely freaked out. They were all around him, arms coming in at him holding rocks. They started to drop rocks on his head.

I and a student tried to push the soldier back from him—it was an automatic response. He went to the ground and they just dropped rocks, huge rocks, on to the middle of his face. It was continuous and I got blood splattered all over me. He was virtually decapitated by the time he was dragged away.

Another soldier who was trying to crawl through a hedge towards the hotel was descended upon.

I ran into the hotel. On the floor there was a group of soldiers laid out. I only saw one breathing. I took just one photograph and jumped on the train with four or five men, thrust up against the wall, punched and hit all my gear ripped off and film taken.

The Liberation Army Daily had already published its own account of this escalating reactionary provocation in its Saturday edition before the square was stormed, taking a clear communist class stance against petty-bourgeois anarchy, and echoing the hearth understandings of the international class-war realities still grasped and proclaimed by some leaders of the Chinese workers state who have not forgotten that all human progress is governed by the international balance of class forces plus decisive Leninist action within its possibilities.

6 An editorial quoted by state radio said that the army had achieved a great victory and crushed "counter-revolutionary violence."

In response, written before Tienanmen Square was captured, went on: "On the morning of June 3 the capital suffered serious counter-revolutionary violence."

"Criminals spread rumours and incited the killing or injuring of soldiers and officers, the burning of military vehicles and the seizing of weapons."

The class-ignorant supporters of this ideological outrage are now calling openly on imperialist TV for China's army to have a civil war.
The historic triumph of communist revolution in China in 1949 solved only the problems of state power and the broad political leadership, the Communist Party at the head of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was not remotely possible for the fact of the revolution itself to come anywhere near automatically modernizing the thinking of 10,000 million backward people into scientific reasoning always confidently striving forward.

The withering away of the state under the first-ever development of real mass-participation democracy under communist society is still some distance away and can only even begin to flourish once the hostile threatening disruption of the incorruptible bourgeois-imperialist trade-war and arms race, and its accompanying imperialist propaganda war, are a thing of the past.

Meanwhile, the influential international forces of bourgeois cultural achievement can only continue to try to undermine relentlessly the confidence the international proletariat has in the communist cause and in the existing workers' state.

Inevitably, in the light of imperialism's continued ability to appear to be thriving and taking human progress retrograde with its economic-industrial achievements, and also in the light of revisionist defeatism (see IIW Books vols 4, 5, and 13) in the thinking of the socialist camp leadership beginning to also help undermine workers' confidence worldwide in the future of socialism, and the progress of the workers’ state was bound to be haphazard.

Since the Cold War was re-imposed at the conclusion of inter-imperialist World War II, the CIA at the head of the imperialist reactionary reaction has been able to skillfully and lavishly organise countless counter-revolutionary campaigns, stunts, and even putsches against the socialist countries.

Now at the peak of the Western inflationary boom, the "free world" democracies are bent on taking up a position to exert greater philosophical and cultural pressure than ever because of capitalism's seemingly effortless superiority in consumerism. That pressure became a destabilising flood over some sectors of Chinese students in recent years. The colossal propaganda campaign for "pluralism", poured out worldwide by the "free world", has undoubtedly continued to have a real influence over wide sectors of the populations of the emerging socialist camp struggling to match established monopoly-imperialism's achievements despite the endless Cold War embargoes and sabotage against it.

When does our country's revolutionary leadership in Peking? A minority of gilded youth plus a minister echo of the CIA anti-communist master-plan Solidarnosc, disrupting the Party's authority.

A view currently gaining ground is that a senior Hong Kong bureaucrat-cum-si- nomatologist at the height of the Beijing troubles last week, gave: "You first have to recognise who are the genuine Sino-Soviet students were. They came from five or six universities, and thus from 13 or 14 main Beijing high schools, where virtually all the children of the family of senior cadres or from the upper ranks of the military."

"Then you have to recognise that these students of whom you have been admitted is a very real Chinese aristocracy (one writer today refers to "one of the most elaborate and pertinent classes of the world") that exists in modern China, want a variety of things. They don't all want what you and I regard as 'democracy'. Some of them held up personal preference inful, if the British and French, which, as far as Mao, as the Westerners seem to think the students are saying, and why do that?"

"Next you have to wonder what the money is doing in the countryside. This protest movement has been urban, aristocratic, organised by students who have studied overseas and, in the last, that's naive surprise and dismay, have come back home wanting change. But do the peasants want change? The 900 millions being fed along the Yangtze and Wuhan and Canton? They've kept pretty mute, have they not?"

"All that has been highlighted by the protest is that the Beijing government has been naive, inflexible and corrupt. Not that its ideological message has been wrong, or actually unpopular. Rather that it's monumentally poorly applied."

"The course the Chinese government has to follow now is fairly clear. It has still to cleave to its basic principles and to uphold its act, half the nepotism and so forth. It has to be more aware of the likely impact of the open door. And it has to be firm."

Such is the message that more sensible leaders in the Chinese press are beginning to convey to the more sensible readers who are not necessarily the same as those who, in their tens of thousands, many wearing Giordano-designed "Democracy" T-shirts, listened to the speeches of the performers who performed got up as Angela Davis or in the hastily-assembled uniforms of the Weather Underground."

And so the world is looking at across.

The Beijing Daily reported the detention of 11 members of the "Flying Tigers Brigade" of motorcyclists, who fought the cops by gathering outside a 100 calling for strikes at the steelworks and rallying the city against the expected entry of the military.

At a press conference held at Tiananmen Square last night, the self-proclaimed Beijing Independent Trade Union Federation announced its new charter and called for members to sign up.

The charter demands genuine representation and participation in state affairs and the right to supervise the work of the Communist Party.

"We believe China will never be the same again. The people have spoken. Socialism needs democracy like the body needs oxygen," Mr. Jolly told reporters. Breeders of the union federation have already been set up around the country. The Beijing branch was officially founded on May 19.

"We recognise the importance of the brothers in the South, and the one in Beijing, who organised a three-day strike, has already been detained.

Student gatherings were being cajoled, calling journalists and other loudspeakers systems from a smaller generator. The Beijing authorities again tried to evict them yesterday.

Others pleaded with us to tell the world what happened. The
The counter-revolutionary provocateurs begin their violent attack on the authority of the Chinese workers state.

West must stop all investments, they said, and condemn their government. No one, not even the Japanese or the Kuomintang or the warlords, had ever done this and this was their own government.

Clearly with reactionary ignorance such as this (about what China was really like under imperialism), Peking has a major problem. Did the West back the students or the state as the idiot fake 'left' in Britain alleges (see below)?

I T is, for all who watch and wonder about the Communist world, the ultimate obloquy. Worse even than Hungary or Czechoslovakia or Afghanistan; for there the tanks and troops were alien invaders, rolling across borders in the fashion through time immemorial of big powers knocking little powers into line. But in China it is the People's Army turned against the people: shooting them indiscriminately in Tianannmen Square, on the streets, on their doorsteps; crushing them beneath the tracks of the tanks; sweeping them from sight in a sea of bloodshed. A bankrupt, desperate, geriatric government; an edifice of ideology and aspiration flaking and toppling before our eyes.

The point is a starkly simple one. We, sitting comfortably in the West, assume that a spark in the individual human condition — a spark called freedom — must, in the end, make a bonfire of the system that seeks to snuff it out. We assumed, from the peripatetic Nixon on, that China — by its own, complex lights — would gradually evolve into a nation which had made its peace with liberty; that the business culture, the Americans with cheque books, would inevitably bring some form of democracy in their wake. How else could the British sign away Hong Kong and millions of its citizens to the old enemy to the north? Beijing, surely, needed and would nurture Hong Kong's wealth.

Tell that, this bloody, awful morning, to the marines. The human beings who walk the streets of Hong Kong can no longer be thought of as 'pawns, signed away and forgotten. And meanwhile, patrolling the Berlin wall, looking East, we must suck our thumbs'.

President George Bush denounced China for using military force against the demonstrators.

Influential congressmen demanded that the United States immediately halt sales of military equipment to China, a move that could signal the start of stormy relations between the two countries.

Mrs. Thatcher said Britain was 'appalled at the indiscriminate shooting of unarmed people'. Mr. Nell Kinnock, the Labour leader, called the attack 'a crime against humanity'.

The Prime Minister yesterday told the Commons that normal business with the Chinese authorities clearly could not continue after the bloodshed of the last few days ended. She said everyone who had seen the scenes on television had felt 'utter revulsion and outrage'.

She was speaking at question time, shortly before the Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, announced that British arms sales to China have been banned, and consultations over Hong Kong halted.

Mrs. Thatcher said the Chinese people had only been asking for their democratic rights when indiscriminately fired upon. "It shows that communism is ready to impose its will by force on innocent people and that we must take into account in our views on defence."

Hong Kong's financial markets have reacted in panic to the weekend's events in the Chinese capital.

Share prices plummeted by 22 per cent as the stock market suffered its greatest one-day loss since the 1987 worldwide stock-market crash. There has also been a run on the Chinese-owned banks in the colony.

"The Chinese Government, Communist Party and army have now lost all legitimacy and are depending on force for the continued existence of the handful of old men who have seized power here."

It is a particularly revealing final struggle: the People's Liberation Army has never before been used by the Government to attack its own citizens.

'There are bloodstains on the ground today in Peking,' blared a message from the protesters' loudspeakers yesterday. 'They are using tear gas, a Japanese weapon we Chinese have never seen before. We are not used to it, but we will be soon. At last, people of Peking, do you understand the evil nature of this Government? Withdraw your support now. Why do you provide this machine with wealth and power by working for it?"

What is dertively referred to here as the Li Peng Government has raised the stakes.

These aged leaders wanted to clear the square, to crack heads, to use the army or the armed police, but every plan was immediately revealed to contain the seeds of its own disaster and, until yesterday's violence, abandoned.

Deng has had to sell out to this gaggle of ancients, his only support in his rage with the demonstrators and with Zhao, who defied and humiliated him.

But the ancients are the very men he swept into honourable retirement in 1985 because they objected to his reforms. Now they are back, dripping a bit but croaking: 'We told you so.'

Deng will never recover. By selling out, by appearing to panic, he has puzzled the party and the army, earned the contempt of a once-adoring population and astounded foreign governments and investors. And yesterday, by ordering the army to smash its way into the square, Deng wholly undid himself.

What we now see in Peking is a mass of citizens, workers, and students who have long been described as interested only in TV sets, washing machines and motor cycles but who turn out to be ready to use their all to fight for liberty.

The West's hatred for the dictatorship of the proletariat could not be clearer. And fearing that an ent-
Irregular new firm communist line might take hold in China - re-establishing Leninist world-revolutionary perspectives and Bolshevik discipline for the Chinese workers state, the West's reaction has quickly gone even further than the above. It has become a new term in China: it featured several years ago in the Party's own defeat on the Gang of Four. There is already a nasty taste of some very familiar ingredients in the most important official explanation issued so far - the letter issued on Monday by the "Party Central" (whoever they may be). There is the ugly emotion of the language employed which mingles formalism with hysteria. Thus it describes the ordinary Beijingers who oppose martial law as "elements who have unrelenting hate for the Party and the socialist system." There is the complete distortion of truth, carried a stage further yesterday with claims that less than 30 students had died while military casualties were vastly higher. And most disturbingly, there is the glorification of what has always been fascism's greatest strength: its willingness to use military force without restraint and to glorify repression.

As the national TV news program made a shaky restart yesterday, after going off the air on Monday, its most significant item (until it "denied" the rumour of Deng's death) was a cringing performance by Yuan Mu, the spokesman for the State Council, before an immaculately uniformed general, Zhang Gong, who is in control of martial law. The general then proceeded to solemnly explain how his men had exercised enormous restraint. The army had "absolutely never killed any students or people" in the Square, he maintained, and definitely did not use tanks to crush people. His policy, he said, was "don't answer back when you are cursed, and don't lift a hand when you are hit."

Yesterday's news of large-scale slaughter in Chengdu raises the even grimmer prospect of violent suppression spreading across the country, with far greater opportunities after the event for easy denial.

The ground, of course, has long been made fertile for social fascism. The disillusionment of the Cultural Revolution was followed by the jettisoning of a much larger set of political values which had stabilised the relationship between the Party and the army. Economic dislocation and inflation prepare the ground further, as does the growth of systemic corruption. But the seed has only been recently planted. Can it still be plucked out before the roots go too deep?

Our euphoria with the student movement, it now seems with the benefit of just two or three weeks hindsight, led us to pay insufficient attention to the determination of the existing power structure to defend itself when threatened. Conversely, should we not now look beyond the immediate repression to see that it must ultimately fail against the wave
of popular hatred?

Student leaders themselves were analysing the situation just as the Tiananmen massacre was one of incipient repression. They took comfort in the long-term view of success, although most spoke in terms of a next generation tasting the fruits of their struggle.

It is still just possible to imagine a complete turn-around which would open the doors to democratic experiment. Such a move would build on the popular revulsion against this military action, enlistings opposition to it in the People's Liberation Army, launch a new socialist mandate for more humane politics. This would require large number of party members to show much greater initiative than they have so far done. It would also be essential to complete the job of purifying the party from its prototypical members who, which Mr. Deng began in the early 60's but never completed.

The bloody repression in Beijing, which can only be compared to the Japanese massacre of Nanjing, is reminiscent of Kim Il-sung's slaughter of the Shanghai labour movement between the wars, has been condemned throughout the European Community.

After two days of despair, we have at last the beginnings of hope in China. The indications are that the party committed to the decision to use force against the Tiananmen demonstrators are moving to confront the provincial troops responsible for the slaughter, and against the Party leaders who ordered it.

And yet despite the clear delight in the West at the embarrassment to communism from the dissident and phillistine provocations in Tiananmen Square, and despite the unmistakable record of the radicals' positive popular backing every counter-revolutionary intrigue that has ever been unleashed against the workers' states, as they are plainly doing now, - the idiot 'left' in Britain which hates the dictatorship of the proletariat still has a chance to preserve counter-revolutionaries in Peking are in fact real communist revolutions, and that the West secretly hates the protesters, and fears them. This certifiable insanity blankets the anti-Leninist swamp from the NOP New Yorker to the deranged Weekly Standard.

In general, the West has given lukewarm support to the demonstrators.

The struggle unfolding in China has opened the road for the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy everywhere else.

It has struck fear into the hearts of Gorbachev and his fellow-Stalinists - just as it has struck fear into the hearts of Thatcher, Bush, and every other capitalist ruler who sits on a volcano of resentment.

The shameful silence of the British trade union and Labour leaders on China shows they are just as hostile as Thatcher and Gorbachev at the sight of the Chinese working class in action.

The real tragedy for the socialist camp and the world revolutionary movement is the stupidity of the revisionists Moscow and Peking are committed by Moscow and Peking which have pretended that the obviously incurable anti-communist bile and hostility of the bourgeois 'democracy' system had somehow been miraculously transformed into tolerant friendship towards the new epoch of the proletariat. This will always remain impossible. The capitalist class can only continue to flourish if the spread and 'threat' of communism is wiped out completely eventually. All the conscious plans of Western imperialism leading to this end, however much the West is forced by socialist camp peace and disarmament offensive to pretend from time to time to accept a reluctant negotiated trading coexistence with communism.

Such peaceful interludes in the life of capitalism are the endoscopic crisis of the capitalist system to lurch back again universally towards trade-war, fascist civil war and inter-imperialist war to find outlet for plunging the planet back into long sickness. Generalised world-wide war again. The capitalist arms race has never stopped and will not stop, and the uncompetitive character of the system in crisis will be unleashed again by inter-imperialist conflict initially, just as happened in World War II in the 30's.

By their idiotic revisionist illusion that imperialism has miraculously changed its essential class character (if true, rendering the entire science of Marxism-Leninism a laughing stock), the small-minded compliant bureaucracy led by Moscow and Peking continuously inviting bourgeois propaganda to confuse and destabilise wide sectors of the socialist camp population.

This has repeatedly happened since WWII under the revived 'success' of the capitalist-imperialist system under American domination, this propaganda disillusionment (with the promises of a planned socialist world) among some sectors of the population of the capitalist country has erupted from time to time (or has been caused to erupt by deliberate Western agent provocateur intervention) into open revolt.

Hungary 1956 was the most celebrated incident in the West, being used as a swine's way of warning the Eurocommunist for all time, despite the fact that this so-called 'revolution' disappeared without trace within months, - something impossible to happen where a genuine class-war revolution is concerned, and explains the working class is already the state power in Hungary. 1956 was a counter-revolution, based on generations of fascist-catholic backwardness in Hungary and on the depleted landed classes and bourgeois elements.

Solidarnosc was the next major incident in Poland, but even with the 1996 reactionary catholicism of Poland feeding this bilious hatred of Leninism, the counter-revolution was routed in 1981 and is now being frosted with in a tentative parliamentary-reformist smile of hypocrisy. Parliamentary reform is doomed to failure whether under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat. Decisive class actions alone can resolve matters either for the capitalist or the proletariat. Class-collaborating parliamentarism with the inveterate and implacable class enemy is pure deception. This reformist charade is also doomed to be violently attacked by hostile class forces sooner or later, both under capitalism and under socialism. What remains to be seen is if the Polish workers' state has fooled the CIA and the Catholic Church by offering Solidarnosc parliamentary exposure, or whether it is the communist it has fooled itself.

Now the Western anti-communist hysteria industry (the biggest activity in the 'free' world) has China 1989 to add to its hate-list against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

There ought to be lessons learned by the socialist state leaderships from the events in Peking about how the anti-Leninist nonsense of modern revisionist and 'pluralist' thinking (and cultural coexisting with the West) was bound eventually to be successfully exploited by bourgeois reaction to create national disintegration and dissatisfaction among commer-cended youth, among the entrepreneurial sectors encouraged by the reintroduction of some market mechanisms into the economy, and among intellectuals who by personal inclination have no love for the reactionary contempt for the scientific philosophy of life - Marxism-Leninism.

The most significant states have backed China's unavoidable decision to rout this counter-revolution. But the deluded revisionist mess in Yugoslavia and Hungary whose leaders have chosen to demonstrate their influence Western petty-bourgeois opportunism has on them and condemn the Chinese workers state, thereby showing to what abysmal depths their ignorance of Leninism has sunk. It is safe to conclude from this that all the counter-revolutionist leadership in Hungary and Yugoslavia that counter-revolutionary turmoil will be unleashed there before much longer.

Sadly, the salutory shock the workers state leaders have been given in China (and elsewhere) the socialist camp will probably not result in any sustained and consistent return to Leninist revolutionary understanding and politics.

Once they have abandoned Lenin's world revolutionary perspective, the established transitionalist states of the socialist states are inclined by the phenomenon of inertia to do just enough to survive as individually at the head of their own class economic system. There will be a few more references to the perfect than to Leninist theory, and maybe a bit more serious understanding of some aspects of it, - but the possible banality of inertia will quickly stagnate back into its easiest option of opportunistically pretending that the socialist camp's necessary peaceful coexisting temporarily with imperialism (to prevent all the imperialist giants um...
OF leadership and in the various political courses open to Peoples China so that the entire international proletariat could get a priceless lesson in active Leninist scientific processes, then the revolutionary cause in the international balance of class forces could only have benefited enormously.

But the debate about which way forward for China has been held entirely behind closed doors. No one is any wiser about what took the Chinese leadership to reach the decision that counter-revolutionary revolt is a threat to socialist development, and what deluded ideas had to be overcome in the Politburo before the necessary action could be taken. Thus the delay obviously helped the OFC leadership to finally make up its mind correctly about what to do, but equally obviously it damaged the international proletarian movement by creating so much confusion and damaging propaganda opportunities for anti-communism, and by still giving no instructive explanations for the argument and delay at the end of the process.

In addition to all the brainwashing of Western public opinion denying that there is any such thing as the international class struggle or that the whole anti-communist diplomatic effort of the entire imperialist system since the war has been devoted solely to the preparations of counter-revolutions everywhere, the other great fraud of this anti-China campaign has been the outrageous lies that any part of the 'free' world, and least of all any of the major capitalist countries, would have allowed for one day, let alone for six weeks, the entire centre of its capital city to be occupied in defiance of the authorities wishes by an anarchist revolt.

Students in Britain were battered senseless by the London police a few months ago just for trying to mount one afternoon's demonstration to march past Parliament with their banners. They had been knocked into an arrested and terrorised heap before they had even reached the south side of Westminster Bridge. God knows what would have happened to them if they had insisted on a six-week total occupation of Parliament Square, including thereon...
the erection of a 26-feet high statue of Lenin. Every month in the USA, workers protest demonstrations and pickets are systematically shot up by vigilantes or beaten up by the police and the national guard. In the great student protests against the Vietnam war, several university campuses were raked with machine-gun fire, killing many. Elsewhere throughout the non-communist world, there is virtual permanent gunlaw and official death-squad rule in a majority of capitalist countries—all officially sanctioned by the leading 'free world' powers. The murderous secret-police death squads in El Salvador, Guatemala, Turkey, Thailand, South Korea, Haiti, Egypt, Zaire, Pakistan, Chile, etc., are trained in their permanent work by the CIA, and armed by the rest of the West. The other great fraud is that allegedly 'normal' and 'democratic' existence in the capitalist world is even at the best of times somehow free from bloodshed and other cruel suffering. It is nothing of the sort. It is tragic that there is lethal conflict in socialist China, but such confrontation between conflicting class ideologies and broad philosophical perspectives is the rule for the whole world, not at all the exception. There is civil-war strife everywhere, and it can only get a lot worse, dramatically so. The world is testing on the brink of its greatest class-war upheavals in history. Virtually the whole of the capitalist world outside of the main rich imperialist powers is an unexplored volcano of revolutionary ferocity and hatred. Full-scale civil wars are already raging in 20 or more countries, and the capitalist system is already whipping up racialist and nationalist hatreds to act as a warmongering diversion to save many capitalist states from socialist revolution by plunging them into international capitalist wars (inter-imperialist warmongering) instead.

Britain has been imposing perpetual death and destruction on the Occupied Zone of Ireland for the past 20 years, massacring and torturing countless more victims than the Chinese workers states conflict with counter-revolution has produced. US imperialism in the same period has blitzkrieged into a pulp entire nation-states such as socialist Grenada and reformist Chile, and reform-minded Dominican Republic, while its Zionist stooges have been relentlessly imposing slow-motion genocide on the entire Palestinian nation. Together, the 'free world' leaders have inflicted countless other crimes on humanity.

While the events in China have given Western anti-communist propagandists a field day, they have also created a few diplomatic difficulties for the more opportunistic activities of cowardly capitalism, especially for the degenerate British bourgeoisie over Hong Kong. London's 'boldness' in defending 'British islanders' in the Falklands, the prize modern example of warmongering diversion by bourgeois 'democracy' to get an unpopular government out of a tight corner such as Thatcher was in in 1982, is coming back to haunt the Tory Establishment and its 'loyal' Labour Opposition worms.

Unlike the 'solemn' state treaties by which the Empire of China ceded 'in perpetuity' (i.e., forever) the land of Hong Kong and Kowloon to Britain in the 1850s, British imperialism
has never had even this fig leaf of legal 'claim' to sovereignty of the Malvinas Islands, seized by the Argentine military in 1982. So if the joke 'British population' of a mere 1,000 Islanders in the Falklands is worth a war to prevent them falling into the hands of Argentine capitaList, how much more war are the 120,000 militant subjects of Hong Kong prepared to prevent them falling into the hands of capitalist China? 

So the bi-partisan British parliamentary establishment has hidden behind the fiction of the New Territorialities to protect the few (though not all) of the 55,000 British citizens in Hong Kong from falling into the hands of the Chinese capitalist regime which was promised, after it seceded from China in 1997, to get out of fighting for the permanently Chinese-owned legal crown territories of Hong Kong and Kowloon where 4 million people live; and which Chinese capitalists live.

2. Now their fear of upsetting Red China (to try to drive a wedge between Moscow and Peking) and their fear of being humiliatingly crushed by the People's Liberation Army if a fight was put up for British Hong Kong, — is out of the open again. The British government is determined that the US imperialists are the first to be checked out of their strategy, to make the maximum anti-communist propaganda possible out of this countercultural revolution, but fearing to antagonise the Chinese Workers State too severely.

The smilling hypocrisy of the Western bourgeoisie (the Labour Party now demands a boycott on the issue) in this petty colony of Hong Kong to antagonise Red China prior to the 1997 takeover, but failed in eight periods of national government itself to even dream of ending the British colonial dictatorship profiteering) is surpassed only by that of the Chinese bourgeoisie masquerading as the 'revolutionary left' of the opportunist movement. Always in such moments of major anti-capitalist threats by CIA propaganda, the fake 'left' come rushing forward to stab the Chinese workers in those parts of its back which have already been pilloried by the bourgeoisie.

The cowardly New Worker led the way with the disgusting opportunist lie that they backed the counter-revolutionaries (like the rest of the West) "because they sing the International and parade hammers and sickles, and look to Mao rather than any Western figure, and have demands which in themselves are not anti-socialist etc.", etc., even for paragraph after self-righteous paragraph, desperate to try to mislead the Chinese communist party back the demonstrators, and that the army's inability to impose martial law was a "favorable development", etc., and pretending that "In general, the West has given lukewarm support to the demonstrators, who are making lies and what absurd political cowardice, snivelling along with the worst of the Trots joining in trying to pretend that the counter-revolutionaries were really communists, and pretending that the West hated that which was hated by the West."

The RCP took this demeant self-delusion to its ultimate folly in its May 26 issue (before the counter-revolutionary was finally rooted out) when it declared that the strange noises on the Hong Kong stock exchange (in reality because of capitalist fear in Hong Kong) that the Chinese Workers State should be provoked by the counter-revolutionary protestors into reasserting its proletarian dictatorship perspectives, thus damaging the 'free market' business confidence were in fact due to the opposite 'reason' — namely that the Hong Kong bourgeoisie had learned that 'real communist' demonstrators (the countervolutionaries) would oust the 'pro-capitalist' government of the Peoples Republic, thus undermining existing trade agreements.

This shows how the RCP make-believe, the Hong Kong index should have boom through the roof when their make-believe 'real communist' protestors were at last crushed by the People's Republic government. In fact of course, the opposite has happened. The financial panic of proletarian dictatorship rule in Peking caused financial panic in Hong Kong, wiping out more than a quarter of stock exchange values, starting a run on several banks, and doing more damage than the Great Crash of 1929. The RCP have not anticipated that the RCP will in its next issue declare itself dissolved due to being nothing but a bog of political chicanery and reactionary opportunism.

The Hong Kong stock exchange has already registered capitalist fear about events in Beijing with the biggest fall since the crash of 1929. Reaction against Westerners in Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and elsewhere must be praying that the Chinese bureaucracy will succeed in defeating its opponents.

Like the RCP New Worker, the RCG naively fell into the trap of the Chinese counter-revolutionaries by deliberately noticing only "paraded pictures of Mao and Zhou" but ignoring the outrageous noises and Nazi emblems slanderously plastered on Deng and Li effigies, the provocative chants of "Solidarity with Taiwan" (as if the Kuomintang were at communist's), and the widespread use of the Statue of Liberty emblem (apparent long before the plaque was placed on Tiananmen Square — see previous two Bulletins), as well as failing to grasp the simplest political fact that all this got the fateful Western press excitement in covering the protests night after night, and given the protestors blatant rapport with the Voice of America and BBC broadcasts, only an anti-communist provocation could be behind it, as Bulletin explained from the very beginning.

Being the conceited subject-idealist morons that they are, the RCG naturally had to go one sophisticated step better in their support for the counter-revolutionaries as the theory of 'socialist theory' onto the degenerate anarchy of the counter-revolutionary activities in China, and getting that hopelessly wrong too.

4. While the students' demands for democracy and the right of workers on the other hand, have combined support for the students with protests about the economic situation. Parading pictures of Mao Zedong and Chou En-lai showed that they are no friends of the capitalist tendency in China today. So bourgeois democracy is out of the question as the workers have to consistently exposed as facing in Bulletin polemics against them since they began their anti-Leninist opportunism operations. With every phrase, these RCG centrists show how much they love to talk revolution but deep down in their petty-bourgeois souls actually revere 'democratic' opportunism,— belying all about a 'proper legal system' for China, and about 'press freedom' being needed, — i.e. a parliamentary reformist free-for-all in which the bourgeoisie will continue to dominate. Revolutionaries want a class war and class justice, and nothing else, and all the time that imperialism lasts on earth, this is possible only under the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is something which can only come long after imperialism has been overthrown everywhere, and then only through the extension of proletarian dictatorship to embrace over wider Leninist-educated sections of the population, and through no abandonment of the revolutionary line.

The real concealed class sentiments of the petty-bourgeois RCG become clearer with all this in mind when they glibly parrot Western propaganda lies about "millions of demonstrators occupying Peking", and that the "pro-Capitalist Out of government control", with "the loyalty of the police, army, and much of the Party and state apparatus in doubt", etc, and with "deep splits in the armed forces".

That is what the Western imperialist bourgeoisie wants to believe. For a quiet opposition to imperialist rule is a threat, the bourgeoisie-corrupted labour movement in Britain, it is obvious that the sick 'left' swamp's petty-bourgeois instincts want to believe this too when faced with the reality of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a Labour Party of all the bourgeois and opportunist groupings that are tolerated at all by workers. The ultimate in irresponsible opportunist cynicism was achieved by the demeant anti-sovietism of the RCP. Any weapon will do to smash the workers' state.

4. Marxists must fully support the protest movement regardless of its political character. 

Communists will take the exact opposite line, backing the Chinese workers state precisely because of its essential Marxist-Leninist character as the dictatorship of the proletariat, incompatible with any form of democracy, and incapable of being anything else or of falling to oppose counter-revolution, as the Bulletin explained weeks ago must happen.
Reaffirmation of workers state power a shattering blow for the West

The 'free world' anti-communist crusade (capitalism's biggest industry) has been humiliated by the events in China.

This vast mass of people (nearly a quarter of mankind, and its oldest civilisation) has demonstrated a unity and strength behind the dictatorship of the proletariat which can only have a devastating effect on the international confidence of the bourgeoisie.

The whole trick of post-war imperialist propaganda has been to use Cold War pressure to distort, obscure, or limit revolutionary communist perspectives wherever they could not be curbed or overthrown militarily.

The very heart of Marxist Leninist advance is the dictatorship of the proletariat. An enormous boost for the capitalist 'democracy' fraud has been the revisionist-defeatist retreat from this essence of Leninism by management bureaucrats throughout the socialist camp.

Moscow and Peking, etc., have for decades deliberately omitted all mention of the crucial role of proletarian dictatorship in the future of world affairs as far as party theory and programme were concerned, have ignored it in foreign diplomacy, and have been trying to hide its existence domestically.

The recent insidious disruption of China's capital by counter-revolutionary philistinism and anarchism has at last forced the communist party to reassert revolutionary leadership as the key question in socialist construction.

The Leninist party builds a movement to take the power forcibly under its own special revolutionary discipline and democracy.

The workers state should then be steadily strengthened and extended in accordance with the same principles and no others, - by open Leninist polices to crystallise a scientific party understanding of all matters in society, - around which leadership, ever-wider layers of the population must be won to an independent assessment of its correctness, tested in practice.

It is a tragedy that the communist party in China has pursued such a mistaken path at times, and an even bigger tragedy that its leaderships understanding still contains revisionist nonsense; but it is totally correct for the party to have reinforced its leading role in society during and as a result of the recent upheavals.

It is the proletarian dictatorship aspects of this which have caused such a hysterical furor in the West.

Their whole agitation against the socialist camp is for the kind of parliamentary democracy which will give the bourgeoisie a chance to recapture state power from proletarian rule. Hitherto, even the feeblest of the revisionist bureaucracies (Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, etc.) have avoided being overthrown by the old capitalist-class social and state power (bourgeois dictatorship), despite it being a close-run thing on occasions (Hungary 1956, Poland 1980-81, etc.).

But the Cold War crusade from the West has never (and could never) give up hope of overthrowing an established workers state some day (which would be an enormous stimulus to imperialism's entire counter-revolutionary psychology) through the creation of sufficient revisionist confusion by one means or another.

This whole reactionary manoeuvring of capitalism has been greatly encouraged by the theoretical stupidities of Gorbatchevism (who has taken revisionist ignorance of Leninism to startling new depths) and by the similar nationalist-defeatist retreat from world socialist perspectives in China.

The irrational splits be-
between Moscow and Peking, and
the subsequent ir responsible
posturing on internationa
matters (plus real rac
ist opportunism) in order
just to score points off
each other, - had the West
licking its lips at all the
revisionist confusion that
was being created everywhe-
ere, - perfect for stimulating
anti-Leninist mindless-
ness in all directions
and eventually organised
counter-revolutionary ac-
tivities on every front.

Much of this slowly won
and craftily-manipulated
subversive influence is now
lying in ruins as a result of
the upheaval in China.

At a stroke, the Chinese
workers state leadership
has had to ride roughshod
over the millions of cul-
tural threads via which the
West was insidiously infil-
trating its fraudulent pros-
spectus for 'parliamentary
democracy' (i.e. capitaliste-
class rule), trying through
every channel to seduce Peo-
ple's China away from firm
Leninist party leadership
(the dictatorship of the
proletariat).

Every pained blast out of
the imperialist press gives
the game away with its cro-
codile tears and arrogant
hypocrisy about 'how could
China sink back to this
barbarism', etc., as though
deadly class conflict was
not the norm for every sta-
te on earth with the West
backing, financing, and
organising wholesale daily
slaughter on socialist Afgha-
nistan by the mujahedin, on
the Salvador revolution by
the US stooge regime, on
socialist Nicaragua by the
vicious Contras, on the Pe-
lstinian nation by imperial-
istic Zionist thugs, on
Ethiopia by the bourgeois
tribal secessionists, on
the Irish national libera-
tion struggle by the Brit-
ish colonialists in the Oc-
cupied Zone, etc.

The 'free world' postu-

erors made far less fuss
when the Chinese workers
state had to put down a
counter-revolutionary se-
cessionist movement in Tibet
a few months ago with far
more bloodshed than was in-
volved in routing the Pek-
ingarcently.

But the People's Republi-
can assertion of its na-
tional territorial integrity is
not the issue which
imperialism with its blood-
stained record of colonial
tyranny would want to make
too much of, even while
quietly stirring things in
Tibet as subversively as
possible.

An open and almost trium-
phant declaration by Pe-
kung, however, of the cor-
rectness of rule over all
China by proletarian dic-
tatorship is too much for
the Western 'democracy' to
swallow, even while the
imperialists would oppor-
tunistically try to limit the
damage to inter-state rela-
tions with China as
much as possible, both
for self-seeking trade and
political influence pur-
poses as well as in order to
continue provoking splits
between Moscow and Peking
by manipulating them differ-
ently.

Hence the outraged con-
demnations of the firm
stand taken by the Chinese
workers state against subjec-
tive anarchism and individ-
ualism, followed by attemp-
ts to scapegoat just one
sector of the authorities
(the 27th regiment was

guilty) or just one or
two leading figures (Li

Peng was a favourite hate
target) in order to try to
then justify maintaining
tensions with Peking with
different state author-
ties with 'clean hands', etc.

The dangerously tricky
numbug of such deception
on world public opinion in
this case was what drove
the Western commentators
to despair in their unpre-
cedentedly slanderous and
dissiseptive conclusions on
the Chinese governments
stand.

Reluctantly, when the
West's hoped-for inter-army
conflict inside China (the
\[\text{truly barbarous perspective}\]
did not materialise, bourge-
osia sophistry then had to
find ways of accommodating
the fact that not only was
the Chinese workers state
largely united in its firm
stand against reactionary
'liberalism' and 'pluralism'
but that it also operated
with devastating effective-
ness once the decision was
taken to crush the counter-
revolutionary violence (see
last week's Bulletin).

Worse still, the 'free
world' press (the monopoly
imperialist lie machine led
by the CIA's domination of
the world's leading news ag-
cences) then had to account
for signs that the commu-

nist party leadership might
just be preparing to make a
long-term virtue of
that China is heading for a return to Maoist-style class struggle and the methods of the Cultural Revolution.

Virtually no one feels sufficiently knowledgeable to obtain first-hand information, even if they could buy any petrol. Yet, based on the sinister evidence available, the situation seems to reflect a martial law appears to be in place.

One would expect by now to find troops and tanks stationed or patrolling every intersection, but surprisingly few signs of military activity seems to be left alone. British diplomats who drove out to the university quarter and round the airport came back with few solid details of what was going on.

In the south of the country it was much the same story, according to tourists who had come from that direction yesterday. As far as they could tell, the government controlled a limited area in the centre - the Square, the Forbidden City, the leadership compound of Ziaochunghua, and a few other points.

The only route out of the city firmly in their hands is the arm of the Avenue of Eternal Peace (Chang Am) heading east, which runs past my balcony.

It was easy to make much sense of the troop movements visible from the living room. In the morning an armoured convoy roared past leaving the town behind it hours later a smaller convoy returned in the other direction.

In between, traffic police rolled up a mini-bus to clear a way for the passage. The armoured convoy of about 60 trucks, which fired wildly into the air as the soldiers went past. The traffic police hadn’t been seen for weeks, which means the government was re-establishing control over the road.

And the troops? Were they retreating or advancing, attacking or defending? They were clearly well-kicked up for battle. With alarms siren, pedestrians picked themselves off the ground when the last truck passed and ran to the nearby shops to keep as souvenirs.

Later, platoons of troops moved along the sides of the road, guns at the ready, reconnoitring. They all took up positions, waiting for an attack. They stopped at all the nearby diplomatic compounds and returned when the road was clear in search of a sniper.

By evening the tanks on the bridge had left, and also disappeared from Tiananmen Square. But nobody could say what the greatest threat had been overcome? Was there any agreement with the 38th Army believed to be controlling the city?

Other tourists who said the television pictures showed, had all but left Tiananmen Square, and by evening the tanks which had been standing on the Dianmemen wall had all gone. A spooky silence enveloped the rainy city.

The sick capitalist press technique of rumour-mongering and deliberately half-truths (only barely revealing that isolated sniper fire was the huge new problem confronting the authorities, hence the alleged shooting up of the diplomatic quarter, and other buildings) persist despite the fact that the government has been in hospital since last week, with either a stroke or cancer of the prostate.

An instruction from the party central committee and the government blamed the "counter-revolutionary turmoil" on two groups of people:

The announcement's appeal for calm among the population has been ignored and a general strike appeared to be under way in the capital. Factories were shut down, businesses were closed, transport all but ceased running and the telephone system functioned intermittently.

Beijing was a city under siege as troops stationed tanks in cases of the Tiananmen Square massacre, was encircled by two rival armies believed to have demanded its surrender before dawn today. Cities across China were marked by confrontations between troops and civilians.

As skirmishes were reported on the western and eastern fronts, the threat to reporter countries including Britain mounted an airlift to carry their nationals out of the country. The death of the senior diplomat from the German Embassy, Mr. Xiaoping, and an assassination attempt against the Prime Minister were rumoured.

The 38th Army, the Beijing government's own, was supposed to attack the student demonstrators, but in this case the citizenry is to be the force which, along with the 38th Army, will drive the students from the city.

Last night, US intelligence reports suggested that up to 300,000 troops were ringing the capital. Other sources said that a further army group, the 5th, was marching from behind the city's lines occupying central Beijing. The 27th was supposed to be taking defensive positions.

State television reports that Mr. Deng's dead but only middle-ranking officials appeared and they expressed a grim determination to hold on to the city at all costs.

No attempt is made to analyse why in the only fighting between tanks and an unarmed civilian, the tanks came off second best after all the talk of their alleged rampages "brutally crushing protesters", etc. Equally, there was no apology for, or any attempt to verify,
The struggle has taken a l
step backwards. The govern
ment is showing some concern
now for public opinion, with
long films on television of pub
lic confrontations with the
army designed to show that
everything could be blamed on
the "counterrevolutionary
hooligans".

The pattern to all the
wildly atrocity stories was
the sudden appearance of
mysteriously printed ac-
counts such as leaflets and
statements, plus a susci-
biously large volume of the
"diplomat said" type of
disinformation, - the hal-
mark of the CIA-led activi-
ties of the Western intel-
genous agencies, masquer-
ding as 'diplomats', etc.

The crowds last
night were buzzing with the
news that six protesters, ac-
cording to government televi-
sion reports, were killed
when the Beijing to Shanghai
express plunged into them
last night.

I heard a different story
from a Spanish consul of
official who arrived on the scene
minutes after the bodies had
been removed. Witnesses
told him the number of dead
was closer to 20, most of
them students apparently
trying to stop troops being
sent to the city.

One particular telltale
theme kept recurring in
all this rumour-sifting
which reeks' of a CIA black
propaganda stunt, - the
insistence that there were
mounds of up to 10,000 bo-
dies on Tianamen Square
after troops evicted
the anarchist encampment on
Sunday morning which
allegedly were burned there.

According to one diplomat,
units of the 27th Army which
blasted their way across
the square on Saturday night broke
through lines of soldiers
attacked by Chinese army
units, causing many casual-
ties. Troops under separate
orders to evacuate thousands of
students safely from the square
were also mown down as dawn
broke on Sunday. About 1,000
soldiers are said to have been
killed.

"They had orders that
obody be spared, and children
and women were slaugh-
tered as mercilessly as the
many wounded soldiers from
other units," another diplomat
said.

While crack paratroopers
did succeed in leading several
thousand people to safety at
the south of the square before the
27th armoured units thundered
in from the north, the diplomat
quoted witnesses as saying that
tanks and armoured troop ca-
rriers pulped bodies in the
square, and then incinerated
them with flame-throwers.

Many bodies were ferried away
by helicopter, according to the
sources.

Up to
3,000 people were said to have
been killed when Chinese sol-
diers and tanks attacked the
square, occupied since 15 April
by the protesters.

No one knows how many
have been killed but one Chi-
inese source claimed that a
senior officer on the square has
said 10,000 bodies had been col-
clected and were being burnt or
lifted out by helicopters which
flew in and out all day.

In an open letter directed to"companions all over the
world", the students said:
"Even those students who
withdrew from the square
when the tanks went in,
those who were
killed or burnt to ash-
the survivors were
bayonetted.
The soldiers piled
the corpses up and set fire
to them. They did so in order to
remove the evidence and wit-
nesses. It is estimated that
2,000 were killed.

We beg that all Chinese
people go on strike, in fac-
tories, schools and markets,
and fight against the cruel
government.

A statement from the Beij-
ing Autonomous Student
Federation read: "We have
stuck to the principle of
non-violence.

Another pamphlet con-
tained a Chinese doctor's de-
scription of events leading to
the clearing of Tianamen
Square. He was among the
last group to withdraw from
the square.

"At 5am, June 4, the stu-
dents began to withdraw
from the square and a part
of them didn't leave in toime,
because some were weak or
badly injured.
The armoured
bers crushed the students
bodies and blood and flesh
mangled,

"Later they piled the
bodies, tents and quilts and
other things and set them on
fire.

"A student who had just
woken up was crushed by the
Tank.
"We left the square at 7 am
and the students had been
burned to ashes," the doctor
wrote.

This sounds more like
the evidence of a spin-
doctor than a real medic. Human
bodies are notoriously dif-
cult to burn without
very special equip-
ment.

To burn one body success-
fully without trace be-5
and 7 a.m. on an open
square without special equip-
ment and without anyone be-
ing able to sneeze a single
picture of it or convinc-
rise eyewitness account
in the middle of a massive ci-
ty which up to that point
the Western media was pr-
oudly proclaiming to be to-
tally 'in the hands of the people', - and partially so
still for many days after
that, - would be miraculous.
To dispose of 10,000 bod-
ies that way puts the part-
ing of the Red Sea and the
feeding of the 5,000 with
a tin of sardines in the
amateur conjuring class.
In other words, the whole
'massacre' story is total
holocut from start to finish
put out by the most destruc-
tive imperialist propaga-
da operation. Despite the
presence of the entire wor-
ld's 'free' press for weeks be-
fore and after the incident
and their intimate par-
ticipation with the coun-
ter-revolutionary organiza-
tion, plus their all-night
activity and film-making
that night with masses of
photographs and film foot-
age, - not one single frame
or recording exists of this
incredible event in the
heart of Peking on Tienam-
men Square, the centre of the
world's attention, - the de-
struction by flamethrower
of thousands of dead bodies
(an impossibility no matter
how long they tried), and/or
the removal next day of
10,000 mangled remains
(ieaving nothing behind) by
helicopters "in and out all
day", and they would needed
to have been. With a gener-
ous ten bodies per heli-
copter, and a hard-to-achieve
(from a loading and air tra-
ffic-control point of view)
departure of a filled heli-
copter every four minutes,
it would in fact have taken
nearly three whole days (72
hours) to clear the square
of the dead. Three thousand
would have taken 24 hours
to clear, a thousand at le-
est eight hours going flat
out from 7 a.m. on Sunday
morning with a helicopter
scooping up every four min-
utes. But not one single
photograph exists of heli-
copters taking off from Tien-
amen with bodies on board
or anything else on board,
- yet the entire world's 'free'
press was right there in
the heart of Peking all the
time, and all the time fill-
ing clandestinely there too
as we have seen from their
stream of pathetically dis-
torted and stunted-up 're-
ports'. Nor one single pho-
tograph of the 'alternative'
method of disposal either,
the burning of bodies with
flamethrowers, - or even with
a box of matches. Remarkable.
But this vicious Western
propaganda hoax was, of
course, completely believed
in by the so-called 'anti-
imperialist left' of the Brit-
ish 'labour movement' or
bourgeois swamp. The
real onslaught, however, was
by the counter-revolutionary
provocateurs against
the army.
4 Since television showed dra-
matic and extreme footage
yesterday of thousands of civil-
ians attacking and setting fire
to a convoy of more than 100
trucks, jeeps, and armoured
troop-carriers.
People were seen prising
open the hatches of a troop-car-
ier and then setting it on fire.
They were filmed hijacking two
other troop-carriers and
taking them on a joyride.
There were numerous other
military failures. Teargas used
against the tens of thousands of
people who came out to stop
the troops on Saturday had little
effect.
The authorities broke their
silence last night on the details
of Sunday's brutal attack on the
square. Despite Red Cross es-
imates, they claimed that only
300 people had been killed,
revolutionary hatred of the
dictatorship of the prole-
taxist (see last weeks Bul-
letin.)
Now the anti-Leninist phi-
losophers of Western petty-
bourgeois 'socialism' have
swallowed the CIA's 'massa-
cre' bait whole - clouning
any ability to stop and

think that it takes two cl-

ass forces to make a class
struggle, and if the West-
ern imperialist media are
breaking every propaganda
norse to support one side,-
then genuine revolutionar-
ies ought automatically to
support the workers state
side, - even if all of the
evidence of the coun-
ter-revolutionary character of the
student anarchist
circles is not immediately
to hand.
5 London University students attend-
ing courses at a Peking campus
had been supporting Chinese friends in
the protest.
One 21-year-old, too frightened of
reproaches to reveal his name, said
he had been lucky to escape.
"We were on our way to the square
when we passed a tube station packed
with students, he said.
"The crowd were in there stones
and missiles at them and a bus
charging troops was forced to stop.
"One was dragged off and beaten
by the people and within seconds 40
or 50 shots in the tube station roused
out, throw a car crash.
"We got away as fast as we could
and kept on heading for the square.
"But we knew what was going to hap-
pen, then tanks and armoured per-
sonnel carrier arrived.
"The next day was the end of a year-
long course in classical and modern
Chinese, said barriers were set up at
the entrance to the Western
campus by Chinese students fearing
troops would try to storm it.
They piled up bricks and made
Maoist cocktails just in case," he
added.
Finally, there is the singer
from Taiwan, Hou Jedian, a
pop idol in Peking, and very
rich. He was reported to
have been ordered to start a hunger strike with
three companions. He had
composed a song about the
protests which he taught the
crowd, a version which it raptur-
ously sang.
He also composed a state-
ment, which I listened to him
discuss at dinner. It said that
he was coming to the Martyrs'
Memorial to show the Li Pung
Government that the people
ever had for too long listened
and not spoken; that it was not
a small handful opposing
the regime, but the people
themselves; and that Hou and his
comrades were giving up food
not for death but for life.
Hou was lucky to escape at
the last moment as the soldiers
charged towards the Memorial.
One witness, who later after
his documents were confiscated by
soldiers, said terrorism was the only option
left to those who want to rid the nation of
the monarchy and its institutions.
6 The student whose docu-
ments were confiscated said for-
eign countries should cut all aid
to China and provide weapons
to the protesters.
Just before, under a truce
negotiated between military
commanders and the Taiwan
singer Hou Dejun, who was on
a hunger strike there, 4,000
troops left the square to the
south-east.
The student, who had spent
three days and nights in the square, was at the rear of the group which left and saw the soldiers entering at the north and west ends.

"They fired first above the heads and then at the heads. They were laughing wildly as if it was not serious."

"At first, the students did not agree to Hou's request that they leave. Hou repeated it and 70 per cent agreed to go.

"Hong Kong students said they wanted to die there, but I told them to leave and tell the world what had happened.

People with short-wave radios were tuning in to the BBC and Voice of America. "You're from the BBC," came a chorus from the students when I said I was from England.

As I tuned in to my radio to the World Service yesterday morning for the news from Peking, cries of "Kuang T'ung" came from the crowd that gathered round me to listen.

One wall poster carried a poem:

*We are so angry our hair stands on end.*

*We stand in a dream, staring into the sky and groaning.*

*Take the train to Tienammen* We must common the will to defy Yang Shangkun's flesh

*We must thirst for the blood of Li Peng.*

The students' union—banned as an illegal organisation by the government of Li Peng, the Prime Minister—issued two statements.

One stated: "We will continue our struggle against the government. We believe that with support from all over the world we will succeed. Democracy and liberty will survive for ever in China.

A separate statement denied reports that the union had given weapons to students.

Western military experts said that the weapons were used by the union to defend itself against the union's attacks, which it did not do in the city of guerrillas without weapons.

"The students are the only ones who have the right to the death," a lecturer said of his students.

Students were counting their dead and missing. "We know the bodies of our dead students," said a spokesman for the students' independent union at Peking University.

A Briton said he and another were in the Jin Jang Hotel when it was attacked by a mob and a small fire was started. About 45 foreigners joined the battle at the private quarters of the US consulate in a small room of the hotel.

"We put beds, bookcases, and cabinets against the doors. We poured water on the mob. We primed fire extinguishers and got what makeshift weapons we could," he said.

Mr Bob Casey, 47, a British engineer, also took shelter in the consulate, said the rioters were hooligans not students.

Several points emerge. There was no shortage of foreigners or counter-revolutionary exiles involved in these highly provocative attacks against the government of China of which the first was the widely filmed and reported story of the explosion of a bomb on a barricade on Saturday night in Tienammen Square. One wonders what would be the reaction in Britain to an occupation of Trafalgar Square against British capitalist corruption by the erection of a statue of Lenin, and then the massacre of the crew of a police landcruiser and rocks by a mob including Cubans, Vietnamese, Arabs, etc. It is an international outrage that parasites from such reactionary capitalist dumps as Taiwan, Hong Kong and Britain should have the approval of the 'principled' Western press and governments to be on the streets joining in pro-acute provocations against the legitimate revolutionary government of socialist China.

Despite BBC Panorama's huckstering promises, its epic reconstruction of the counter-revolutionary still produced not one piece of live film, nor even one still photograph, or even one convincing eye-witness of this total fiction in the 'massacre'. Everything once again was hearsay, or else a deliberate distortion of the army's normal actions in protecting itself (following government orders in imposing martial law) from murderous counter-revolutionary thugs who were clearly filmed by the BBC, and photographed by a Guardian representative (who had his film taken by the mob, see last week's Bulletin), smashing in the head of an unarmed and defenceless soldier.

The anonymous hearsay account of the army's allegedly 'indiscriminate and large-scaled' action of students is the 'evidence' of someone hurrying out of the southeast corner of Tienammen claiming that at night-time nearly a half-mile away entering the northwest corner of that vast area, he could not only see troops firing, but could see who they were firing at, and could see smiles on their faces as they did it— a truly incredible feat of eyesight, especially in the dark, and especially in view of the dense smoke everywhere from the burning vehicles the mob had set on fire. The whole hoary farce is unbelievable, as is every other account of the so-called 'massacre'.

Finally there is the little-trumpeted Peking University students' admission (three days after the event) that when the British Embassy had announced it had successfully contacted all 73 of its British students and lecturers nationals safely—"that seven students had died (and even that figure would have been toned down from such a counter-revolutionary source as the 'independent union') there.

There is also the even more amazing admission by the Westerners in the Jin Jang Hotel in Chengdu of a murder mob attacking them, an astonishing fascist complicity to the Western propaganda myths about these well-meaning peace-loving counter-revolutionaries, and too gladly dismissed again by the capitalist press as the "students", but with no comment about what the Chinese authorities should do about such behaviour.

The imperialist intelligence agencies have done their homework well, and know what a great stepping effect can be had on shallow philistine opinion by the hysterics surrounding an alleged 'massacre'.

This combination of rumour-mongering deception, of emotional subjectivism, and of played-up philosophical individualism has proved to be a viciously destabilizing cocktail on soft-headed Western public opinion without the earliest Western propaganda about Bolshevik 'atrocities', and particularly from the notorious Kronstadt 'massacre' incident onwards. The anti-Leninist philistinism of the 'left' complacent hostility to theory has never looked back, reinforced in the late 1920s and 1930s by Trotsky's re-assert of 'Marxist' demarcation of the proletarian dictatorship strength of the worlds first workers state.

Every anti-Leninist ignominy on the 'left' in the West hates every mention of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and spends the whole time going round in circles trying to deny the very existence of this core of Marxism-Leninism, and its touchstone role for anyone claiming to be 'Marxist'.

It is this hatred of the dictatorship of the proletariat which every 'left' in Britain and the West automatically has in common instantly with every anti-communist dissident in the world. Everyone is now thinking whether they are reactionary dissidents or allegedly 'progressive', as the BCP openly admitted (see last week's Bulletin), and even with every subversive disruption by Western imperialist intelligence no matter how reactionary and grotesque.

The CIA's vicious longterm and shorter anti-Soviet
strategies absolutely count on the 'left' spontaneous petty-bourgeois 'revolutionaries' in the West always automatically lining up right behind any and every anti-communist stunt or major provocation that has ever been unleashed, such is the hatred of the dictatorship of the proletariat among the un-Leninist ignorant middle class. But this Western strategy is now deep in trouble. The long-proposed mass "revolt" against proletarian dictatorship has once again failed to materialise. Coming soon after the catastrophic failure of the 'rebel' mujahedin to demonstrate anything other than their utter counter-revolutionary uselessness against the Afghan revolutionary workers state, this is another colossal humiliation for Western 'understanding' and the hop-on hop-off 'appeal' of so-called 'free-world' ideals.

But DO WE learn then, as we secretly feared in our racist youth, that the Chinese are unusually cruel rat-eaters who slide bamboo under finger nails, kill with a thousand cuts or with countless drips of water? Are their leaders, as a British diplomat said recently, just a bunch of thugs, who sometimes murder in the dark, one by one, or in the daylight in heaps which are then stacked up in hospital morgues or burned secretly at night?

There are such Chinese. They gave the orders for the Saturday night massacre. They drove the tanks which clanked over the students in Tiananmen, they fired the AK-47s which knocked over the doctors and nurses, and they tortured the wounded and bound students.

Such men are intellectual terrorists, too, who wish to crush the intellects and curiosity of the dissenters, like Professor Su Shaozhi, the purged director of the Marx-Lenin-Mao Tse-tung Thought Institute, who accused them of being Stalinist, and Fang Lizhi, who dismisses Marx-Leninism as 'trivial' and suggests that nothing will change in China until 'the old men die'.

HERE are no more China experts - none of us saw this coming," confessed the former US Ambassador to China, Mr Winston Lord. One of a tiny band of Sinologists who have been making the non-stop rounds of the seminars and TV programmes and radio interviews in the past month, Mr Lord is also helping the US Government to rethink its policy on China.

But the US experts acknowledge that they are groping in the dark. Even President Bush cannot phone directly to the Chinese leaders, many of whom he knows personally from his time as US Ambassador in Beijing.

It was also a week which laid to rest the hope that the murderous forces could not consolidate their triumph; and that a clash between army units and a crisis within the pro-Bolshevik junta caused Deng's disablement, if not his death.

Despite rumours of internal squabbling, the aged murderer and mouthpiece, are in solid control and have never lost it. The handful of Communist Party veterans who have re-emerged from retirement rawing for blood have not fallen out among themselves, except perhaps on the question of how serious a charge to hurl at fallen Party General Secretary Zhao Ziyang.

Chinese television has advertised telephone numbers which law-abiding citizens can call to inform on sedition.

The long-awaited clash between military units never occurred.

A telephone call to Peking University yesterday was answered by a security man who said: 'Go away. Your friends are all dead.'

On the surface this Peking incident still looks like another good propaganda scalp for Western counter-revolutionary subversion, but deeper down things are not so simple, and in reality a very serious crisis is discernible for the anti-communist cause. The issues raised by Chinese conflict are the great matters of the modern world politics and civilisations future. The historic confrontation between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat which all sections of anti-Leninist opinion (including the revisionist socialist-state leaderships themselves) have always wanted to see buried and forgotten, has irresistibly come roaring back onto the centre stage (where in truth it has always been, and where it must always remain until the final world triumph of completed communism, in the society many decades hence).

Even if they quickly resume denouncing it in Peking (which may well happen) as they have effectively denounced it or ignored it for the past 20 years, the issue which virtually stopped the entire world for a fortnight watching its greatest conflict in the history of conflict, - was the issue of proletarian dictatorship, - to be or not to be.

Only wilful morons can now continue refusing to accept that this is certainly the question. And only even bigger fools can continue understanding this, moreover.

Only the dictatorship of the proletariat can take mankind forward. And only those who want to build a party of proletarian dictatorship are worth listening to, starting first and foremost with Lenin.Almost every other human political activity is a completely reformist waste of time.

Only the revolutionary confrontation of class forces is eventually going to solve any major problem facing civilisation. And only a totally dedicated movement of the class forces fighting for the proletarian dictatorship is ever going to be able to intervene to purposefully secure the correct outcome to such confrontations.

Despite the apparent current death of Leninist understanding around the world (particularly in the more advanced Western countries and in the so-called socialist states), these crucial issues facing mankind can only continue to bubble away relentlessly, slowly forcing a massive growth eventually in proletarian revolutionary consciousness (and parties to organise it) world-wide.

Moreover there is a slight chance that the 'free-world' cause of parliamentary 'pluralist' subjectivism may suffer immediate damage if the Chinese workers state decides, as a result of the counter-revolutionary shock it has just recovered from, to desist from its previously irresistible policies of backing the counter-revolutionary Afghan mujahedin, the counter-revolutionary Khmer Rouge, and such fascist-dictatorship bastions of reaction as the Pakistani military stooges of US imperialism, etc. Even a very slight shift byImplausibly from some of the more stubborn nationalist idiosyncrasies it ostentatiously adopted out of its anger at earlier Soviet treachery to true proletarian internationalism, - could mean a colossal blow against anti-communist intrigues. A return by Peking towards any re-embracing
reform leaders must find means of communication and choose a course of action that will deepen public support for the movement.

Strikes, demonstrations and, as a last resort, the use of violence will be the key tools to regaining the movement's high profile. 'I haven't heard of any preparations (for street fighting),' he said. 'But if we want to beat the hardliners, there must be violence.'

Wang Dan, Sha's colleague in the leadership of the Union of University Students (within Peking), has sought asylum at the French embassy.

The most famous dissident, Fang Lizhi - the man the Chinese police prevented from going to dinner with President George Bush when he was in Peking — is safely inside the American Embassy compound. His presence there is causing much anger to the Chinese authorities that they are reported to be planning some reprisal.

And in no way shamed is over the Goebbels pig lie about a non-existent massacre for which there is only ridiculously unacceptable 'evidence', but no filmed or photographed reports or any eyewitness statements apart from the dubious muck analyzed above, the imperialist media circus has subsequently created a new fiction about 'random shootings and killings on the streets by troops', etc., with again only the most vague and untested hearsay 'evidence', plus the criminal distortion of concealing the fact that murderous random sniper fire by the counterrevolutionaries has continued turning central Peking into a killing ground for unarmed soldiers and passers-by.

6 It was then that a sniper struck, killing one soldier and wounding three others.

Tanks stationed on the roundabouts opposite were firebombed in the night and others were attacked in Fuxinmen, on the west side.

The State Council, under the direction of Premier Li Peng, said the national rail system was at risk from what it called saboteurs. It said security personnel had been authorized to use all methods to protect rail communications.

Trucks with loudspeakers in front and machineguns behind moved through the streets to spread the message of counterrevolutionary leadership and to warn against 'reform'.

Despite the relative calm, troops are still under attack, and shooting continued around
the diplomatic quarter last night.

The Governor of Genoa province called for action against students blocking rail lines, saying: "It is necessary to form a deterrent force against them and develop a situation whereby when a rat runs across the street everybody cries 'kill it.'"

With all the fanaticism of the very young, there is even talk of the necessity for Shanghai to provide some martyrs to match Peking's sacrifices.

But there were at least six martyrs, crushed to death last Wednesday by the Peking to Shanghai express, which either would not or could not break in time. Ironically, the train was carrying student leaders fleeing from the capital — one of them carrying a shirt dyed brown with a dead friend's blood — desperate to lose themselves among Shanghai's 12 million people. A mob tried to burn the carriages, and then fought a pitched battle with police and firemen.

Most students are in hiding but one interviewed in secrecy yesterday said he hoped to continue the struggle. "Some of us want to resort to terrorism and find arms. We know the people are against the government," he said. "The movement is in a great crisis. We are not organised well enough this time but we will continue and try again, in a few months or a few years," another student leader contacted in Shanghai said.

At the train station several youths were arrested yesterday carrying guns as well as books and leaflets.

The youths arrested have allegedly been unemployed youths, former convicts and private entrepreneurs usually said to have come from outside the big cities to make the move. The net is being widened to include intellectuals.

Last night the students, who had captured machine-guns, were busy making Molotov cocktails as they prepared for the next stage of the war ... on their campuses.

"These things will be accounted for one day," someone said in a dairy English in a wall opposite Maxim's restaurant near the Bund, which had been hung on Saturday night.

The mixture of naive arrogant Western racism and middle-class anti-communism which allows bourgeois public opinion and the petty-bourgeois 'left' sweep in the West to write off the chosen and strongly-supported workers state of any quarter of mankind as something indefensibly monstrous which no 'civilised' person would ever take seriously or want to have dealings with again — is sterile ostrich-behaviour with no future.

The Chinese workers state is what is real, — one of the most colossal achievements in human civilization which will in a few decades be overshadowing any anti-colonialism just as newly-arrived capitalism once outstripped decadent feudalism.

Close kinship between forthcoming revolutionary proletarian struggles against the capitalist states, and the working-class power of the socialist camp (dictatorship of the proletariat), is inevitable. The wretched 'left' sweep in Britain which has given its support to the disgraceful jamborees of disdained petty-bourgeois ignorance in public demonstrations and special TV spectacles in recent days, is tying itself to a hopelessly lost cause with its demented anti-communism and hatred of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Leninism will inevitably come into its own.

The events in China are a dramatic confirmation of the IIMP's fight to make the understanding of the role of proletarian dictatorship the key to making sense of all development and class struggle on the planet.

The tragic loss of life and suffering, and the despicable confusion of past revisionism in Peking in allowing such indecisiveness and chaos to paralyse the Chinese workers state for so long, — are not matters which the revolutionary movement could be 'glad' had happened, or could have even wished to have happened in the way they did after the counter-revolutionary fete was in the fire.

But what the Leninist struggle must take heart from is the way that the Marxist understanding (of fundamental class forces being the decisive element in social and political strife, and how a decisive clash between the influences of Western decadence and the historical requirement of proletarian dictatorship could easily be seen to be inevitably coming well in advance) — so dramatically demonstrated its effectiveness when the subjective-idealistic guiding mechanisms of every other political tendency plumped them into hopeless middle and contradiction. (See elsewhere, and last week's Bulletin).

The Chinese revisionist leadership remains flawed and unreliable. The triumph of proletarian dictatorship in this conflict in China is a victory for the science of Marxism, and a great boost for the future Leninist struggles for the spread of world proletarian dictatorship.

The histrionics in the West about the 'tragically cruel' in Peking are a wholly bourgeois humanism. The totally predictable clash happened not because the IIMP willed it but because some woolly-minded revisionist weakness by the leadership of the Chinese workers state (failing to guide proletarian power firmly enough through the degenerate compromising confusion of this interregnum between the overthrow partially of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and the final triumph worldwide of Marxism-Leninism) was finally forced to lash out against imperialist counter-revolutionary subversion or see the entire socialist structure collapse.

The unanimous chorus for class compromise by the 'left' sweep invites the same violent chaos. As monopolistically capitalism outlives its usefulness and becomes not
thing but a lethal deathtrap for mankind, so will all its petty-bourgeois stooges be of the 'democracy' movement fight harder than ever to prevent or delay the final irreversible triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The despicable cheap emotionalism of weekend protests showing 'bloodshed' in Peking are the same political posturings of a nauseating Tariq Ali/CP/Trotski/Tot type who swooned along with Salvador Allende's 'democratic socialist revolution' right into the butchery of the Pinochet counter-coup. By abandoning Leninist science, the Chilean 'good' military officer caste and bourgeois monopolist circles (and their petty-bourgeois hangers-on) were not scheduled for elimination as a class (not necessary to take action against every individual). As a result, the counter-revolutionary violence was inevitable.

Peking's counter-revolutionary violence was inevitable because of a similar philistine collapse by Chinese workers state leaders into the lethal delusion of class compromise with Western 'democratic' influence, the unchanging cover for the forces worldwide of bourgeoisie dictatorship. (And the Polish workers state wants to keep its powder dry. It already had to politically disarm Solidarnosc from counter-revolutionary violence in 1981, thus giving Warsaw the chance now to expose the reactionary religious movements destructive hostility to socialism by means of parliamentary manoeuvre. This may or may not prove the unconstructive bankruptcy of this petty bourgeois revisionism, but either way the CIA and the Vatican are bound to be planning yet another switch by Solidarnosc tactics back towards violence if the communist party looks like gaining any ground.)

Yet despite all this obvious class conflict inevitably at the heart of world events, the trivial clamour of TV Trotskyism is still for class compromise, and effectively for victory solely for counter-revolution. For all the clamour is against workers' state violence in Peking. And meanwhile the tens of thousands of economic and political deaths daily caused by the 'democracy' system worldwide go totally ignored.

All the 'left' swamp's occasional half-hearted protests against Western-good savagery in El Salvador, South Africa, Philippines, Chile, Occupied Palestine, etc., are rendered utterly null and void the moment that their anti-Leninist ignorance and petty bourgeois fear of the workers’ states have them out on the streets at the end of the imperialist propagandist machine's screaming hater at the one vehicle which can and will alone finally do something against capitalist violence they also 'deplore'—namely the dictatorship of the proletariat introduced by a disciplined Leninist party.

This was certainly how Lenin saw things. Build Leninism. Spread the ILP Bulletin.

**THE STATE**

And this society, based on private property, on the power of capital, on the complete subjection of the propertyless workers and labouring masses of the peasantry, proclaimed that its rule was based on liberty. Combatting feudalism, it proclaimed freedom of property and was particularly proud of the fact that the state had ceased, supposedly, to be a class state.

Yet the state continued to be a machine which helped the capitalists to hold the poor peasants and the working class in subjection. But in outward appearance it was free. It proclaimed universal suffrage, and declared through its champions, preachers, scholars, and philosophers, that it was not a class state. Even now, when the Soviet Socialist Republics have begun to fight the state, they accuse us of violating liberty, of building a state based on coercion, on the suppression of some by others, whereas they represent a popular, democratic state. And now, when the world socialist revolution has begun, and when the revolution has succeeded in some countries, when the fight against world capital has grown particularly acute, this question of the state has acquired the greatest importance and has become, one might say, the most burning one, the focus of all present-day political questions and political disputes.

Whichever party we take in Russia or in any of the more civilised countries, we find that nearly all political disputes, disagreements and opinions now centre around the conception of the state. Is the state in a capitalist country, in a democratic republic—especially one like Switzerland
or the U.S.A. — in the freest democratic republics, an expression of the popular will, the sum total of the general decision of the people, the expression of the national will, and so forth; or is the state a machine that enables the capitalists of those countries to maintain their power over the working class and the peasantry? That is the fundamental question around which all political disputes all over the world now centre. What do they say about Bolshevism? The bourgeoisie presses abuses the Bolshevists. You will not find a single newspaper that does not repeat the hackneyed accusation that the Bolshevists violate popular rule. If our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in their simplicity and gullibility (perhaps the simplicity which the proverb says is worse than robbery) think that they discovered and invented the accusation that the Bolshevists have violated liberty and popular rule, they are ludicrously mistaken. Today every one of the richest newspapers in the richest countries, which spend tens of millions on their distribution and disseminate bourgeois lies and imperialist policy in tens of millions of copies — every one of these newspapers repeats these basic arguments and accusations against Bolshevism, namely, that the U.S.A., Britain and Switzerland are advanced states based on popular rule, whereas the Bolshevik republic is a state of bandits in which liberty is unknown, and that the Bolshevists have violated the idea of popular rule and have even gone so far as to disperse the Constituent Assembly. These terrible accusations against the Bolshevists are repeated all over the world. These accusations lead us directly to the question — what is the state? In order to understand these accusations, in order to study them and have a fully intelligent attitude towards them, and not to examine them on hearsay but with a firm opinion of our own, we must have a clear idea of what the state is. We have before us a capitalist state, a state re-established after the 1914-18 war and one which was created before the war. In order to answer the question properly we must critically examine all these theories and views.

I have already advised you to turn for help to Engels’s book The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. This book says that every state in which private ownership of the land and means of production exists, in which capital dominates, however democratic it may be, is a capitalist state, a machine used by the capitalists to keep the working class and the poor peasants in subjection. While universal suffrage, a Constituent Assembly, a parliament, are purely accessory, purely subsidiary notes, which does not change the real state of affairs.

The forms of domination of the state may vary: capital manifests its power in one way where one form exists, and in another way where another form exists — but essentially the power is in the hands of capital, whether there are voting qualifications or some other rights or not, or whether the republic is a democratic one or not — in fact, the more democratic it is the cruder and more cynical is the rule of capitalism. One of the most democratic republics in the world is the United States of America, yet nowhere (and those who have been there since 1905 probably know it) is the power of capital, the power of a handful of multi-millionaires over the whole of society, so crude and so openly corrupt as in America. Once capital exists, it dominates the whole of society, and no democratic republic, no free state can change this situation.

The democratic republic and universal suffrage were an immense progressive advance as compared with feudalism: they have enabled the proletariat to achieve its present unity and solidarity, to form those firm and disciplined ranks which are waging a systematic struggle against capital. There was nothing even approximately resembling this among the peasant serfs, not to speak of the slaves. The slaves, as we know, revolted, rioted, started civil wars, but they could never create a class-conscious majority and parties to lead the struggle, they could not clearly realise what their aims were, and even in the most revolutionary moments of history they were always pawns in the hands of the ruling classes. The bourgeois republic, parliament, universal suffrage — all represent great progress from the standpoint of the world development of society. Mankind moved towards capitalism, and it was capitalism alone which thanks to urban culture, enabled the oppressed proletarian class to become conscious of itself and to create the world working-class movement, the millions of workers organised all over the world in parties — the socialist parties which are consciously leading the struggle of the masses. Without parliamentarism, without an electoral system, this development of the working class would have been impossible. That is why all these things have acquired such great importance in the eyes of the broad masses of people. That is why a radical change seems to be so difficult. It is not only the conscious hypocrites, scientists and priests that uphold and defend the bourgeoisie. It is not the state itself which is the obstacle; it is its mission to defend the interests of all; so also do a large number of people who sincerely adhere to the old prejudices and who cannot understand the transition from the old, capitalist society to socialism. Not only people who are directly dependent on the bourgeoisie, not only those who live under the yoke of capital or who have been bribed by capital (there are a large number of all sorts of scientists, artists, priests, etc., in the service of capital), but even people who are simply under the sway of the prejudice of bourgeois liberty, have taken up arms against Bolshevism all over the world because when the Soviet Republic was established there was talk of a new state and all that was opened: you say your state is free, whereas in reality, as long as there is private property, your state, even if it is a democratic republic, is nothing but a machine used by the capitalists to suppress the workers, and the freer the state, the more clearly this is expressed. Examples of this are Switzerland in Europe and the United States in America. Nowhere does capital rule so cynically and ruthlessly and nowhere is it so clearly apparent, as in these countries, although they are democratic republics, no matter how prettily they are painted and notwithstanding all the talk about labour democracy and solidarity of classes.

The fact is that in Switzerland and the United States capital dominates, and every attempt of the workers to achieve the slightest real improvement in their condition is immediately met by civil war. There are fewer soldiers, a smaller standing army, in these countries — Switzerland has a militia and, every Swiss has a gun at home, while in America there was no standing army until quite recently — and so when there is a strike the bourgeoisie arms, hires soldiers and suppresses the strike; and nowhere is this suppression of the working-class movement accompanied by such ruthless severity as in Switzerland and the United States, and nowhere does the influence of capital in the state manifest itself as much as it does in those countries. The power of capital is everywhere, the stock exchange is everything, while parliament and elections are marionettes, puppets.... But the eyes of the workers are being opened more and more, and the idea of Soviet government is spreading farther and farther abroad, especially after the bloody carnage we have just experienced. The necessity for a relentless war on the capitalists is becoming clearer and clearer to the working class.

Whatever guise a republic may assume, however democratic it may be, if it is a bourgeois republic, if it retains private ownership of the land and factories, and if private capital keeps the whole of society in wages-slavery, that is, if the republic does not carry out what is proclaimed in the Programme of our Party and in the Soviet Constitution, then this state is a machine for the suppression of some people by others. And we shall place this machine in the hands of the class that is to overthrow the power of capital. We shall reject all the old prejudices about the state meaning universal equality — for that is a fraud: as long as there is exploitation there cannot be equality. The landowner cannot be the equal of the worker, or the hungry man the equal of the full man. This machine called the state, before which people bowed in superstitious awe, believing the old tales that it means popular rule, tales which the proletariat declares to be a bourgeois lie — this machine the proletariat will smash. So far we have deprived the capitalists of this machine and have taken it over. We shall use this machine as a lever for the destruction of all capitalism.

And when the possibility of exploitation no longer exists anywhere in the world, when there are no longer owners...
of land and owners of factories, and when there is no longer a situation in which some gorge while others starve, only when the possibility of this no longer exists shall we consider this machine to the scrap heap. Then there will be no state and no exploitation. Such is the view of our Communist Party.

First published in Pravda, No. 15, January 1, 1929.

5. The present stage in the development of the international communist movement is marked by the widespread realization among the proletariat of the capitalist countries, that the proletariat’s preparations to effect its dictatorship have not been completed, and, in many cases, have not even been systematically begun. From this it does not, however, follow that the proletarian revolution is impossible in the immediate future; it is perfectly possible, since the entire economic and political situation is most inflammable and abounds in causes of a sudden flare-up; the other condition for revolution, apart from the proletariat’s preparedness, viz., a general state of crisis in all the ruling and in all bourgeois parties, also exists. However, it does follow that the Communist Parties’ current task consists not in accelerating the revolution, but in intensifying the preparation of the proletariat for it. On the one hand, the class struggle between the classes and the history of many socialist parties make it incumbent on us to see that “recognition” of the dictatorship of the proletariat does not remain a mere matter of words.

Hence, from the point of view of the international proletarian movement, it is the Communist parties’ principal task at the present moment to unite the scattered Communist forces, to form a single Communist Party in every country (or to reinforce or renovate the already existing Party) in order to increase tenfold the work of preparing the proletariat for the conquest of political power — political power, moreover, in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The ordinary socialist work conducted by group and party which can recognise the dictatorship of the proletariat has the two-fold meaning understood on the one hand, of fundamental revolutionary action, which is essential before this work can be considered communist work and adequate to the tasks to be accomplished on the eve of proletarian dictatorship.

6. The proletariat’s conquest of political power does not put a stop to its class struggle against the bourgeoisie; on the contrary, it renders that struggle most widespread, intense and ruthless. Owing to the extreme intensification of the struggle all groups, parties and leaders in the working-class movement who have fully or partly adopted the stand of reformism, of the “Centre”, etc., inevitably side with the bourgeoisie or join the wavers, or else (what is the most dangerous) they make the unreliable friends of the victorious proletariat. Hence, preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat calls, not only for the intensification of the struggle against reformist and “Centrist” tendencies, but also for a change in the character of that struggle. The struggle cannot be restricted to explaining the erroneousness of these tendencies; it must unsparing and ruthlessly expose any leader of the working-class movement who reveals such tendencies, for otherwise the proletariat cannot know who it will march with into the decisive struggle against the bourgeoisie. This struggle is such that at any moment it may — and actually does, as experience has shown — substitute criticism with weapons for the work of criticism. Any inconsistency or weakness in exposing those who show themselves as reformists or “Centrists” means directly increasing the danger of the power of the proletariat being overthrown by the bourgeoisie, which tomorrow will utilise for the counter-revolution that which short-sighted people today see merely as “theoretical difference”.

The pamphlet The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, which has just come off the press in Moscow and Petrograd, I examine Kautsky’s views in detail. I shall try briefly to give the substance of the point at issue, which has become the question of the day for all the advanced capitalist countries.

The Scheidemanns and Kautskys speak about “pure democracy” and “democracy and reform”, with the purpose of deceiving the people and concealing from them the bourgeoisie character of present-day democracy. Let the bourgeoisie continue to keep the entire apparatus of state power in their hands, let a handful of exploiters continue to use the former, bourgeois, state machine! Elections held in such circumstances are lauded by the bourgeoisie, for very good reasons, as being “free”, “equal”, “democratic” and “universal”. These words are designed to conceal the truth, to conceal the fact that the means of production and political power remain in the hands of the exploiters, and that therefore real freedom and real equality for the exploited, that is, for the vast majority of the population, are out of the question. It is profitable and indispensable for the bourgeoisie to conceal from the people the bourgeoisie character of modern democracy, to picture it as democracy in general or “pure democracy”, and the Scheidemanns and the Kautskys, repeating this, in practice abandon the standpoint of the proletariat and side with the bourgeoisie.

Marx and Engels in their last joint preface to the Communist Manifesto (in 1872) considered it necessary specially to warn the workers that the proletariat cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state, take over the bourgeois state machine and wield it for its own purpose, that it must, indeed, seize the state, the renegade Kautsky, who has written a special pamphlet entitled The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, concealed from the workers this most important Marxist truth, utterly distorted Marxism, and, quite obviously, the praise which Scheidemann and Co. showered on the pamphlet was fully merited as praise by agents of the bourgeoisie for one switching to the side of the bourgeoisie.

It is sheer mockery of the working and exploited people to speak of pure democracy, of democracy in general, of equality, freedom and universal rights when the workers and all working people are ill-fed, ill-clad, ruined and worn out not only as a result of capitalist wage-slavery, but as a consequence of four years of predatory war, while the capitalists and profiteers remain in possession of the “property” stripped by them and the “ready-made” apparatus of state power. This is a cruel and shameless trampling on the basic truths of Marxism which has taught the workers: you must take advantage of bourgeois democracy which, compared with feudalism, represents a great historical advance, but not for one minute must you forget the bourgeoisie character of this “democracy”, its historically conditional and limited character. Never share the “superstitious belief” in the “state” and never forget that the state even in the most democratic republic, and not only in a monarchy, is simply a machine for the suppression of one class by another.

The bourgeoisie are compelled to be hypocritical and to describe as “popular government” or democracy in general, or pure democracy, the (bourgeois) democratic republic which is, in practice, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the dictatorship of the exploiters over the working people. The Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzers and Renners (and not only in this, but with the help of Friedrich Adler) fall down in this falsification and hypocrisy. For the Social Democrats, the Marxists, Communists, expose this hypocrisy, and tell the workers and the working people in general this frank and straightforward truth: the democratic republic, the Constituent Assembly, general elections, etc., are, in practice, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and for the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital there is no other way but to replace this dictatorship with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat alone can emancipate humanity from the oppression of capital, from the lies, falsehood and hypocrisy of bourgeois democracy — democracy for the rich — and establish democracy for the poor, that is, make the blessings of democracy really accessible to the workers and poor peasants, whereas now, even in the most democratic — bourgeois — republic the blessings of democracy are, in fact, inaccessible to the vast majority of working people.

But why not reach this goal without the dictatorship of one class? Why not switch directly to “pure” democracy? So ask the hypocritical friends of the bourgeoisie or the naive petty bourgeoisie and philistines gullied by them.

And we reply: Because in any capitalist society the decisive say lies with either the bourgeoisie or the proletariat, while the small proprietors, inevitably, remain wandering, helpless, stupid dreamers of “pure”, i.e., non-class or above-class, democracy. Because from a society in which one class oppresses another there is no way out other than through the dictatorship of the oppressed class. Because the proletariat alone is capable of defeating the bourgeoisie, of overthrowing them, being the sole class which capitalism has united and “schooled”, and which is capable of drawing to its side the wavering mass of the working population with a petty-bourgeois way of life, of drawing them to its side or at least “neutralising” them. Because only mealy-mouthed petty bourgeois and philistines can dream — deceiving thereby both themselves and the workers — of overthrowing capitalist oppression with a long and difficult process of suppressing the resistance of the exploiters.

Signed: N. Lenin

Pravda, No. 2, January 3, 1919
"Government propaganda has argued consistently that no one was killed in the square during the crucial hour and a half when the students were evacuating. That may well be true."

- capitalist press admission, finally, twelve days after the totally bogus 'massacre' on Tienanmen.

For days, the CIA-fed lie machine (BBC, ITV, Fleet Street) has been traumatically inching its way towards this confession of utter bankruptcy (see previous two Bulletins), first by failing to suppress all the evidence that it jointly and consciously the anti-communists who started the bloodshed in Peking; and then by agreeing that all their predictions about the regime's collapse and an inter-army conflict had been hopelessly misguided, admitting that there had been so much rumour-mongering that it was now not even certain that there had been a 'massacre' at all.

This astonishing revelation is now accepted by the senior Fleet Street correspondent in Peking. In the notorious 90-minute 'massacre' on Tienanmen around 5 a.m. on Sunday morning June 4 about which the whole world has been blackmailed with Western disinformation, not one person died.

"That may well be true," the Guardian's John Gittings, leader of the 'eyewitness' pack, now allows.

This explosive admission that the entire 'massacre' furore whipped up against the Chinese workers state was not even based on a real incident as well as criminally distorting the motives and values of the regime as it resisted insurrectionary anarchy, has not knocked the wind out of Western anti-communist hysteria however. Bourgeois 'free press' disinformation has continued to pile up the lies against the Peoples Republic, especially demeantely by the middle-class 'left' swamp. The Murdoch press and the Trotskyites vie with each other to see how much further they can bend the truth in the wish to totally discredit Marxist-Leninist proletarian dictatorship power if possible.

First, the views are completely incorrect of the communists' announcement June 3 and firmly established and widely supported (it must now be admitted), representing a quarter of mankind, its oldest civilization, and undoubtedly the most difficult country in the world to govern, which the GPO has done brilliantly since completing its incredible revolutionary triumph in 1949, humiliatingly showing up capitalist imperialism's previous attempts at running the place, which produced famine, disaster, and backwardness.

In the first official account of the events on Tienanmen Square published on June 4, released yesterday, China claims 100 troops and 100 civilians were killed, but none in the square itself.

The report, drawn up by the propaganda department of the Beijing Party Committee and carried by the New China News Agency, describes the events as "a shocking counter-revolutionary rebellion".

It says that troops moved "cautiously" into the city to restore order after martial law was declared on May 20 but "a certain small group of people did not stop their efforts to create unrest even for a single day and didn't swear in the highest degree from their purpose of overturning the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party."

The report says these unnamed people prepared a list of officials to be purged and named the members of a new government.

It is unsurprising that no one died, that the regime was able to take control so quickly and so easily, and that the students who refused to leave were forced to leave by policemen. By 5.30 am, the clearing operation of the square, which had lasted only half an hour, was completed. During the whole process of this clearing operation no one died.

Then the trick is to repeat stale atrocity stories plus deranged pre-mature obituaries of communist China and the socialist world in general, while making just the odd admission that the regime was not entirely without a case to argue or entirely unprovoked, but then making sure to leave the next day not looking around government explanations.

The historic events unfolding in China are the most dramatic, but far from the only, evidence that the dynamic of communism—the ideology which came of age in this century to win control of the largest country on earth and the most populous—has all but run its course. The forces of reaction in Peking may still survive, perhaps even for a considerable period, the Chinese people, just as the Polish, Hungarians, Czechs and many more have more been suppressed in their time. The 27th Army and the Red Guards can prevent revolt from becoming revolution, but it is difficult to see communism be seen so unequivocally and so publicly as brutal reaction is a body of flowing blood.

For the rest of the world, communism has ceased to be something to be adopted or imitated; it has lost all conviction with change for the better or the best human aspirations. It stands naked, in a heartland and in the world's great continent in the worst human endeavour. Communism, the ideology that became this century as the wave of the future, cannot not be seen in any recognisable form for the start of the next.

The failure of repression to produce the economic goods and the success of freedom in doing that very thing is the fundamental change which has finished. But it will not die peacefully or disappear gracefully.

Behind Chairman Mao's mausoleum in the centre of the square, students linked hands and sang the Internationale. Soldiers moved them down with machine-gun fire, row after row after row.

The soldiers chased down alleyways, people shot on the way.

Two mob climbed on to the tank, dragged out the driver, beat him and set his body on fire. The army left the corpse dangling from the tank to show other soldiers the cruelty of the "counter-revolutionaries."

Government propaganda has argued consistently that no one was killed in the square during the crucial hour and a half when the students were evacuating. That may well be true."

The figure of ten thousand deaths seems far too high.

The government videos show civilians burning themselves in this area early on the evening of the 3rd, but there is reason to believe that the time sequence has been distorted, since the burunings took place the next day after so many people had been shuttered. But stones were thrown and troops were rouged up.


"The heroic events unfolding in China are the most dramatic, but far from the only, evidence that the dynamic of communism—the ideology which came of age in this century to win control of the largest country on earth and the most populous—has all but run its course. The forces of reaction in Peking may still survive, perhaps even for a considerable period, the Chinese people, just as the Polish, Hungarians, Czechs and many more have more been suppressed in their time. The 27th Army and the Red Guards can prevent revolt from becoming revolution, but it is difficult to see communism be seen so unequivocally and so publicly as brutal reaction is a body of flowing blood.

For the rest of the world, communism has ceased to be something to be adopted or imitated; it has lost all conviction with change for the better or the best human aspirations. It stands naked, in a heartland and in the world's great continent in the worst human endeavour. Communism, the ideology that became this century as the wave of the future, cannot not be seen in any recognisable form for the start of the next.

The failure of repression to produce the economic goods and the success of freedom in doing that very thing is the fundamental change which has finished. But it will not die peacefully or disappear gracefully.

Behind Chairman Mao's mausoleum in the centre of the square, students linked hands and sang the Internationale. Soldiers moved them down with machine-gun fire, row after row after row.

The soldiers chased down alleyways, people shot on the way.

Two mob climbed on to the tank, dragged out the driver, beat him and set his body on fire. The army left the corpse dangling from the tank to show other soldiers the cruelty of the "counter-revolutionaries."

Government propaganda has argued consistently that no one was killed in the square during the crucial hour and a half when the students were evacuating. That may well be true."

The figure of ten thousand deaths seems far too high.

The government videos show civilians burning themselves in this area early on the evening of the 3rd, but there is reason to believe that the time sequence has been distorted, since the burunings took place the next day after so many people had been shuttered. But stones were thrown and troops were rouged up.
Most importantly, the army was falling to get through.

Despite all the appearances of a massive anti-communist propaganda war among Western bourgeois democracies, no one had represented the revolutionary proletarian masses. But they represented nothing of the sort. They were the subjective-idealist, politically-ignorant, individualistic nobles. The theoretical bourgeois bourgeoisie (from the Marquis de la Tour and the Western bourgeoisie) have represented the reactionary masses. The Peking government which has been put in its place, but that the party's lack of confidence in the reactionaries has allowed the Western media to make an enormous political issue of the fact that it was always obvious - a very trivial outlook among a minority of the intelligentsia supported by a few backward workers.

Thus the West has been badly caught out by mailin its colours for Trotskyism, which an arrogant and irrelevant interest to the relentless progress of the Chinese workers.

Terrorist and demoralized as well as totally confused by the distraction of the bourgeoisie the proletariat against 'ordinary' people, and the people's 40 percent of the triumph of the proletariat revolution, the anarcho-pragmatist wishful thinking of the 'free world' propaganda machinery indulged in. The Golden Rule of the Chinese workers being defeated by this brutal outburst of the Western 'democratic' deceptions and capitalist opportunism. The anti-communist Peking and Eurose dribbled down their Chinese workers, even more deservedly at this ridiculous 'hope' of proletarian dictatorship being overthrown by petty-bourgeois reactionary illusions.

The frustration of the imperialism-corrupted Western intelligentsia at this is crushing setback to their 'fearless' anti-communist heroism and to their ability to interpret the world socialist revolution and the Mills of Marxism Leninism, is first and foremost the mass movement in Afghanistan, but was making as much propaganda as possible out of the 'trivial excesses of some reactionary bourgeoisie thinking by Chinese intelligentsia'.

Two issues later on May 17 the Bulletin explained in detail the phantasmagoric posturing of the proletariat whose singing of the Internationale was entirely phony because they had no interest in the movement itself. The whole demonstration was becoming something more than a trivial reactionist diversion for Western propaganda to exploit. In issue 495 on May 24, the Bulletin described in length how and why the communist government has been capable of consolidating the errors of the counter-revolutionary anarchists, at a cost only of lost party-leader prestige for their paralyzed delays in assessing the situation and taking action.

On May 11 (issue 497) the Bulletin confidently explained that "the psychological fascist student has been put in its place" and that the party's indecision and lack of confidence in the reactionaries has allowed the Western media to make an enormous political issue of the fact that it was always obvious - a very trivial outlook among a minority of the intelligentsia supported by a few backward workers.

But this current Western chorus against the "barbarism" of the Chinese People's Republic is doomed to an early collapse. The potential fascist dementia against such imagined 'horrors' will continue to cause panic in Western politics, later on possibly beginning to poison parts of the 'free world' in exactly the same way that imperialism's last great 'bulwark' against 'fascism'—hope, will be poisoned capitalist Europe, but before doing damage elsewhere.

The festerere morality of Hong Kong's sick political farce provides an early glimpse of how this irrational fascist despair will take hold like a disease spreading across the venereal parts of capitalism. The financing from that of more 'pro-democracy' subversion inside China with the proceeds of none of the most vicious monopoly-capitalist exploitation on earth where colonial tyranny has never allowed any democracy of any kind hitherto - is an outrage of the Chinese workers state is taken to allow their profits. But less belligerent or less extreme individualist elements in the Western bourgeoisie wake-up will opt for a different course as soon as they see the full mentality grasp against that communist China is very firmly established, and that it is here to stay. Humiliated by their own loosing-like anti-communist hysteria, these capitalist circles will accept losing a bit of face in having to eventually concede that the Chinese government's view of things is not wrong after all, it is the Western establishment that then resume trading as usual. Many capitalist groups alr
eady have.

Western propaganda meanwhile continues to reflect all these conflicting emotions and confusions, consistent only in its conceited self-justification but revealing a few glimpses of the truth as it stumble clumsily through all the contrivances of propaganda. This latest near-Marxist description of how counterrevolutionary thinking could revives in China.

Ten years of reforms produced in China the beginnings of a middle class of professionals, intellectuals, well-to-do peasants, private entrepreneurs, and the post-Cultural Revolution generation who saw what was happening outside China and wanted the same. They are a drop in the ocean of China's vast population and found in and around the main cities where they are exposed to foreign influences and enjoy growing material independence.

The bands of motorcyclists which circulate around Beijing at the height of the student demonstrations and the photocopying and fax machines at the disposal of the protesters bears witness to the new and independent wealth some sections of the population.

What passes for a bourgeoisie in China has for the first time led to an effective challenge to the power of the largely peasant government that conquered China 40 years ago. The students had demanded the right to question the authority of a group of old men who had been elected to account for their mistakes.

This surprising objective then collapses at this point into an ineptic failure to grasp that vastly more is at stake in the Chinese workers state than the pride of revisionist-conservatism in the leadership whose need for sharper revolutionary thinking has been raised not by a Leftist movement by anti-communist petty-bourgeois anarchism and opportunism. By ignoring that the dictatorship of the proletariat establishment in 1949 under communist party leadership represents the working class's choice for the vast masses of history despised and exploited Chinese but also for the entire masses of Asia and beyond, such degenerate 'reports' can then turn the crucial developments in the revolutionary government of China into an incredible case of revision of 'Dallas' but with even more transparent vices and even shallower ambitions, if such a thing can be thought possible.

Faced with their challenge, China's gerontocracy feels that only their children can be trusted to succeed them, and it was the Princeton-educated resident Yang Shangkun's nephew who led the bloody assault on Tiananmen and it was planned by his brother.

The threat posed by this new class is not just to the leaders but to their followers in the party and bureaucracy who run the inefficient, and often corrupt, state sector.

It is already losing out in the competition for raw materials between the state and non-state industries and would only do worse in the future. This economic competition also made of many of these state-run corporations accountable for the first time, forced to explain why a silk factory in Shanghai for example remains taboo, and many of the octogenarians now back in power have blood on their hands going back many years. And there is a reason to prevent the Great Leap Forward which cost upwards of 20 million lives or the Cultural Revolution to mention only the most notorious of them.

As long as these men remain alive, China will not be ready to re-evaluate its past in the way that Hungary or the Soviet Union did. Even by Third World standards, China's record in education is appalling and the reforms have done little to reverse that. The democratic reforms in South Korea, with a similar authoritarian political heritage, were propelled by the huge "middle class" which had sprung up as a result of massive investment in education.

This is a criminally distorting assessment of the colossal achievements of the Gorbachev era in China which has changed the course of world history no less than 1971 itself did. But this wretched leftist, imperialist-corrupted middle-class anti-communist scribbling is nevertheless forced to come back to gain new life by grudgingly accepting that the Chinese workers state is going to continue growing strength to strength under its own conscious communist control. Although the 'free world' bourgeoisie hate to admit it, the dictatorship of the proletariat represents undeniable progress for civilization as a whole, and is bound to triumph and reorganize the whole world eventually.

Many Chinese intellectuals argue that even if the economic crisis worsened sufficiently to provoke a peasant uprising, it would only lead to another form of dictatorship, just like their own.

The support the educated urbanites need to successfully change China's political culture will come only with an education that has been delayed for more than a small minority to think for themselves. In the meantime, China's intelligentsia will continue to be the victim of organs and campaigns as they have been for four decades.

Almost as disgraceful as the deceptions and self-delusion practiced by the Chinese leadership is the infamously cretinous concept of the star turn of modern revisionist compromise Gorbachev.

So obsessed in the Soviet president now with smooth media performance and the opportunism pretense that Marxist-Leninist scientific theory is nothing but a means of service to mankind (plus a tendency towards saying that Leninism never did anything but harm, now growing in many revisionist circles see below), that moronic fence-sitting now spoons out without thinking. Last week, in his press conference, nearly a month and a half after the Bulletin with its tiny resources had first begun to correctly analyse the anti-communist and dead-end nature of the 'pro-democracy' anticommunist antics in Peking, and nearly a week after it had mushroom into a counter-revolutionary pro-Western exorcism for the whole world to see, Gorbachev the president of the world's most powerful state pretended that he did not yet have enough information to judge whether recent events in China were counter-revolutionary or not.

This drive not only gives tacit encouragement to the counter-revolution of course, when a fence-sitting "don't know" is a virtual stab in the back to the Chinese workers state which stands a decisive move. It is also a vile bucket of shit over the heads of everyone struggling right round the world against imperialism. The one ingredient every revolutionary struggle needs more desperately than any other is the clarity and confidence to make firm Marxist-Leninist judgments about the insurmountable war against imperialism.
alist system and then to organise and take action accordingly. The one ingredient which Gorbachevism will show pretending that it is even impossible for the Soviet Union to accept which is revolution and which is counter-revolution despite having numerous sources of a matchless supply of up-to-the-minute and inside information— is demoralised defeatism. What a shallow bird-brained wally this is.

And hasn’t Moscow’s infamous revisionist tradition trained its middle-class acolytes well in the West. Listen to this screaming counter-revolutionary diatribe from the Murray nomad: "In the last two years Times, virtually urging armed intervention against the socialist camp, and almost in ecstasy at the eternity of class-collaboration with the affulent bourgeois— that could then be conducted with a calm conscience by the treacherous petty-bourgeois left'.

The crisis in the Soviet Union is nothing less than the end of 1917. It is not simply the end of Stalinism. It is the end of the political leadership of the Soviet Union.

The crisis in Eastern Europe, which in the first instance was a function of Gorbachev, brings to a conclusion an era which began in 1945. Its end, it is now clear, was in 1989. A system which had the capacity to draw to an end an era which commenced with the declaration of the people’s republic in 1949. It is the end of the era of revolution and the beginning of the era of systems which those revolutions gave rise to. They had three main characteristics. Economic development was organised by means of a highly planned, centralised system based on the dominance of a single party over the life of the state and society. And these societies existed in a state of remarkable isolation and globalisation from the rest of the world.

Up to a point, they worked, or at least some of them worked. The Soviet Union and China were productive and backwardness. But now, for some two or three decades, it has been clear, especially in the case of the Soviet Union, that economic dynamism has given way to stagnation and sclerosis.

And the remarkable post-war growth of the advanced capitalist countries has thrown the failure of the centralised economies into sharp relief.

The disintegration of the old communist orthodoxies is proving to be the most dramatic event of the post-war era.

The Chinese events are a reminder that renewal is not inevitable. The Chinese government will now seek to stabilise the country, but things can never be the same again. Just a few months ago, it enjoyed enormous legitimacy. Now, having turned its guns on itself, it has no equal even among comparable outages of the post-war period, such as Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, it faces a period of continuing crisis of legitimacy.

Already we can begin to perceive the most rudimentary outlines of what a Gorbachev-style Soviet Union might look like. It will no longer be able to function, but integrated with it. It will have a mixed economy, with a significant domestic and international private sector. It will have a pluralistic political structure, with many alternative media, free trade unions and probably competing political parties.

In other words, we are talking about a pluralistic, and in many ways social-democratic, model.

The outlines of such a scenario can be seen in a state which has Hungary and Poland. Both are becoming multi-party systems, both are accepting the growth of a bourgeois private sector, and both are moving rapidly towards the establishment of a political pluralism and political relationship with Western Europe.

Which brings us to the second scenario: an authoritarian outcome, a Francoisation of some of these societies. This would mean a long-term regression into a political and ideological system where ideology is less prominent, but where force is never far from the surface.

The possibility of such a regression is clear from the events in China, and more generally from the authoritarianism which has been such a marked characteristic of these systems.

A combination of economic and ethnic unrest in the Soviet Union has produced a new revisionism and a powerful movement towards some kind of law-and-order solution.

The West must not be a passive bystander to this development. We can argue there is nothing we can do. Others rub their hands in pleasure at the problems. But we have a powerful interest in what emerges. To set out the potential scenario in a country which has been the most to gain from the triumph and success of the Gorbachev-style forces in the communist world. We shall attempt to assess how best we can influence them. They will make these countries and the world a better place to live in.

Joe Goebbels? Norman Tebbit? George Galloway? No it’s Martin Jacques, editor of the CCRS flagship Marxism Today! (11) — surely the sickest deception on the working class in the whole of revisionism’s rotten history, and one still subsidised by the state (What a criminal scandal!).

But anything 100% that revisionist defeatism can sink to, Trotskyism can do worse and with even less pretend ‘objectivity’. In

banner headlines that swelled the CIA’s propaganda-bait hook, line and sinker, the psychotic Spats trumpeted ‘massacre’ and warned that little credibility they have on the capitalist press stories being correct that they openly used as the sole basis for believing what the imperialist media wanted people to believe.

June 6—Chinese Stalinism has provoked a political reaction that may well spell the doom of this bureaucratic, anti-worker regime. The massacre centuries and other protests by the despised Deng regime has brought China to the brink of civil war. The bloodletting, with victims numbering perhaps in the thousands, did not succeed in intimidating the populace. Defiant and heroic, the rebels marched out of Beijing’s Tiananmen Square singing the anti-worker anthem: the Internationale

The opportunist left’s swamp is still falling for this infantile deception in which the counter-revolutionaries sang the song of socialist revolution to confuse the Peking crowds but clearly without the slightest interest in fighting for socialist revolution, but, on the contrary despising the perspective heartily, — as their anti-communist supporters in fascist-individualist Hong Kong have bluntly demonstrated, — yet still simulating internationalism for other theatrical effect, as provocateurs will always do.

There have already been clashes between army units which support the youthful protesters and those which support the decept Deng regime.

Crowds applauded sympathetic troops as they moved into the city to liberate the seat of government from the butchers of Tiananmen Square.

Our Government is already done with,” declared a young worker as he stood, rock in hand, facing the soldiers that fateful bloody Sunday, 6 May. The army does not have the strength to cope with the corrupt and murderous Stalinist clique.

While pro-regime military forces still occupy the center of Beijing, the real victors are the half a million intelligent workers and students: “everywhere in Beijing people reacted to the killings by torching vehicles and creating blockades. The troops only controlled a few major thoroughfares, and elsewhere citizens continued to control the streets” (New York Times, 5 June). In the great majority of cases, the students and workers have set up barricades using buses, trucks and cars. And a de facto general strike has been declared in several parts of China.

The crowds kept chanting, “The People’s Liberation Army must not fire on the people. They must join us. if they don’t, we’ll kill them.”

The massacre was carried out by one particular military unit, the 27th Army, which received reinforcements from Inner Mongolia to the capital. The 27th has long historic ties to the Deng clique. Its commander is a relative of Ching Shui, Deng’s daughter. Deng’s deputy and a prime mover in the suppression of the students’ protests. Significantly, after the bloodbath the 27th was designated a punishing army but a besieged force. CBS News (5 June) reported:

“The tanks are ranged in a particular formation pointing in all directions. Down below them on the highway, below them on the rails passing troops. Now, this is clearly a defensive formation that is set up not expect-
Several thousands join the anarchy, not millions.

The main line of force is back to the capital, Beijing. The communist army, led by Peng Hsiung Hsiung, has many ties to the civilian population, especially the students. Beijing University students used the army reserve reportedly to reinforce the main body by Deng and his hardline premier Li Peng. And now many soldiers of the 38th quite likely have relatives killed in the butchery of June 4.

As China moves rapidly toward civil war, the government has gone into hiding. None of the top leaders have been seen in the past few days. Rumors abound that Deng is dead or dying of cancer, that Li Peng was shot and wounded by a soldier whose relatives were killed in the massacre.

Only after swallowing this total crap of CIA disinformation do the S朋s then get round to trying to think what might be wrong with such a self-serving capitalist-press scenario as the world's greatest proletarian dictatorship being overthrown by its own people, a unique historical phenomenon which few Trotskyists (the same ones, that is) even believe in any more, despite it being an article of faith.

While the students display more than a little petty-bourgeois elitism, the formation of 'workers' and 'poor peasants' soviets would polarize the student movement, attracting those activists motivated by genuine social idealism.

Certainly, the students have strong illusions in some kind of pure, classless democracy which many of them seem to identify with America. They thus erected a large statue of the "godess of democracy," modeled on the American Statue of Liberty, and provocatively placed it opposite the huge portrait of Mao Tse-tung hanging in Tiananmen Square. Some student activists appealed to the Bush White House to pressure the Deng regime to "democratize" China.

With the massacre, many supporters of the "democracy" movement abroad have campaigned for the U.S. and other imperialist powers to launch a direct action against China. A group of Chinese exchange students in the U.S. wrote an open letter to Bush saying that the Chinese Communist Party is "an evil fascist dictatorship" (New York Times, 5 June). One member of this group even stated that "Chiang Kai-shek" and "Kuomintang" was a bloody military dictatorship which cruelly oppressed China's workers and peasants in the service of Wall Street. Thus the cult of "pure democracy" could develop into an ideological basis for capitalist counter-revolution and imperialist subjugation.

Civil war is breaking out, but it's by no means all going toward counter-revolution.

And while there are plenty of pro-capitalist elements in China, with close links to Chinese capital in Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore, the current protests are oriented not toward counter-revolution but in the opposite direction, feeding off discontent with the pro-capitalist economic policies of the Deng regime. They promised consumer goods and delivered... but only for the privileged petty-bourgeois layers. Having sown the wind, they're now reaping the whirlwind of political revolution. A Beijing Commune was taking shape in Tiananmen Square. And moreover—unlike East Berlin 1953, the 1956 Hungarian workers revolt or the 1968 Prague Spring—it is a political revolution without the presence of the Soviet army and the complicating factor of perceived national oppression.

But those slight reservations are as far as petty bourgeois rationalism dares to go. Trotsky's anti-Soviet 'political revolution' dogma must prevail,—slightly tempered with to give it a better 'fit' for China's circumstances,—and also the easier to explain the crushing defeat (about to be delivered to this bizarre 'political revolution' fetishism plucked out of thin air by the defeated Trotsky),—which these US bourgeois 'revolutionary' dilettantes must already have sensed was coming even as they voted up this hopelessly derailed 'analysis' of events in China.

The Chinese Revolution was based on a peasant (i.e., petty-bourgeois) army led by declassed intellectuals like Mao and Deng. From its inception the Maoist regime had a petty-bourgeois bonapartist character, trying to balance above all classes in Chinese society. Thus it requires another revolution for the working class to achieve political power. That revolution now begins.

Sounding more Trotskyite with every occasion, the fake 'Leninist' hymn, floating in the CFGP bog, do their usual act of pretending to be above the anti-communist 'left' swap while in reality being the nastiest objects in it precisely through their pretended 'support' for the workers state. This is strikingly obvious in falsifying the dictatorship of the proletariat in the back at the first signs of approaching middle-class disapproval (and loss of financial backing) in the West. Their China coverage is up to their usual treacherous standards of refusing to identify with the Chinese workers state just at the moment when it is most needed.

This has been a "rebellion of the Chinese people" but not a "revolution" they observe oh so quietly, and briefly (and briefly). Believing the capitalist press that "a million had demonstrated in Tiananmen Square" (it was never more than 20,000 at the most—a very tiny crowd by Chinese standards), the 'Leninist' then asserts that "Li Peng could only use helicopter gunships to distribute leaflets". This loaded hysterical gibberish is straight out of a CIA anti-communist handbook. It gets worse. "Once the masses moved, Beijing was brought to a standstill". Their argument against the official CFGP '7 Days' that it was a rebellion rather than a revolution grows more and more obscure.

The threat of an army clampdown, they declare, "is the approach of the bureaucrats to hold onto privilege, not that of the Communist who made the revolution in 1949... a deep split was created in the bureaucratic leadership of the CCP... a whole layer of party and government officials... have an interest in constituting themselves as a capitalist ruling class". This is Western petty-bourgeois defeatism of near certifiable proportions. Who needs Trotskyism with a CPGB of Jacques mentalité, and a 'Leninist' opposition faction which is even more counter-revolutionary than its despicable parent body.

In all the 'left' swap, only the pathetic CPGB followers of Reg Birch sounded even more stupid with the deranged screed: "Amitzans, My Lai, Bloody Sunday in Derry, the Rape of Nanking: the world never forgets and does not forgive". Applied to anything the Chinese workers state could ever do, this would be the most despicable slander of fascist provocation proportions. But pronounced over a not particularly violent rout (and a necessary one) of counter-revolution, and over a Western press massacre.
The 'pro-democracy' frauds launch arson attacks on the authorities to start the bloodshed.

Anarchist hippies join the revolt, hating communism.

The real nature of the present leaders of the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany (leaders of whom it has been wrongly said that they have already lost all influence, whereas in reality they are even more dangerous to the proletariat than the Hungarian Social-Democrats who styled themselves Communists and promised to 'support' the dictatorship of the proletariat was once again revealed during the German equivalent of the Kornilov revolt, i.e., the Kapp-Lüttwitz putsch. A small but striking illustration is provided by two brief articles—one by Karl Kautsky entitled 'Decisive Hours' ('Entscheidende Stunden') in Freiheit (Freedom), organ of the Independents, of March 30, 1920, and the other by Arthur Crispin entitled 'On the Political Situation' (in the same newspaper, issue of April 14, 1920). These gentlemen are absolutely incapable of thinking and reasoning like revolutionaries. They are swilling philistine democrats, who become a thousand times more dangerous to the proletariat when they claim to be supporters of Soviet government and of the dictatorship of the proletariat because, in fact, whenever a difficult and dangerous situation arises they are sure to commit treachery while "sincerely" believing that they are helping the proletariat! Did not the Hungarian Social-Democrats, after rechristening themselves Communists, also want to "help" the proletariat when, because of their cowardice and spinelessness, they considered the position of Soviet power in Hungary hopeless and went swilling to the agency of the strategic capitalists and the Entente hanger-ons? The childishness of those who "repudiate" participation in parliament consists in their thinking it possible to "solve" the difficult problem of combating bourgeoisie-democratic influences within the working-class movement in such a "simple", "easy", allegedly revolutionary manner, whereas they are actually merely running away from their own shadows, only closing their eyes to difficulties and trying to shrug them off with mere words. The most shameless careerism, the bourgeois utilisation of parliamentary seats, glaringly reformist perversion of parliamentary activity, and vulgar petty-bourgeois conservatism are all unquestionably common and prevalent features engendered everywhere by capitalism, not only outside but also within the working-class movement. But the selfsame capitalism and the bourgeois environment it creates (which disappears very slowly even after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie), since the peasantry constantly regenerates the bourgeoisie, is that essentially the same bourgeois careerism, national chauvinism, petty-bourgeois vulgarity, etc.—merely varying insignificantly in form—in positively every sphere of activity and life.

You think, my dear boycottists and anti-parliamentarians, that you are "terribly revolutionary", but in reality you are frightened by the comparatively minor difficulties of the struggle against bourgeois influences within the working-class movement, whereas your victory—i.e., the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the conquest of political power by the proletariat—will create these very same difficulties on a still larger, an infinitely larger scale. Like children, you are frightened by a minor difficulty which confronts you today, but you do not understand that tomorrow, and the day after, you will still have to learn, and learn thoroughly, to overcome the selfsame difficulties, only on an immeasurably greater scale.
Under Soviet rule, your proletarian party and ours will be invaded by a still larger number of bourgeois intellectuals. They will worm their way into the Soviets, the courts, and the administration, since communism cannot be built otherwise than with the aid of the human material created by capitalism, and the bourgeoisie will do their utmost to prevent the masses from being enfranchised and destroyed, but must be won over, remoulded, assimilated and re-educated, just as we must — in a protracted struggle waged on the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat — re-educate the proletarians themselves, who do not abandon their petty-bourgeois prejudices at once, by a miracle, at the behest of the Virgin Mary, at the behest of a slogan, resolution or decree, but only in the course of a long and difficult mass struggle against mass petty-bourgeois influences. Under Soviet rule, these same problems, which the anti-parliamentarians now so proudly, so haughtily, so lightly and so flippantly belittle, will be of the highest importance. These selfsame problems are arising anew within the Soviets, within the Soviet administration, among the Soviet "pleas" (in Russia we have abolished, and rightly abolished, the bourgeois legal bar, but it is reviving again under the cover of the "Soviet pleasers"). Among Soviet engineers, Soviet school-teachers and the like, e.g., the most highly skilled and best situated workers at Soviet factories, we observe a constant revival of absolutely all the negative traits peculiar to bourgeois parliamentarianism, and we are conquering this evil — gradually — only by a tireless, prolonged and persistent struggle based on proletarian organisation, education and discipline.

Of course, under the rule of the bourgeoisie it is very difficult to eradicate bourgeois habits from our own, i.e., the workers', party; it is "difficult" to expel from the party the familiar parliamentary leaders who have been hopelessly corrupted by bourgeois prejudices: it is "difficult" to subject to proletarian discipline the absolutely essential (even if very limited) number of people coming from the ranks of the bourgeoisie; it is "difficult" to form, in a bourgeois parliament, a communist group fully worthy of the working class; it is "difficult" to ensure that the communist party's resolutions do not become a palliative for all the injustices, but concern themselves with the very urgent work of propaganda, agitation and organisation among the masses. All this is "difficult", to be sure; it was difficult in Russia, and it is vastly more difficult in Western Europe and in America, where the bourgeoisie is far stronger, where bourgeois-democratic traditions are stronger, and so on.

Yet all these "difficulties" are mere child's play compared with the same sort of problems which, in any event, the proletariat will have to meet in order to achieve victory, both during the revolution and after the victory, of the proletariat. Compared with these truly gigantic problems of re-educating, under the proletarian dictatorship, millions of peasants and small proprietors, hundreds of thousands of office employees, officials and bourgeois intellectuals, of subordinating them all to the proletarian state and to proletarian leadership, of eradicating their bourgeois habits and traditions — compared with these gigantic problems it is chilishly easy to create, under the rule of the bourgeoisie, and in a bourgeois parliament, a really considerable group of a real parliament, a real parliament.

If our "Left" and anti-parliamentarian comrades do not learn to overcome even such a small difficulty now, we may safely assert that either they will prove incapable of achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat, and will be unable to subordinate and remould the bourgeois intellectuals and bourgeois institutions on a wide scale, or they will have to hastily complete their education, and, by that haste, will do a great deal of harm to the cause of the proletariat, will commit more errors than usual, will manifest more than average weakness and insufficiency, and so on and so forth.

1. "LEFT-WING" COMMUNISM — AN INFANTILE DISORDER May 1930

7. In particular, we must not restrict ourselves to the usual repudiation, in principle, of all collaboration between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, of all "collaborationism". Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, which will never be able, at one stroke, to abolish private property completely, mere defence of "liberty" and "equality", while private ownership of the means of production is preserved, turns into "collaboration" with the bourgeoisie, and undermines the rule of the working class. The dictatorship of the proletariat means that the state uses its whole machinery of power to uphold and perpetuate "no-liberty" for the exploiters to continue their oppression and exploitation, inequality between the owner of property (i.e., one who has
By that time, the disputes as to the significance of the Soviets were already linked up with the question of dictatorship. The Bolsheviks had raised the question of the dictatorship even prior to the revolution of October 1905 (see my pamphlet Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution. First Section, 1905, published in a seven-page pamphlet called Twelve Years). The Mensheviks took a negative stand with regard to the "dictatorship" slogan: the Bolsheviks emphasized that the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies were “actually an embryo of a new revolutionary power”, as was literally said in the draft of the Bolshevik resolution (p. 92 of my Report). The Mensheviks acknowledged the importance of the Soviets; they were in favour of “helping to organise” them, etc., but they did not regard them as embryos of revolutionary power, did not in general say anything about a “new revolutionary power” of this or some similar type, and flatly rejected the slogan of dictatorship. It will easily be seen that this was a position alien to the logic of the dissection of all the present disagreements with the Mensheviks. It will also be easily seen that, in their attitude to this question, the Mensheviks (both Russian and non-Russian, such as the Kautskys, Longuetists and the like) have been behaving like reformists or opportunists, who recognise the proletarian revolution in word, but in deed reject what is most essential and fundamental in the concept of “revolution.”

Even before the revolution of 1905, I analysed, in the afore-mentioned pamphlet, Two Tactics, the arguments of the Mensheviks, who accused me of having “imperceptibly substituted the dictatorship policy for revolutionary action.” I showed in detail that, by this very accusation, the Mensheviks revealed their opportunism, their true political nature, as toadies to the liberal bourgeoisie and conductors of its influence in the ranks of the proletariat. When the revolution becomes an unquestioned force, I said, even its opponents begin to “recognise the revolution”; and I pointed (in the summer of 1905) to the example of the Russian liberals, who remained constitutional monarchists. At present in 1920, one might add that in Germany and Italy the liberals have been the most educated and alert of them — are ready to “recognise” the revolution, and at the same time refusing to recognise the dictatorship of a definite class (or of definite classes). The Russian liberals and the Mensheviks of that time, and the present-day German and Italian liberals, Turati and Kautskys, have revealed their reformism, their absolute unfitness to be revolutionaries.

Indeed, when the revolution has already become an unquestioned force, when even the liberals “recognise” it, and when the revolution is not only the recognition of the oppressed masses, then the entire question brings to the theorists and the leaders of practical policy — reduces itself to an exact class definition of the revolution. However, without the concept of “dictatorship”, this precise class definition cannot be given. One cannot be a revolutionary in fact unless one prepares for dictatorship. This truth was not understood in 1905 by the Mensheviks, and it is not understood in 1920 by the Italian, German, French and other socialists, who are afraid of the severe “conditions” of the Communist International; this truth is feared by people who are capable of recognising the dictatorship in word, but are incapable of preparing for it in deed. It will therefore not be irrelevant to quote at length the explanation of Marx’s views, which I published in July 1905 in opposition to the Russian Mensheviks, but is equally applicable to the West-European Mensheviks of 1920. (Instead of giving titles of newspapers, etc., I shall merely indicate whether Mensheviks or Bolsheviks are referred to.)

In Communist Revolutionary of 1848, Mehring tells us that one of the reproaches levelled at this newspaper by bourgeois publications was that it had allegedly demanded “the immediate introduction of a dictatorship as the sole means of achieving democracy” (Marx, Nachlass, Vol. III, p. 53). From the vulgar bourgeoisie standpoint the terms of dictatorship and democracy are mutually exclusive. Failing to understand the theory of class struggle and accustomed to seeing in the political arena the petty squabbling of the various bourgeois circles and coteries, the bourgeois understands by dictatorship the annihilation of all liberal institutions, the restoration of absolute monarchies, the dispersion of every sort of abuse of power, in a dictator’s personal interests. In fact, it is precisely this vulgar bourgeois view that is to be observed among our Mensheviks, who attribute the partiality of the Bolsheviks for the slogan of ‘dictatorship’ to Lenin’s ‘passionate desire to try his luck’ (Iskra No. 103, p. 3, column 2).

In order to explain to the Mensheviks the meaning of the term class dictatorship as distinct from a personal dictatorship, and the tasks of a democratic dictatorship as distinct from a socialist dictatorship, it would not be amiss to dwell on the views of Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung.

“After a revolution,” Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung wrote on September 14, 1848, “every provisional organisation of the state requires a dictatorship, and an energetic dictatorship at that. From the very beginning we have reproached Camphausen [the head of the Ministry after March 18, 1848] for not acting dictatorially, for not having immediately smashed up and eliminated the remnants of the old institutions. And while here Camphausen was fumbling with constitutional illusions, the defeated party [the revolutionaries] strengthened its positions in the bureaucracy and in the army, and there and there began to venture upon open struggle.”

These words, Mehring justly remarks, sum up in a few propositions all that was propounded in detail in Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung in long articles on the Camphausen Ministry. What do these words of Marx tell us? That a provisional revolutionary government must act dictatorially (a proposition which the Mensheviks were totally unable to grasp since they were fighting shy of the slogan of dictatorship), and that the task of such a dictatorship is not only to eliminate the remnants of the old institutions (which is precisely what was clearly stated in the resolution of the Third Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party [Bolsheviks] on the struggle against counter-revolution, and was omitted in the Mensheviks’ resolution as shown above), third, and last, it follows from these words that Marx castigated the bourgeois democrats for entertaining ‘constitutional illusions’ in a period of revolution and open civil war. The meaning of these words becomes particularly obvious from the article in Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung of June 6, 1848.

“A Constituent National Assembly,” Marx wrote, “must first of all be an active, revolutionary, active assembly. The Frankfurt Assembly,” however, is busying itself with school exercises in parliamentarianism while allowing the government to act. Let us assume that this learned assembly succeeds, after mature consideration, in evolving the best possible agenda and the best constitution, but what is the use of the best possible agenda and of the best constitution if, in the last analysis, the governments have in the meantime placed the bayonet on the agenda?”

“That is the meaning of the slogan: dictatorship...

“Major questions in the life of nations are settled only by force. The reactionary classes themselves are usually the first to resort to violence, to civil war; they are the first to ‘place the bayonet on the agenda’, as the Russian autocracy has systematically and unswervingly been doing everywhere ever since January 9th. And since such a situation has arisen, since the bayonet has been placed on the agenda in the last analysis, revolution has proved imperative and urgent — the constitutional illusions and school exercises in parliamentarianism become merely a screen for the bourgeois betrayal of the revolution, a screen to conceal the fact that the bourgeoisie is ‘recolling’ from the revolution. It is precisely the slogan of dictatorship that the genuinely revolutionary class must advance, in that case.”

That was how the Bolsheviks reasoned on the dictatorship before the revolution of October 1905.

CONTRIBUTION TO HISTORY OF DICTATORSHIP QUESTION O.C. 1920
SECTION FOUR

Western petty-bourgeois 'democracy' illusions will have to like it or lump it as far as China's unbeatable proletarian dictatorship path is concerned.

The firm course adopted by the Chinese workers state in crushing the counter-revolutionary opposition to the communist party's leadership role has created a crisis for imperialism, not the socialist camp.

Anti-Leninist propaganda can scream hysterically until it is blue in the face but it is 'parliamentary reformism' which will be humiliated and frustrated in the end, not the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The collapse of illusions in the alleged 'invincible success, strength, and influence' of the so-called 'democratic way of life' will drive half the middle-class anti-China protesters towards pacifism, and the other half (particularly the 'lefts') towards fascism.

The whole of anti-Leninist bourgeois opinion (including the bogus 'revolutionary' groups of Trots and Euro's) will either have to accept proletarian-dictatorship China as an obviously legitimate and dominant force on the entire future development of world history through increasingly triumphant economic, political and military influence inspiring the world masses ever-more-rapidly towards communist revolution. At which point many of the various posturing 'socialist' and 'democratic' tendencies in Western society will quietly abandon their egotistical political aggression for a more pacific 'peace at any price' stance.

Or else the more ideologically hypocritical elements will have to try writing off the Chinese nation (a quarter of mankind) as being 'a law unto themselves' or being 'not relevant to the rest of civilisations development' - which is pure racism, a not infrequent expression of the bitter anti-proletarian class prejudice which lies at the bottom of all anti-Leninism.

In working itself up into such a barren lather over the exemplary authority and maturity the Chinese workers state has shown against this wretched Western-inspired provocation trying to undermine communist party rule, Western reaction has indicated that a historical watershed may be about to be reached in the bourgeoisie's century-long anti-communist crusade.

The beginnings of a tell-tale pattern may be developing. Demented anti-communist prejudice had already been utterly humiliated only a couple of months ago by making such a fool of itself over Afghanistan, counting the chickens of counter-revolutionary 'victory' before they had hatched and contemptuously writing off the Kabul regime whose triumph, however, is now assured.

Neutral logic would suggest that Western anti-communist reaction could not be daft enough as to make an even more catastrophic misjudgment of the viability of a workers state just a few months later.

But the dialectical history of class-struggle logic produces exactly such astonishing phenomena. Not only has petty-bourgeois prejudice against the dictatorship of the proletariat stamped the West into a disastrous new misjudgment about the fate of a workers state under counter-revolutionary pressure. It wagged its reputation and sanity on defeat for the peoples republic of China at all places. And what is worst, it has unleashed such a barrage of propaganda distortion, emotional degeneracy, and philosophical irrationalism that everyone has been sucked deeply into their worldwide dominance over human affairs, and inevitably plunging the whole planet back into warmongering turmoil and total devastation as soon as the cut-throat profiteering trade war had run its usual course towards all-out shooting war. As it is, only half the world faces that prospect, and the existence of the socialist camps enormouly powerful progress since 1917 stands as the one great hope for avoiding a complete warmongering catastrophe for capitalism next time round, by offering the working masses the alternative of making the socialist revolution rather than blindly following capitalist nationalism, which is already doomed.

Restoring capitalism is also an idiotic argument even as far as economics is concerned.

The apparent 'democratic' influence of the leading Western powers is nothing but a gigantic fraud of imperialist exploitation. The visibly massive and palpable progress is real enough. But it is only achievable because the giant multinational imperialist monopolies exploit and dominate the entire planet in their profiteering advance. Its highest expression is apparently effortless 'democratic' affluence, but its fatal reverse side is the pitiful poverty and brutal exploitation of the Third World fascist dictatorships operating under Western imperialist protection. For every despicable Kimokcke, Thatcherite, Tariq Aliite, or Sakharovite cheering on the 'democratic achievements' of the Western world, there is a child-labour racket or child-prostitution outrage greasing the wheels of the 'free-market' commodity-productivity pressure all over the backstreets and villages of Brazil, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, the Philippines, Egypt, Nigeria, Mexico et al., duplicated a hundred times around the Third World.

And when these anti-communists scream that the socialist states education and welfare achievements are not much to write home about (as Sakharov and the anti-China hysteria have
world! Soon trying through fascist warmongering to divert a communist revolt against the mile-high and soaring permanent mass-unemployment and depression poverty, the deranged void of Sakharov & Co. that 'the West is best' will convince all the capitalist imperialists that it is certifiable and needs locking up.

China's Sakharovs have forced the Chinese workers state's hand first, possibly thinking that the rotten revisionist record of the Peking leadership and the counter-revolutionary overthrow. Some leaders indeed had reached such a paralyzing revisionist-defeatist condition that they were ready to commit suicide by 'pluralist democracy' and the restoration of capitalism. Hence the dialectical struggle for the dictatorship of the Chinese workers state proved far more sturdy and historically-ally assured than the idiot anti-communist clique (from Thatcher to Tariq Ali, the Trots and the Euro), so foolishly reckoned with their CIA-fed nonsense about the communist party's 'imminent collapse,' etc.

The least mass of China supported the 1949 seizure of power after a heroic 20-year guerrilla war struggle, and have had their lives utterly transformed by this historic revolution. This seems so obvious that it is only very recent persons (a minority of anti-capitalist activity, dominating a passive indifferent mass in the West) who continue to deny the obvious huge political implications of this reality.

Lenin in his very last article (Better Fever, But Not Yet Dead, March 1923) referred in passing to this unanswerable demographic factor. Can we save ourselves from the impending conflict with these imperialist countries? May we hope that the internal antagonisms and conflicts between the thriving imperialist countries of the West and the thriving imperialist countries of the East will give us a second respite as they did the first time, when the campaign of the West-European counter-revolution in support of the Russian counter-revolution broke down owing to the antagonisms in the camp of the counter-revolutionaries of the West, the East, in the camp of the Eastern and Western exploiters, in the camp of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat? I think the reply to this question should be that the issue depends upon too many factors, and that the outcome of the struggle as a whole can be forecast only because in the long run capitalism itself is educating and training the vast majority of the population for the globe for the struggle.

In the last analysis, the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., are strengthening the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And during the past few years it is this majority that has been introduced into the struggle for domination with extraordinary rapidity. So that in this respect there cannot be the slightest doubt as to the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of socialism is fully and absolutely assured.

The West's disgusting 'democratic' bourgeoisie and its even more loathsome armchair-socialist 'left' swill will obviously try clinching the proletarian dictatorship's collapse. The 1917 revolution and the 1949 revolution (plus all the rest of the socialist camp) are 'nothing to do with socialism' or even 'nothing to do with Lenin,' but Lenin's greatest theoretical achievement was his understanding of the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat as alone being the vehicle capable of taking the world socialist revolution through its very difficult early decades (being speculated upon here by Lenin) on to the time when the vast majority of mankind had won its way, arms in hand, out of the imperialist orbit. And Lenin's greatest scientific achievement was the merciless world proletarian revolution was a consciously aggressive communist-materialist philosophy which embraced indivisibly both the proletarian dictatorship concept and the inevitability and ultimate of the mass power of mankind (the 'masses of mankind,' including the USSR, China, India, China, and all vast populations and inbetween).

It was precisely this current type of Chinese workers state, relentlessly rebutting imperialist intervention, that Lenin had in mind, based on the USSR's own crucial experience of crushing the Kronstadt revolution, the Menshevik petty-bourgeois revolution and the Menshevik-Revolutionary army 'pluralist' counter-revolutionary demands.

And this, of course, is very well known to every 'left' swill reptile in the West, but it is also, of course, more than their recent rosy reputations are worth to admit it and have to hand Lenin over to the real Leninists (IUP, etc). So the swill briars between totally disowning Lenin (CPGB, etc), and trying to pretend that Lenin in a petty-bourgeois democracy-socialist (i.e. Menshevik and anti-communist) trait like they all are.

But the swill bogus claims to Marxism-Leninism are of no use either against the irresistible historical avalanche of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only really exemplified by the Chinese example. Hence the psychotic/psychotic schizophrenia of the entire anti-communist swill from Thatcher to Tariq Ali. The anti-China hysteria is also a fraud from the point of view of democracy too.

Democracy can only start with the street committees as apparently operate brilliantly in China (judging from the scaled hate-filled reaction of the West to the unexampled capture, and handing in of the defunct counter-revolutionaries by the popes). The LWP has endless disagreements with the allaround revisionist line pursued by the CPI leadership in China and has no use or need to justify the whole structure of democratic development in China with the ultimate communist aim of achieving a community of the state a few generations hence under the abundance of fully self-disciplining communist society.)

But post-capitalist democracy can only start with street committees, and even these must be led by convinced and capable communists. Only political and economic developments have enabled street committees to effortlessly master all the arts and sciences of harmonious social upbringing and development on a local-issue level will they be philosophically mature enough to handle the whole scale and nation-wide affairs effortlessly too. But meanwhile communist revolution...
any leadership alone can play the vital cohesive role in society.

The real democracy of proletarian dictatorship, - an infinitely more advanced democracy than anything achievable under 'pluralism', - lies in the crucial necessity for the revolutionary leadership to convince the masses of their own role in every detail of the overall correctness of the communist policy and of the all-important role of the masses in communist perspectives, - starting with the absolute need to get street committees working together to make the whole area of community life the absolute problem family remaining on any street in Britain (thereby immediately beginning to solve every 'slum housing' problem in Britain (on the basis that there are no slum houses as such, only slum families), every educational blackspot problem, every cultural dependence problem, the way towards economic renewal eventually providing all the facilities presently lacking for a complete transformation of social life in Britain. It is just a democracy' cynicism to wonder whether or not people should not be allowed to fail, to make mistakes, or fester aimlessly or to re-educate their lives. Similarly, it is only selfish anarchy, not democracy, to argue that people have the 'right' to live whatever sort of life they wish. The truth is that untransformed capitalist 'market', there has never been any end in sight to the winners-and-losers inevitable consequence of an economic system fundamentally of exploitation by one man of the labour of hundreds (or thousands) of others, which unavoidably then determines the way of life, hopes and prospects of success and failure, into get-up-and-go or down-and-out, into responsible-law-abiding or anti-social-element, and finally into worthless-figurehead of the democratic-way-of-life versus criminal-communist-rabble-rouser, and, on the international, democracy and internationally human-rights versus absolute-tyrannical-ruler or communist-regime-conspicuity, etc. In other words, always back to fascist civil strife and inter-imperialist warmongering.

No Leninist can doubt the record of the international system of capitalist 'democracy' producing as much poverty, exploitation, brutality, and degeneracy now as any time in history plus even more destructive arms race, war preparations and conflicts than ever before; and no Leninist can doubt the need to unconditionally support the communist dictatorship in the face of endless imperialist subversion and hostility.

And it is not only the revisionist retreat from Leninism which helped cloud and confuse the appeal of the socialist state in contradistinction to the incurably rotten record of the capitalist system. The artificial hysteria whipped up against the dictatorship of the proletariat in China is a sickness for the capitalist system, not for socialism. It shows that the final shatter of the capitalist state after imperialism is well under way. It is the demoted misrepresentation and distorted analysis of the Chinese workers state which is a blind alley, - not the logical, stable, creative and brilliantly successful dictatorship of the proletariat.

A class-war struggle has taken place in China, with more workers-state soldiers killed than anarchists. There is nothing to judge in terms of 'violence'. Tens of thousands more are being killed each year by capitalist violence of one form or another (famine, infant mortality, disease, civil war, inter-imperialist war, etc.) including the suppression of protests of various kinds (from the Philippines to Chile, from South Africa to Algeria, from the USA to India, from Australia to Pakistan, from Indonesia to Palestine, from Guatemala to Argentina, etc.) What must be judged is who should win, - the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the capitalist-fascist anarchy of 'parliamentary democracy' worldwide? Or as Marxists I should ask the question: Either the dictatorship of the proletariat, or else the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. There is no alternative.

By not supporting the dictatorship of the proletariat in China, the anti-communist 'left' swamp is willy-nilly supporting the dictatorship of the Western bourgeoisie, worldwide.

The charge that there need not have been any violence at all in the recent Chinese conflict is firstly the most trivial hypocritical nonsense since it was such a minor clash compared to the whole bloody history of China under imperialist domination, and compared to the truly colossal slaughter in modern times in anti-communist Third World countries, not just cheerfully condoned by the West but actively encouraged with imperialist arms agreements. The anti-communist press itself admits happened just a few years ago in Indonesia.

Between October 1965 and March 1966 around a million people were killed and thousands more imprisoned.

This military oligarchy has simply eliminated all opposition, imprisoning torture tens of thousands of people over the past 20 years. Newspapers and books which criticise the regime have been closed and trade unions crushed.

But while other despots have been overthrown, President Sukarto lives on, under the continuing political and economic patronage of the Western industrialised powers.

One major aspect of this patronage has been the sale of weapons to Indonesia which still flows into Indonesia, particularly from the US and Western Europe, despite the brutality for which the Indonesian military are responsible.

The US doubled its arms trade with Indonesia and massively increased its military aid to the Sukarto government following Communist victories in Vietnam.

Meanwhile, the Sukarto government is in the business of brutally subjugating Indonesian territory. In 1962, West Papua was occupied, and in December 1975 the Indonesian armed forces launched a full-scale invasion of the former Portuguese colony, East Timor.

Since then, East Timor has been torn by an untold atrocity to atrocities leading to the death of 200,000 people.

Secondly it is an outrageous peace of hubris championing China's state authorities with responsibility for the violence in any case, since they clearly had spent seven weeks bending over backwards to avoid a clash with the protesters, allowing their own police and troops to be frequently present and as they tried to talk to the arrogant and ignorant ana-
Chai Ling, who had organised the hunger strikes, said the occupation should continue and was greeted by the crowds as the movement's 'Commander-In-Chief.'

Today is June 8, 1989. It is now 4pm. I am Chai Ling, Commander-In-Chief in Tiananmen Square. I am still alive.

I believe I am the best qualified critic of the situation in the Square during the period, June 2 to June 4. Allow me to briefly talk about my position. I was Commander-In-Chief.

At 9pm sharp, all of the students in the square stood up and with their right hands raised they shouted: 'I vow that for not to be destroyed by a handful of schemers, for saving our 11 billion countrymen from dying in the white terror, I vow that for to live up to our youth's life to protect Tiananmen Square, to protect the Republic, Heads can fall, blood can run, but the Square can never be abandoned. We are willing to use our youthful lives to fight until the very last person.'

Even with the frenzied fascists' crackdown, a true people's democratic republic will be born. The critical moment has come. My compatriots, we, as Chinese people, wake up. The ultimate victory must be the people's. Yang Shangkun, Li Peng, Wang Zhen and Bo Yibo... the doomsday for your puppet regime is near. Down with fascism! Down with military rule! Long live the republic!
An armored personnel carrier that had sped into the square half an hour before the main assault was blocked by a barricade of bicycle racks. Protesters mumified the APC in banners and cloth, then set it ablaze with Molotov cocktails, trapping its crew of eight or nine soldiers.

C: Don't you think that your present activities would cause disruption in your studies?
S: Yes, for me personally, my studies have been disrupted.
C: Is it true that a so-called "Goddess of Democracy" has been erected in Tiananmen Square? What are your views about this?
You erected a statue of a goddess and according to the newspapers, you have not consulted the people. That is raping public opinion.
S: What is meant by "raping public opinion"? What public opinion have we raped?
C: How do you know that we are staging a coup?
S: Why then has the Beijing Military Region not been mobilizing its troops?
C: I understand that the Beijing Military Region has sent its troops. I am certain of that and in fact the majority are from the Beijing military region. You are wrong on this count. They are the ones who arrived first.
A woman (interrupting and forcing some bread on the soldiers sitting on the ground): Now hundreds and thousands of university students are going through a hunger strike and we are bringing you bread.
C: The newspapers reported that there is an extremely small minority of troublemakers. I can tell you that we are substantial in number.
C: A minority is taking advantage of the patriotism of the students.
S: I don’t care who is using us or who is not using us. We don’t care who is using whom. No matter who the leader is, the leader that makes good is good.
C: Can you guarantee that everything that you are doing is good and that there is no wrong?
S: I can make no such guarantee. It is the general feeling of the masses and it is how I feel.
C: We also support you in your opposition to official profiteering and government corruption.
S: But how do you support us? With what actions?
C: We have received curfew instructions issued by the State Council.
S: Who at the State Council?
C: Li Peng of course! We received orders from above that curfew be imposed. We soldiers have to obey orders.
S: This I know. The troops stationed in Beijing are not around. They have all gone home because they are aware of what actually is going on.
C: A soldier's supreme duty is to obey orders. How can they be away?
S: Because they know the truth and they do not want to carry out the suppression.
C: You can't say that we are executing suppression.
S: You have all been fooled by the officials. When you are fighting ten thousand people, it is a small handful. When you are fighting a million, it is also a handful. You don't know how many, do you?
C: We are here on duty, to protect the law and order of the capital.

Finally, the 'rebel documents' again bring out the treasonable nature of the anarchists' determination to have blood sacrifices. They want their martyrs to have an international appeal to help overthrow the communist government of China, or to wreck its economy.

Before the final decision to clear the square, as is admitted by the above capitulation press caption (and copious other sources—see IMF Books vol 16), the hooligan white terror provocations by the counter-revolution had begun.

Nothing could be more counter-revolutionary than inviting US imperialism to repeat its Grenada blitzkrieg when it claimed it was being "called upon by Grenadian citizens for intervention to restore law and order", etc.

The last despairing Western media gaffes against the Chinese workers state is to extract as much synthesis emotional hypocrisy as possible out of the death sentences for these counter-revolutionary conspirators. But only the most gullible workers in the West are fooled by these huckster sentiments. The "free world" press sang a different tune when it was necessary to justify British imperialism's cold-blooded murder without trial of three Irish nationalists in Gibraltar who were known to be unarmed and in possession of no detonators for a car bomb which had not yet even been planted—and then to justify the Goebbels disinformation blitz lyingly put out by the media to cover up the unlawful killings afterwards.

As for the racist attempts to exaggerate the blood-curdling brutality of a bullet in the back of the head, Fleet Street evidently demonstrates that it is its own values which need attention, not China's. One
lurid piece trying 'colourfully' to sing the praises of the degenerate fascist-individualist dump Hong Kong as against socialist China, tried even to boast in passing that Hong Kong prostitution (a notoriously vicious slave-trade) was really not so bad.

There are neon promotions for Hong Kong's sex industry—a quaintly domestic affair in contrast to the Americanized Babylons of Bangkok and Singapore. Resplendent Cantonese signs frame the doorways plus price lists detailing the durations of services on offer.

Communist China, on the other hand, has instant justice for any pimps trying to organise prostitution: a bullet in the back of the head. Let capitalism keep its 'splendid' neon signs advertising the details of the ultimate in vicious human exploitation. Healthy revolutionary-minded workers everywhere will much prefer communist China's approach to this 'market-oriented' degeneracy.

Vastly improved education is the key to civilisation's future, transforming the narrow horizons of life un-
under capitalism (and the limits placed on socialism, development by imperialist world domination) which reduce individuals to making ends meet however they can — by prostitution, by pimping, by drug dealing, by thieving, by violent crime, etc., — all of which capitalist culture has bequeathed to the world both on the relentless smallscale and on the grandiose corporate-level and government-level scale. And education is not a matter of choice, even under capitalist democracy. It is compulsory.

But it is only compulsory up to the level of elementary education to make people fit for factories, the better to exploit their labour-power.

As against this cynical neglect of bourgeois dictatorship, the dictatorship of the proletariat alone can aim to make compulsory for everyone a total re-education from the demoralised, defeatist, low-achievement standards people are forced into by the rotten pressures of capitalist society.

Votes and opinion polls
do not come into it. There is a clear scientific way forward to reeducate the whole planet towards a harmonious flourishing of the earth and to get out of the catastrophic economic and warmongering crisis. The divisive and exploitative capitalist-imperialist system is inevitably plunging the world ever more relentlessly towards, totally distorting ordinary lives and wrecking the environment through profiteering.

But the class war has to be fought to a revolutionary triumph first, and the dictatorship of the proletariat is the only possible authority which can lead the reorganisation of society afterwards.

Only reactionary morons like Sakharov, given full licence now by the revisionist c of Gorbachev, can utter the total lies that imperialism does not exist, and that it is socialist revolution alone which is responsible for the plight of the world, calling for imperialist sanctions to halt China’s brilliant socialist progress since 1949, and backing That- chera’s renewed Cold War hostility towards the Soviet workers state, claiming that British imperialism’s record has always set the example for the world of peaceful progress.

There is no arguing with such demented anti-communism as this. Lenin repeatedly explained that until the influences of affluent Western imperialist culture are finally overthrown worldwide, then all the old reactionary-idealist confusion will keep on halting socialist progress unless curbed by the dictatorship of the proletariat in exactly the same way that bourgeois dictatorship curbs revolutionary communist influence when it really threatens to topple capitalism (e.g. the CIA’s overthrow of Allende in Chile, plus hundreds more examples of Western imperialism forcibly installing fascist dictatorships throughout the Third World this century).

Gorbachevism is unleashing counter-revolutionary chaos in the USSR, and only firm proletarian-dictatorship action by the Soviet workers state will eventually restore order and progress (as has just had to happen in China on a smaller scale).

Then the West’s anti-communist propaganda industry will have another field day— with endless Oscar-winning sobbing performances by various ‘smuggled tapes’, etc., from ‘pro-democracy’ alleged ‘heroes and heroines’, etc.

But despite such setbacks and despite many current revisionist weaknesses, the socialist camp as a whole will continue to flourish and expand through continued socialist revolutions worldwide. Meanwhile the schizo- phrenic West will increasingly turn in on itself on its way back towards fascist reaction and inter-imperialist warmongering. All the lies about relative socialist-state economic performances compared to the super-profit achievements of the Western world’s leading monopoly-imperialist multinational corporations will evaporate when the real crash arrives shortly and plunges capitalism back towards a 1930s worldwide slump and fascist-warmongering crisis.

The pro-Zionist Sakharov will slink off to Occupied Palestine then to help put the fascist boot into the tortured Arab population who are denied basic rights beyond even the criminal inhuman levels set by British and French colonialism in their hayday, and by US and German imperialism at their most foreign-blocrieg rampaging in Vietnam or World War II.

But eventually there will be no refuge anywhere for the decadent values of subjective-idealist, nationalism, and elitism— not for Zionist imperialism nor for any other privileged bourgeoisie.

Genuine proletarian internationalism will triumph, not the bogus provocation by fascist individualists from Hong Kong trying to disguise their counter-revolutionary intrigues by leading the winging of the Internationals on Tianmen Square, but revolutionary internationalism for the overthrow of capitalism everywhere. Build Leninism. Spread the IMF Bulletin.
Lucky for Gorbachev that the West is in such a mess

The Nato summit confirmed that German imperialism is now the force to be reckoned with in Europe.

The real story of the inter-imperialist conflict is only partially discernible in the detailed conclusions reached. But the general significance of what has happened is unmistakably clear: German imperialism has bluntly declared that it will no longer be a tool of Anglo-US imperialist strategy, and Nato has had to accept this.

British imperialism created the loudest uproar at this unprecedented postwar challenge to Anglo-Saxon dominance, obviously feeling that it has sufficient junior (and weak) position in the alliance was most threatened by powerful new rivals at the top table.

Washington wanted to give the impression, naturally, of coming out on top, but it is necessary to do this with any serious interruption of the imperialist arms race, and this is purely diplomatic game suiting the US foreign interests at the same time as it temporarily takes Gorbachev's persuasive pressure on the White House.

France remains that 'independent' nuclear power with postwar French imperialists' decision to remain closely allied to German imperialism inside the EEC means a struggle with Bonn is less of an issue than it is for the Anglo-Saxons, particularly Britain. And the only role French nuclear 'independence' seems to have played in this diplomatic skirmish was to undermine Thatcher's arrogant stance when it was suddenly declared to the press that France had a 15-year 'special relationship' on nuclear matters with the USA, thereby totally demolishing the British bourgeoisie's pretence to the sole 'special relationship' in Western nuclear affairs.

So the Thatcher/US glib nicks of sudden Cold War Soviet 'spies' expulsions to raise the 'security temperature to stress the value of Britain's 'special strategic nuclear understanding' with US imperialism, was all in vain. Gorbachev's 'special parliamentary reformation' charmade in Moscow was alone undone by this sabre rattling. Gerry Mole

Naive counter-revolution exposed but revisionist language remains

While accepting that a serious split had developed within the Chinese communist party and that every allowance must be made for the polemical struggle to unfold and be successfully concluded to the satisfaction of sufficient (and possibly dubious) proletarian opinion, it seems certain that Peking's conduct of its crisis is an example of socialist revolution in the minds of Western workers.

That much uncertainty should surround the leadership course after 40 years of the workers' state is an indication of what deep and unresolved issues have accumulated in that time, unmissably flowing from weaknesses in Leninist education which alone can dialectically combine pursuit of worldwide proletarian dictatorship with necessary temporary peaceful coexistence tactics while imperialism remains strong and unoverthrown still over large areas of the planet.

It now seems that the most philistine class-collaborating opportunism within the CPO, more in tune with Gorbachev's cross anti-Marxist ignorance (see ILP Book vol 15), has been pushed back, which is a great victory for the revolutionary proletariat in the international balance of class forces. But there is so little reliable Leninist science in the so-called 'conservative' group, and it is so incapable of exposing the stupid anti-Marxist excesses of Gorbachevism, that the Chinese party is still far from providing any coherent alternative to Moscow revisionism, and will remain unable to the foreseeable future.

Thus although the shallow pro-Western fetishism of
the reactionary students movement has been put in its place, the CPC has exhibited its own ideological fraud and defeated the confident decisive leadership of allowing the Western media to make an enormous anti-communist meal out of what was always obviously a very trivial outlook among a minority of the intelligentsia suppressed by a pyramid of workers (see Past Bulletins).

Predictably, this CIA-orchestrated propaganda against the dictatorship of the proletariat has harvested its usual crop of ignorant 'left' dupe among the Western petty-bourgeois, as well as setting up more orthodox 'free world' middle-class opinion for another humiliation.

No sooner had the painful wounds of being hopefully wrong about the 'imminent success' of the Kojeedin communist revolution begun to heal (see Bulletin 459, and others) than the less circumspect among the capitalist press hysterics were screeching: "Students 'scents victory', etc., meaning the overthrow of the Chinese communist regime at last, the first real revolution for the people of China, according to the Guardian's esteemed senior correspondent.

The Western liberals restrained hatred of communism was finally openly matched by the reactionary student circles in China as either despair or cockiness finally brought out their true colours.

Gone was all the 'peaceful', friendly, brotherly, love-facade of the earliest capitalist press reports of the demonstrations in 1966, and out came the effigies of Deng and Li with nooses around their necks, plus fascist provocations claiming authority of Mao and Zhou for 'summoning the present leadership to the grave'.

However, witched a revisionist bureaucrat Premier Li might be, the widely-publicised caricature of him bearing a nazi emblem, carried without opposition on one Peking demonstration, and spread all round Peking University on wall posters, was a hallmark of the ignorant stupidity of the Western consumerism corrupting the minds of this reactionary student movement. There is no arguing with people who cannot see the difference in the contributions to civilization historica-

ly made by the communist movement since the 1840s, and by the concentration camps of Western imperialism in its openly fascist-dictatorship periods of nationalist, that is, the equation is strictly for degenerate morons. And while Li as an individual communist leader may have all of the vices of Stalin's personality and none of its virtues, Li's period of 'rule' is virtually non-existing and without being deposed and nazi emblems about other than pure counter-revolutionary provocations?

No further explanation need be sought either for the 20-foot high replica of the USAs statue of liberty now cast in plastic of another hero of the earlier and less substantial polystyrene, and now placed on Tianamen Square itself, the heart of the Chinese People's Republic. It is quite simply an outrage, which only the very brave would feel to try to catch at in the sight of the monstrous war mongering suffering inflicted on China by US imperialist support for the Kuomintang during China's long civil war and thereafter by the Cold War, the Korean War, the Viet Nam war, the refusal to allow China into the United Nations, and the maintenance to this day by US forces of counter-revolutionary Chinese rearguards on Taiwan, Que moy, Matsu, and other islands off the China coast, etc.

It is precisely great backwash that one is dealing with in the 'left' swamp which has yet again fallen pathetically for the tricks of Western bourgeois propaganda.

It is their fundamental ignominium for Marxists-Leninists which leads those 'left' hoyegless confused about what to make of such contradictory phenomena as have been reported from China this past month. By never starting from basic facts, the 'left' in the first place, the swamp can only ever end up in cloud-cuckoo land at the finish.

Disoriented by the fact that the student youth of socialist China, which was demonstrating, and even more by their singing of the International as they marched, the CFENL, for example, immediately put 2 and 2 together and made inevitably 5 out of it. Their absurd impressionism conclusions: "What is going on in China isn't anti-communist at all. It represents mass dissatisfaction with the capitalist measures of the last decade under Deng Xiaoping... China's workers, fighting against foreign interests that are anti-working class... Multi-party democracy is only what the media's men in China wish it was all about... The last few weeks have marked a return to the country's revolutionary spirit, what is a quarter of humanity... The crowds have been awesome yet gentle, and good order has been maintained throughout by the organizations involved. This is more than 'freedom' as the media quietly calls it... Like the Chinese, we could demand an end to autocracy" (the CFENL ends, comparing the government of the Chinese workers state to the fasci
ist imperialist idocy of Thatcherism).

Out of the subjective follies of nationalism and revisionism, the Peking regime has often behaved outrageously. But to compare the Chinese workers state to the imperialist nations, anywhere on earth, shows a diseased mentality which can never ultimately do anything other than make a complete nonsense of reality.

And if 1,200 million Chinese had really been behind the bourgeois student protest, as the CFENL implies, then this 'revolutionary spirit' could hardly have disappeared without trace within a week of this ridiculous CFENL verdict.

How could a handful of communists around Deng, allegedly, have routed the 'revolutionary spirit' of a quarter of humanity (which was supposedly on the march behind the Statue of Liberty-wielding petty-bourgeois student circles) without even a shot being fired and the same week? It took the entire nationalist bourgeoisie and feudal aristocracy of China, backed by the entire might of the imperialist world, from 1927 to 1949 to try to subdue the 'revolutionary spirit'. The masses of China, when led by its own communist party, and still they failed hopelessly despite countless holocaust-level massacres.

In any case, these students whinges about subjectively-idealistic illusions in bourgeois 'freedom' and 'democracy' are completely the wrong thing to be looking for to challenge the Deng regime with, even assuming there was an atom of sinocentrality or plausibility (which there isn't) in the Peking student-circles protests.

A renewed communist-Leninist interest in trying to progress from the present revisionist middle of the Chinese workers state to the greater scientific socialist society in China is a study that would certainly want to start with the party of leadership itself - to turn it towards becoming a real Bolshevik vanguard rather than have it cancel itself out into parliamentary reformism, as the daf Gorbachev is trying to do.

As the Bulletin first argued a long time ago (see ILPM Books vol 15), there is a case for 'gloasmot' of sorts, but it lies in serious non-stop polemics from the top of the party downward to revolutionary nationalism - a non-stop debate to have out in front of the entire proletariat openly - with the ever-greater active participation of ever-wider sectors of workers who genuinely want to take part in the furtherance of the world socialist revolution.

Under such a simple regime, no 'protest' need ever be taken seriously again. Either you want to be heard because you have a better idea of how to aid the Mozambique revolution against the Western-backed RENAMO fascists, or to aid the Nicaraguan workers state against the CIA mercenaries and Contras, - or you have no 'protest' worth listening to about 'democracy' or 'freedom' or whimpering about the best way for the workers state to survive capitalist encirclement and hostility while doing whatever possible to further the world socialist revolution outside. If the dissident students had anything worthwhile to say at all, they could have said just that. But they said absolutely nothing like that at all.
clearly said: "The Western way of life is the best. We want it for ourselves."

Deng has performed no such miracle of 'routing the great Chinese communist revolutionary movement' with just a few Woodbines and a cough & spit or two, because no such miracle has been called for or even remotely relevant to the miserable little petty-bourgeois student whingeing seen on Tienamen Square. As frequently analysed by the Bulletin, the revisionist CCP has huge problems, as does the entire socialist camp. But the opportunists yearning for Western consumer values of a minority of gilded youth in China (or elsewhere) is just one tiny miserable symptom of the difficulties, and not remotely part of any 'revolutionary spirit' solution.

These protests were precisely in essence spontaneous and anti-communist, with no serious or worthwhile organised demands. It was just a pathetic bleat which did exactly fall for the ridiculous fallacy that it is bourgeois democracy which guarantees the shoddy rock-n-roll consumerism of the West so much admired by these particular student circles. Hence their call for victory in Tienamen Square as a "link to reality" (see copious bourgeois press reports) and their perceived status of liberty.

Singing the Internationale is an obvious gimmick for reactionary provocateurs to pull, and far wider sections of students and workers would have fallen for that, thinking 'internationalism' could as well represent their longing for things American as anything.

But as the Bulletin has previously asked: Why don't these students with the privilege of a higher education in a socialist society have any concrete 'revolutionary internationalist' demands to make of the undoubtedly sclerotic, revisionist, bureaucratic, and corrupt CCP leadership? Why just sing the Internationale? Why not demand an end to support for the Pol Pot petty-bourgeois anarchists? Why not demand an end to support by Peking for the feudal-tribal Mujahedin in Afghanistan or to the military aid to the fascist-minded military dictatorship in Pakistan? Why not demand to be allowed to go and fight beside the workers state in Mozambique and Angola against the fascist-apartheid regime and Western-imperialist backed counter-revolutionary destruction thugs wrecking the building of socialism there?

Because all that these student circles have on their tiny minds is Western rock-n-roll records, Martinis and beer, and the latest fashionably gear - none of which (correctly) the Chinese socialist economy can yet have been able to bother to supply, being fully occupied with more important reconstruction matters.

And what was so 'gentle' about the noosed effigies of Deng and Li, or about the Nazi swastika signs plastered on their caricatures, or about summoning them to the grave??? Like all counter-revolutionary sentiment, these backward bleats would have had a cowardly hole-in-the-corner start, but would quickly have mushroomed into street hangings of communists once mayhem and anarchy had been let loose.

In more ways than one, this miserable spontaneity of anti-communist subjectivism and individualism has exhibited the classic signs of all counter-revolutionary movements, always negative, always concentrating on personalities, always whingeing away destructively in the background, never able to voice clear positive programmes without making utter fools of themselves, etc.

Wales and the Solidarnosc gimmick of the Vatican and CIA millions were always like that, - expressing support for Thatcher against the British miners strike, and hailing capitalist Sweden and Japan as the greatest goal for mankind to emulate (I), when they could be persuaded to do anything other than endlessly complain. And the fabled 'ten million member-
Another view of how the Trot-Euro swamp plays right into the hands of counter-revolutionary reaction came with Socialist Workers coverage of US imperialist pressure on Panama's Noriega regime. It sounds hook, line, and sinker the one counter-revolutionary with a world-wide propaganda output that week—namely that it was vital for US imperialist interests that the whole planet should believe Noriega was up to no good in Panama and that therefore it was Chiricahua Apache Indians to overthrow him, if such a course of action was eventually decided upon by the White House.

So even while the SWP noted the hypocrisy of US interests in turning against their former thug-stooge, more than 100,000 US luminaries for the CIA's propaganda trap in accepting that Noriega was behaving as vitally badly as at any moment as the orchestrated Western media were reporting.

**President Bush has rushed US troops to Panama and announced that he plans to go for a one day general strike on Wednesday in an attempt to bring down the country's military junta.**

"They should do everything they can to get Noriega out of office," said Bush. "We'd like to see him out there."

"I've had the same idea, as well as Noriega himself..."

Point. President Bush is making his first trip to Panama and will pressure the military junta to step down. He plans to bring in US troops if necessary to force out Noriega.

**Leninism will eventually return to the workers states to replace revisionism, but only under the peaceful influence of the continued world-wide socialist movement.**

As a result, the world socialist movement—no the consequence of any proletarian revolt inside the socialist countries. A new revolution would only be on the cards there if there was a completed counter-revolution to oust the dictatorship of the proletariat and establish bourgeois democracy.

In their stupid confusion the CPMN just like the rest of the Trotsky-Euro swamp, are effectively joining forces with just such counter-revolutionary influences, basically all inspired by Western Imperialism.

But even when the miserable lumpen-enigmas in Hong Kong staged their first political demonstrations ever (in honour of the Feking student circles) despite having themselves lived under no democracy of any kind, the non-Marxist pro-Imperialist Governor and never having complained about it, (such are their natural fascist sentiments) the British 'left' swamp still failed to smell a rat about these protests in the Peoples Republic, presumably due to the stench of subjective idealist illusion and individualist opportunities already emanating from the tactics; and only the most gullible anti-communists of the SWP school could swallow whole the stunted-up Western media stories that Noriega behaviour upstaged the USA was only thuggish, and nothing else, thereby justifying US invasion.

The SWP failure—thus a US invasion had the White House decided upon that.

The straight bourgeois press did better than its 'left' petty-bourgeois imitators at the anti-communist SWP.

**Difficult to accept is the current hypothesis that he is the worst thing in the Western democracies that are immediately overthrown, jeopardises democracy in the New World and vital interests of the USA.**

Not so. It is a sad fact that throughout Latin America there are regimes much worse than Noriega's: regimes which have systematically imprisoned their citizens on a large scale; mocked the civilized world for their human rights abuses and terrorist tactics outside their borders and which are on their way to the benevolent neglect of Western democracies because of lack of support for them by Western society.

Why? The US General Augusto Pinochet still there after more than 15 years of suffering and to my secret police have committed bestialities against their own people; tortured a British surgeon because he did his duty as a doctor; and blew up a man and a woman, the latter an American, inside a car in Washington. But the Pinochet regime has not been subject to a fraction of the behavior that has besmirched Noriega. Indeed the 'Chilean model' of being held up by a number of western governments is as some sort of economic paradigm.

Why was General Alfredo Stroessner allowed to keep Paraguayans in subjection? The Paraguayan government for 44 years — yes 44 years — with the help of his European friends, why were they allowed to get away with it? Why was there no international condemnation? Why were Western nations a party to the dictatorships in Port-au-Prince was a British prime minister on the Cote d'Azur.

And why are huge amounts of Western military equipment still going to the army in El Salvador? That army has been guilty of more individual murder in the past 10 years than Manuel Noriega has ever dreamt of. And why are the recently elected Government of Nicaragua still subsidised and whose leaders given extensive aid? The Sandinista leadership is denied access to the UN General Assembly in New York?

The bourgeois-anarchist cypher at Private Eye did even better:

**The Reluctance of President George Bush and his normally gangster Pentagon chiefs to take military action against Manuel Noriega of Panama is not based on the physical difficulty of overcoming the ragtag Panamanian defence forces.**

The fact is that Pineapple Face knows much about too many people involved in a case of illegal US activities over the last 20 years or more. Noriega himself was, as head of the agency, charged with the assassination of Archbishop Romero. Under Bush's watchful eye, the man the US press sees as a "dictator" began running American weapons System in Central America, enabling banned US technologies to Cuba and probably giving American-made weapons to the US of A of itself. It was also in this period that Bush men were accused by the most effective undermining of US drug smuggling operations — he simply passed on advance payments for the planes and the pilots.

The tin-pot dictator has been busy. As head of Panamanian intelligence from 1970 to 1981, Noriega developed his cunning espionage techniques, from recruiting agents on anyone and everyone in the US military and government. The doctors started in the early 1970s, when a embassy in the Ancon Inn, a brothel outside the American military base in Panama. He taught his agents to collect blackmail material on officers who are now at the top of the US military tree.

In 1970s, through a membership association with senior CIA officers such as Nestor Sanchez, Bush met Noriega where he offered him $20,000 for CIA files on US officials personal and political problems.

The dossier on Bush which has become one of the fastest, was taken to Washington by Noriega at his first meeting with the then CIA chief in 1976.

US lawyers who represented Noriega in the courts have since been charged last year said they had a file of documents 'designed to embarrass' Bush. There is no reason to doubt them, they have five times told more on the mumblings about Bush's involvement in the Noriega affair than Washington, in cahoots with Noriega, was recommended for the murder of Noriega's predecessor, Oscar Torrijos, in 1981. The plan was believed to have been hatched by right-handers at the Bush-directed CIA in the autumn of 1980.

In a joint statement, the Nabokov committee of the US Senate agreed with the findings of the CIA's illegal attack on US intelligence in Central America, in the aftermath of the US attack on the Panamanian navy gunboat June 20, 1989.

The White House has known Noriega for a long time. He was arrested when he was a child and later given a temporary release. Noriega was released again in 1985 and later conducted a secret election in the country under the guise of a military junta. Noriega's candidacy was supported by the US military and he was eventually elected as the head of the military junta. The US invasion of Panama was the result of the failed coup attempt against Noriega in 1989.
It is imperialist crisis which has not changed

The Thatcherite patronising arrogance towards the Soviet workers state has remained the same since fascist-imperialist circles (from the first moments of the 1977 Revolution) began trying to sabotage economically and wipe out militarily the spread of socialism. The Soviet Union was riddled with Western counter-revolutionary agents and spies, and 14 'free world' nations sent armies on the first murderous War of Intervention (1918-21) towards the West, and the USA; and another seven European countries joined German imperialism's second destructive onslaught from 1914 to 1945, built up by the West's 1950s policy of encouraging Hitler as a 'liberator of the non-communists'.

The KGB's (under various titles) has been defending its security interests from Western subversion ever since Lenin immediately set it up, using all the 'free world's intelligence-gathering techniques but using them better.

Thatcher's expulsion of 11 Soviet personnel is the Cold War as usual, Moscow's expulsion of British imperialist representatives is a correct step to reduce the filth of capitalist-bourgeois influence inside the USSR.

British imperialisms war-mongering circles underlined their unchanging counter-revolutionary arm-race mentality with aggressive contempt: 'The Soviet Union's response to that deliberate restraint on 18-21 shows how far they still have to go to live up to the standards of behaviour the free world regards as normal', etc.

Whether this meant the Pentagon's death squads at work against the revolution in El Salvador, or the SAS killings in keeping down Republican Irish nationalists on the streets of Gibraltar, wasn't specified.

Thatcher added, to beef up British imperialism's dirty role in the inter-imperialist war-mongering rivalry and the cut-throat economic and strategic competition, roles have decided to jolt against Germany's alleged 'gullibility, and appeasement-softness towards the Communist Evil', etc, as well as other tactics.

This attack on Cold War confrontation and class truculence has left the revisionist off Orbach with egg all over his face, and needing to retaliate hard (threatening 70 British expulsions from Moscow) in order not to appear a complete failure to the revisionist 'new politics' nonsense which has pretended that the Cold War is over.

The Cold War will carry on full blast until the very last day of the imperialist systems survival. All in has ever done, and all it could ever do, is to sustain the capitalist last,- is to change its form and emphasis from time to time.

As the Bulletin has consistently explained (see ILP Book 4 vol 13), the management system of the Soviet workers state can by its very class essence never capitulate totally to the non-stop Western propaganda trying to undermine its defenses and its confidence in socialism; and despite the nonsense of 'new politics', Moscow will always ultimately be obliged to defend Soviet interests when called upon, and will always have the capacity to do so more than adequately against the dy- ing imperialist-war-mongering system.

Thatcher still maintains that their differences with Germany are all in the 'noble cause of defending the free world', etc, rather than the reality which is to do with cut-throat trade war.

That it is this imperialist creation which is the truly unchanging feature of worldwide turmoil is underlined by British imperialism's simultaneous rows with the German-led Common Market over various issues, and with the Bundesbank over how to intervene against the new currency soaring dollar, as well as over the renewal-of-short-range nuclear-weapons issue (important for British arms-trade contracts and for rubbing in Germany's strategic subservience) over which the British war-mongering oligarchies, incapable of combining dialectically the necessary pursuit of the world socialist revolution with the necessary temporary peaceful coexistence dictated to keep the imperialist countries alive and enable it its forces and policies together for one final armageddon onslaught against the USSR and socialist camp, will within a short time be back at its destructive game of dissolving the proletariat in the capitalist world by breaching 'new politics' once again, and pretending that 'imperialism has completely changed its war-mongering spots and that world peace is now assured for ever by capitalism and communism living in perfect harmony, etc.

Tragically, no more of rude slaps in the face with a wet fish from Thatcherism will prevent the cowardly class-collaborating philosophy of the middle-class bureaucracy from returning (like a dog to its vomit) again and again to the subjective-idealistic illusion of class-collaboration; worse than ever under Gor- bachev but exactly the same anti-Leninist destabilising element creating many confusing difficulties from Stalinism rule onwards, and very damaging to Socialism when called upon, and will always have the capacity to do so more than adequately against the dy- ing imperialist-war-mongering system.

But the bureaucratic decay of revisionism will always persist by never trying to replace one piece of anti-Leninist nonsense with another in the regular 'shake-up reform' gimmickry with which Moscow bureaucracies have tried to keep things going since their understanding of socialism and world revolutionary perspectives disintegrated af- ter Lenin's death.

Western imperialist sharp practices and propaganda successes against Moscow gullibility can only ever get so far without running into the irreducible materialist interests of the Soviet workers state; but at the same time the philosophical complicity of Gor- bachevism, etc.
and attitudes represent.

While never very far from turmoil, the international scene in shares, currencies, and interest rates has been particularly close to hysteria and panic in recent months. Another major crisis is imminent—possibly this time proving near-fatal to some capitalist regimes, and certainly giving a massive new boost to the world socialist revolution, and taking the trumps off Gorbachevism once again.

Thatcherism is especially at risk in view of British imperialism's chronic lack of industrial competitiveness and the growing balance-of-trade deficits, coupled with the worst inflation of the major Western rivals. Some over-value rate wars are going on around the yo-yo dollar; and the German Bundesbanks decision to cease buying up its out-of-it reserves the soaring billions of the American currency, may mean London will soon have to compete for surplus funds against higher European rates—thus putting down its international role yet again in Britain.

While these vicious circles spiral ever upwards towards eventual collapse, the so-called 'peace-loving' in Moscow (bureaucrats' eyes) bourgeoisie has become the fifth power in the world. After the US and France (the USSR and China) to perfect its own medium-range ballistic missile.

The capitalist press's own 'protests about the system's endgame' could not conceal the war-mongering significance of this event, try as it might to deflect attention from the 'peaceful' nature of the new missile.

India has become the major power of its kind in the East. While its economy is not strong, it has a well-developed technology to become one of the bigger arms producers (not export-oriented).

While it is correct for Moscow and the socialist countries to oppose war, it is equally incorrect to call the Indian state's actions 'peace-loving,' when they are being used to strengthen the war-mongering capitalist world system. And this is just as relevant to the imperialist war in China as anywhere else, as the following story shows.

US imperialism's 'low intensity' invasion threat is obliterating the state of Panama. The US soldiers training near the Panama Canal surveys the battlefield.
Not the best China

Building a polystyrene Statue of Liberty and pleading to Western newsreel to aid their protest shows the reactionary naivete of the dissident movement in China.

A communist campaign to unseat the martial law regime would be contrary to the long-term progress. But replacing warlords in China is bureaucracy by anarchic/opportunism illusion in bourgeois democracy would mean jumping out of the frying pan into the fire to a catastrophic degree.

China has been the faithful revisionist group of leadership in Peking, the complete collapse of the ruling communist party would be even worse. Only the imperialist-dominated nonsensical subjective-idealism could spontaneity renew and then sweep away the disintegration of the CCP.

The only successful guiding philosophy there can be for a workers state is Marxism-Leninism, and while the communist party in China has been revisionist for decades, the rest of the socialist camp, some basically well-ordered development is continuing all the time through planned economic expansion plus organisational, educational and scientific advance. The Chinese people, like most of the rest of the socialist world, are no space power, a nuclear power, an industrial power, and so much better fed, coordinated, and motivated than ever before in modern history that the humiliations for China from imperialism throughout the 19th century, the 1940s of the 20th century, have been colonised and militarily slaughtered, and subjected to degrading inferiority in every kind, will not again be thinkable, and already seem like something from the dim and distant past.

Such are the history-making, immeasurable achievements of the Chinese Communist Party.

The CPC has nearly 50 million members and is a representative of the best elements of the people of China as anything could be.

The bureaucratic opportunism and revisionist complacency within the party leadership itself is a common phenomenon of all working states in the circumstances of imperialism continued survival, hostility and pressure, and where the regime fails to deepen Leninist understanding sufficiently to be able dialectically to combine some degree of necessary peaceful co-existence diplomacy with the all-important philosophical perspective and social motivation of helping to complete the world revolution.

From the very first moment that any workers state government capitulates to reformism gimmickry and empty promises as a 'solution' to massive problems which any international economic domination based social harmony can strive for (all imperialism and capitalism-market competition are overthrown), and starts deliberately stalling the only possible scientific understanding of these matters (Leninism), then relative social peace and stability is sure to be short lived.

The solution to China's problems is a renewal of Leninism within the party. Exactly the same is true of the 'problems', such as they are, facing other socialist countries, like the USSR itself. There is little chance of the Leninist solution re-stabilising China's situation due to any influence in the socialist camp outside of the ruling parties, and any collapse of power into hands other than those of the communists would inevitably create an even greater disorganisation than would continue under the revisionist party.

As longsore and destructive as corruption is among communist officials, these old vices of petty-bourgeois state bureaucracy spring from society itself and its relative backwardness, against which only a deeper commitment to Leninist science is proof.

They do not at all spring from the socialist revolution itself and its necessary class-rule form of proletarian dictatorship. Just the opposite. Not only does corruption allow the state to avoid social revolution too much corruption that the viciously criminal mafia is just one small relatively indistinguishable part of the rotten whole, but the social-democracy of the bosses (the 'democratic socialist way') are always far more bent than the workers and their online conservative-party movements ever know how to be (study the record of Labour councils and governments in office in Britain, for example).

On top of that, such corruption as there is in the socialist world has been precisely not in the earliest revolutionary-inspired years of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the different countries but only later on when the need still to partly coexist with the rest of the world. Hence imperialisation has begun to blunt each party's firm Leninist edge, and, through weakness in dialectical philosophical understanding, begun to weaken the ever-increasing pull of battling on 95% for the completion of the socialist revolution, via the overthrow of imperialism.

It is only if fired by revolution that confident leadership of the dictatorship of the proletariat can enhance the country's honest and most democratic social order so far in human history.

But where workers start to lose sight of and to lose confidence in the international-planned-economy solution to the problems of the socialist camp and of armed race and Cold War competitiveness, then small-minded philistine conservatism and bureaucratism can complacently quickly disillusion workers and lead on to revisionist gimmickry and arbitrariness most notably associated with the CPSU.

The general sentiments of the demonstrations in China of wanting more decisive leadership for the workers state are not invalid; but anarchic and spontaneous mass protests are no substitute for a properly functioning party of Leninist cadres.

Obviously, the party's failure is the leadership's failure, but once again the arbitrary selection or sacking of leaders by a Western media-oriented mob of students who have yet to show any understanding of anything let alone a detailed grasp of Bolshevik revolutionary science (starting with Lenin's entire collected works) sufficient to make the party's decisions for it about which he said is clearly a poor substitute.

The way this strange short-term conflict has been going in Peking and elsewhere, it would seem that some decisive firmness is going to be needed from somewhere in the workers state leadership. When this would appear to coincide with Marxist scientific expectations too.

Whether they like it or not, and however justified their protests, the students nevertheless by their entire conduct in this dispute regard class-free intrinsic hostility to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Their singing of the Internationale is pure opportunism without the slightest sympathy or understanding at all of the song's urgent content for socialist revolution. Their incoherent drivel about 'democracy' has given a field day to the CIA-fascist circles of imperialism at the head of Western bourgeois 'democracy'. Their mocking up to the denigrated anti-communism of the Western media is equally counter-revolutionary. Their posturing of making an...
could never be—in the case of the existing socialist camp revisionist leadership— a route back towards anything like a complete Leninist rehabilitation, — it remains a simple scientific reality that all programmes and policies of the ruling class are dictated, and the need to take on reaction is the starting point for all revolutionary development.

Generally speaking, the normal plodding along health of the Chinese workers state is not in any doubt. The question is one of penetration of the 'reformist' activity by a basically Stalinist and conservative regime, — a society becoming more and more like the Soviet Union every day, no longer inspiring the imagination, but, as the US government proved over the years, now showing itself more and more the 'chaotic collapse and reaction to capitalism' of Western bourgeois dreams, and all the time becoming an ever-stronger and more stable influence on world affairs, even if hopelessly out of touch with the most minute economic and political international understanding, which via the actual overthrow of imperialism here, there, and everywhere will finally lead to the world-planned socialist economy, solution to cut-throat market anarchy and arms-race competition, the destruction, and destruction, affecting all peoples.

The polycentric Structure of Liberty, the naive trick with Western reporters, the defacing of Mao's portrait, etc., are all millions of miles remote from the real needs of the Chinese people (and still of the international proletariat generally, — see lead story).

As explained, such phenomena, however far removed they may be from any serious counter-revolutionary conspiracy, — nevertheless hardly reflect or represent the normal state of the proletarian class dictatorship in the international balance of class forces. They much more echo the colossal pressures and needs of reactionary bourgeois propaganda on the planet. The Western imperialist media are not by accident obsessed with the future of the workers state, and almost drunk with the intoxicating speculation about the possible collapse of communist party authority, etc.

A paralysed upheaval for working-class involvement and support, but with the self-doubt within the Moscow leadership that the gradual defeatist retreat from world revolutionary socialist perspectives (Leninism) was made possible by the non-communist workers state would it appear be the case. Much more confidently and boldly will Japanese imperialism now speed up its rearmament programme and its aggressive challenge to Western monopoly-capitalism political dominance (now that the feudal-capitalist cohesiveness of Japan has been wiped out economically).

Bourgeois propaganda will instinctively have a field day against Chinese workers state turmoil on principle, even if it hasn't yet worked out what a feeble Peking would necessarily be to every sort of repressive vagabondage (as some of the more thoughtful Tories like Heath have directly prayed).

The worst thing now for the socialist camp and the world socialist revolution would be Stalinism in China which would forever leave the impression that there is no need for any serious workers state leadership in Peking, and that therefore no one need ever fear any serious rebuff, on anything, from a socialist system in which the ruling regime has no little inspiration for, or control over, the ordinary workers of the country. The pathetic lack of leadership over the last 10 days, it will be difficult for the communist party vanguard to guide affairs confidently ever again.

Corbachov has come close to making a similar role for the European countries in the present paralysis of firm direction over scores of issues from Zionism disadvent and anti-Leninist propagandists to its importance over increasing petty-bourgeois nationalist reaction in the Soviet Union.

The illusion of glasnost openings or just insinuations in Peking are no way round a generations-long problem of falling to carry the proletariat and intelligentsia masses with the workers state via constantly deepening involvement of the people in the revolutionary socialist affairs of state.

The problem began in the USSR not with any lack of desire to encourage ever-wider sectors of active workers' mass organisations and federations, but with the self-doubt within the Moscow leadership that the gradual defeatist retreat from world revolutionary socialist perspectives (Leninism) was made possible by the non-communist workers state, and almost drunk with the intoxicating speculation about the possible collapse of communist party authority, etc.

While having to fight against reaction and anarchy it has been noted that the situation in China requires a new approach to the problems of the Chinese workers state, and the Chinese workers state can only develop on the basis of firm leadership and a strong working-class support.
Illusions about peace are concealing imperialism's war drive

If Chinese student protests prove a catalyst for reforms in the workers state, it will be a tribute to the communist revolution for organizing a society where peace can prevail. The dilemma of capitalism, just as the demonstration, is a matter of political content of their demands is oddly enough better than the demonstration itself. Singing the International is just a philistine posture. These favoured youth are making no communist demands for world socialist revolution. Just the opposite. Their confused 'democracy' calls to have it all for the slightest awareness among students that for tens of millions of really poor and especially suffering people, an international war is being fought out right now, precisely against colonialism, that instead of the Philippines to Chile and from Namibia to Pakistan, in favour of proletarian revolution.

The CPC leaders have failed to bring up at least this part of young China in a Leninist understanding of the crucial historic role of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the world socialist revolution as the only route for guaranteeing the real beginnings of emancipation for everyone through the overthrow of imperialism, in the clear Marxist philosophical understanding that the freedom for each is the condition of fundamental freedom of all which only communism can provide. Until then, there is only one dictatorship of the proletariat or the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, no third way.

Idealistic Fencing students should be demonstrating for the right to go and fight by the side of the Marcos regime. This makes no sense against the Western-organised fascist forces from the Philippines to Chile and from Namibia to Pakistan, in favour of proletarian revolution and support of the entire socialist camp.

Gorbachev has no use to the real needs of the masses in China (or elsewhere) because he shares Fencing's view that the only way to resolve the conflict between the West and the Soviet Union is to seek peace. This is not only an illusion, but a danger to the entire socialist camp. The reactionary 'peace' that Gorbachev loves the student demonstrations because to build communism is a futile one.

The aim either to be a totally national social movement dedicated to scientific communist revolution or to continue to make agreements must either be resolved in completely ridiculous or else openly and consciously coexisted with until a solution can be found. What is an impossible attitude is for the opposition to the idea of deliberately conceal its conclusions and differences from another section, or from the party in general, for whatever reason. This is a completely non-communist approach. Exclusively proclaiming a brand new, "being shouted at", etc., are a hopeless nonsense. Whatever else may happen, may lead to, it certainly is not a communist party which is going to be built.

Crucially, the revolutionary party historically is the only place where a future leadership of society can be trained, where the collective understanding of all problems in society, and able to respond to developments promptly and correctly in any revolutionary way which society's existing leadership is clearly incapable of solving. These are the problems of the management of the economy, housing, education, transport, local communities, philosophical outlooks, etc. under capitalism, or under a succession of Ayr and Labour governments, when in this country and throughout the 'free' world.

The degree to which some developments within the socialist camp have run into problems today since 1978 has been precisely that degree to which the

SECTION SEVEN
(First published May 17, 1989 in ILWP Bulletin 495)

No revolution without totally scientific Leninist outlook

The ICPs recent experience of having to defeat nationalist opportunities which tried to outst the Party's revolutionary perspectives has valuably underlined some crucial lessons of Bolshevik development. The Party might have learned to learn in other circumstances. The broadest conclusion is that building a party is not merely a task of organizing and strengthening which can apply to almost any 'progressive' activities and purposes but is in fact a most difficult and specialized task of consciousness of the whole revolutionary fight, and a question of experience gained by Leninism alone. It is something far more than just a well-meaning collection of self-sacrificing individuals, sharing the idea of the independent theoretical understanding and practical experience of cadres paradoxically plays in the making of a Bolshevik party.

As a general approach, people must convince themselves of the correct analysis and the right way to do things. But once having reached their conclusions, it is then crucial for any differences to be kept in front of the party in organized consciously polemics. It is farcically unscientific to indolently repeat valuable political experiences thanks to the broad experience the Party has adopted, but then start treating the conclusions as something "the party would never approve" or something else "they would not appreciate", or something that would not agree with", etc. This is the subjective-idealistic philosophy of idealism, or individualism, something far from the need for cadres to make their own personal experience of the correctness or otherwise of the party's general lines.

This is the fatal assumption that "as long as I understand things correctly then the party will be right". Hopelessly wrong. Without a constantly expanding common party understanding of the most advanced scientific knowledge it is possible to develop and impart, the task of building an eventual vanguard leadership capable of transforming the entire proletariat and progressive intelligentsia into a new revolutionary ruling class prepa-
ruling communist parties were not trained sufficiently enough in a Leninist scientific-philosophical outlook.

Bureaucratic decay comes from that philosophical legacy of unreconstructed subjectivism-idealism such as not making changes in time or even recognizing the need for changes, which in turn results from a confused, uncertain grasp of the overall world revolutionary perspective and the place for each nation's socialist revolution within that pattern — an ignorance of Leninism.

The more advanced the revolutionary epoch, the more advanced the communists have to become in order to cope with all the complexities of modern society's illusions, philistinism, and confusion. Imagine giving permanent political and social tasks to the workplace, the local community, the trade union branch, the local school, the Labour Party ward, etc. Mature mastery of personal development problems and every relevant bit of modern scientific understanding about the course that the world would be required, and more besides. Communists have to make this preparation first and foremost inside their own party — the highest point of the class struggle. If you can't face up to the need to develop these issues inside the party, then it will automatically transform into a competent party of mature social leadership anywhere else.

The very highest standards are demanded of membership of the revolutionary party. It is pointless to build any other kind of party.

All the necessary links to the masses through workers who don't themselves aspire to party membership but admire other workers who do, will flow from such an outstanding leadership. The Vietnamese communists had only 5,900 members when in 1945 it set up its first short-lived independent socialist republic, quickly re-establishing itself after first routing French imperialism before then going on to rout US imperialism. Conditions are ripe for the same type of unadventurist, pre-advanced Leninist party as the imperialist West slithers into its monstrously complex but inevitable decay.

Development of Leninism is the key. Every interest-

Given or difficult point of conflict on tactics, strategy, broad political programme, party building, etc., should involve every member for polemical discussion. It is the only way for the party to learn. Far more articles about the party, politics, and social developments should be attempted in the programme, but certainly should be raised in discussion. It is the party's knowledge which finally counts, not "my activity".

There is no room for the monstrous complacency and philosophical dead-end of "it will all happen anyway—odds will develop whether I put myself out or not". The only correct philosophical sense in which it can be confidently stated that the necessary social and political forces will develop to topple imperialism is if one is living proof of that confidence. The only answer to those who say "it will happen" regardless of their own activity is to say that with just people like you around, it certainly won't happen. The victory of socialist revolution is inevitable to insist non-stop that the victory of socialist revolution is necessary.

And the most effective way of achieving this, paradoxically, is not to commit ourselves to a useless activism but much more importantly through complete rationality. An ice-cold brain which can knowledgeably sort out the complex political and social problems of building the revolutionary movement in its entirety is the most pragmatically effective against injustice than anything else.

What is or wasn't inevitable in revolutionary history is in the end totally uninteresting. Solving what was done wrong and what must be done right is the only way to live. Build Leninism.

---

**Capitalist reaction beaten in Afghanistan**

A year ago (May 1968) the Soviet expeditionary forces helping the 1978 Afghan Revolution to impose CIA-financed and organised counter-revolution from across the Pakistan border, hand-picked military control of the Jalalabad region back to the pro-Soviet state army and began to pull out. The Western capitalist press admits that talk now of counter-revolution (Pakistani-inspired victories) is lunacy. The class forces of socialism are defeating the class forces of imperialism.

This triumph symbolises the ascendancy of communism within the international balance of class forces as nothing else can, and it will have incalculable consequences worldwide on all current and subsequent struggles for the socialist revolution.

Attempting to subvert the 1978 Afghan Revolution has been the costliest-ever of the CIA's covert operations, and is now its most expensive and disastrous failure, comparable in its way with the devastating military intervention into Vietnam by the Vietnamese communist revolution (and by the revolutions of Laos and Cambodia) on the full-scale imperialist forces of the US war machine, the mightiest in capitalist history. The success of the Afghan revolution was not just another form of anti-communism — fearing to associate too closely with anything which might just go down as "another Stalinist disaster" with their puppet friends in Kabul.

But being against Solidarnosc or the Mujahideen, but refusing unconditional support to the Warsaw and Kabul regimes in their life-and-death struggles
against imperialist counter-revolution, regardless of the non-stop criticisms which have to be made of the weak revisionist ideology of the socialists crowning this is a complete nowhere position.

But nearly nine years later, the hoes 'Leninists' still has its foot more firmly in the mouth of the same... or to be specific its viciously middle-class anti-communist subjectivism came a spewing back out like a sewer in its No 73 issue, full of hate-filled defeatism about the anti-imperialist struggle, and incurably backwards and limited. The workers states for this, in typical fake 'ultra-left' fashion.

'The Afghan Revolution - looks like it is about to be drowned in its own blood. It gives no pleasure to be proved right about Afghanistan. .............................. as a result of Gorbachev's treachery the Afghan revolution faces the most agonising, lonely and barbaric of destinies. And the Thought of the Khoj ib and his fellow Parcham opportunists will do no good... courting the counterrevolutionaries will only foster demoralisation and give the Mujahedeen a sense of impotence, women will be subjected to the most appalling humiliations, trade unions will be crushed and those who object will be tortured and sometimes killed. The country will fall into the hands of Islamic warlords who consider the only good communist a hated to death communist. Whatever our left groups say, once the Soviet armed forces pulled out Afghanistan's descent into this reactionary hell was more or less certain.

The 'Leninist' pretence of having 'supported' the Afghan Revolution, 'if critically is nonsense. In this armchair socialist sect's first publications, they started out with generalised defeatism, almost maliciously gloating (because of their in-truth, deeply anti-communist class position) about the extinguishing of the flame of the revolution in Afghanistan immediately the Soviet invasion took place. And in the so-called 'imperialist struggle' had begun, -adding gory anthropologies about "facing death" and "major amputations", etc. But to anybody other than fake 'revolutionary' academic hysterics, it was obvious that the major shift in historic class forces (booth with the Afghanistan's and the Soviet intervention to confront imperialism-backed counter-revolution), the fundamental essence of real revolution, could not be so easily extinguished, or 'amputated', or 'faced with death'.

Not surprisingly, the closest thing to the blood-bath is the defeatism of the left. Like the fake 'left' is a self-righteous, small-minded triumphalist relish with which the rest of the political petty-bourgeoisie (typified by rightwing journalists) have also previously been greeting the presumed phenomenon of the Afghan Revolution running out of its own blood' (Copyright the Leninist MMMXXXIX). Obviously they all share a fear of the dictatorship of the proletariat ever really coming to power. From being able to afford to drink in the same Irlington pubs under the illusion of the safe and the happy era before the outburst of American imperialist inflationary boom, the right petty-bourgeoisie get the courage to boast of Kabul's imminent demise while the 'left' petty-bourgeoisie luxuriate in pretended 'revolutionary indignation' that their own claimed 'Leninist purity' had not been lived up to by Moscow (while in reality delight to be spared the potential social embarrassment around Barmsho of seriously having to defend unconditionally the PDP regime in all its conflicts with imperialist-bourgeois influences, while ruthlessly criticizing the bourgeoisie in Kabul and Moscow - the only real Leninist position).

The language with which the rightwing middle class anticipated defeat for the revolution in Afghanistan was almost universally the Joyce 'fear of the left' middle class, much more shallowly disturbed by the general historical consequences of class upheaval than scientifically rational about the cold hard facts of the specific international balance of class forces.

Fleet Street wrote in January the following about Kabul itself, 'never mind such easy pickings as Jalalabad much closer to the Pakistan frontier across which the CIA-financed counter-revolutionary mercenaries were这支ergency.

TE cruel spectre of starvation haunts Kabul as frightened families freeze for hours in bread queues, fighting for their meagre rations as they watch the retreat of the Red Army rumbling past them.

With just over three weeks to go before the last Soviet soldier leaves, the Afghan capital is paralysed by a fear of what happens next. City's heart of tragedy are the children - youngsters who knew nothing but hope and despair, but who in the pathetic belief that their elders will provide them with a scrap of bread. Yet another loaf of bread which is running perilously short. Mobs become stockpiling whatever food they can act as bakeries as soon as supplies arrive.

A Soviet soldier on guard duty was shot dead yesterday as he tried to stem the rush of men and women, weakened by hunger and despair, to the bakeries in the streets as they wait for a last crust.

Slowly, but surely, the Mujahedeen are assembling the capital with their rocket attacks on food convoys, waiting for the chance when the Russians have gone to move in for the kill.

The only value the Red Army has is to keep its tail between its legs and keep the murderous hands off Kabul's throats for a few more days.

All westerners have been ordered to fly out while they can. And if the US Army here after the Red Army is gone be before their February 15 deadline to avoid an unattractive death.

But apart from rampant Western rockets killing innocent civilians every week in Kabul, the capital has in reality come under not the slightest danger of a 'rapid triumph for the Mujahideen, or of imagined anarchy'.

Everywhere else is relatively quiet. In Kabul, the CIA-aligned 'freeworld press', the vulnerable frontier town Jalalabad which was expected to collapse within hours after the Feb 15 final Soviet pull-out with scarcely a fight, - in fact now counter-attacks by the besieging mercenaries.

And this month's Fleet Street press reports tell an entirely different story about who is going to win the class war in Afghanistan.

In the city parks have been given over to pits for tanks and ammunition dumps, and are being used to allow helicopters to land.

The city guards the route to Pakistan through the Khwaja. It was said that it would be impossible to man a new government and a provisional Mujahideen government would be set up there.

But peasants were gathering again in the fields, parading in the streets, and the dusty roads of the city with their carts.

That the regime of President Najibullah agreed to Western jet fighters taking off from its bases, despite repeated refusals until only last week, indicates Kabul believes it has seized the initiative in the contest for the city in some session. After a helicopter flight from the capital, which was an epic in itself, our party was deposited unceremoniously in a wheatfield on the north-west side of the old city in the early morning.

We were whisked past 1000 choppers which featured T54 Russian tanks and anti-aircraft guns lowered for firing along the ground; these are the preferred weapons for the close defence of the 800000-strong capital.

Behind them stood several white villas, pitted and scarred, their roofs caved in - once the impressive seats of provincial government. 'Dear journalists, you are welcome,' said a dapper figure clad in light khaki tank suit, white shirt, and Paris designer shoes.

Mohamed Safar Khoarabi, deputy governor of the city, added: 'You have heard how the Mujahideen claim to have put the airport out of action, and the east of the city.

Even set up part of their government in a church of the city. Now look for yourselves.'

The first stop of the tour in a gently disintegrating bus was the airport, to the east of the old city, its main building had been ripped out from time to time.

Every building had received a direct or indirect hit from the guerrillas' heavy-calibre rockets.

But the main apron and central section of the runway seemed in good repair, albeit heavily pitted.

The bitterness with which we were taken there indicates that the government forces have now pushed their outer perimeter defences to well beyond five miles outside the town in several directions, suggesting that there have been some successful recent counter-attacks.

'We have sustained up to 30 rockets on the course or the day, said a ferocious moustached air force officer. Clearly the Baron Munchausen of the Caravanserai had been at work for this would have been the firepower of an army for a small campaign.'

The officer in charge, Lt-Col Jahan Gir, explained more sardonically that the airport could now function in emergencies. 'If we have to, we can get transport planes in here, though most supplies come by road,' he said.

A more omen piece was given at a briefing by the two commanders at Jalalabad, ColGen Mohamed Azef Delwar, who is Pushto, Eastern Front, and the Governor, Lt-Gen Mirzad Khan Mangal.

The governor said it was five days short of a year since the Soviet garrison handed over the
the city of Jalalabad to the Afghan Army, "which since then has heroically defended it."

In the past two months, according to the governor, the city has been bombarded from about 150,000 artillery, rocket and heavy mortar rounds.

Rather less plausibly he insisted that the Mujahideen had suffered 15,000 casualties.

Both generals blamed Pakistan and its Inter-Service Intelligence Department, and what they called a "terrorist band and Arab" instructors on the other side, for the prolongation of the war.

According to Gen. Delwar, road convoys are now supplied from Jalalabad every day. "The garrison force is more than adequate to defend the population of 170,000 now in the city," he said.

Gen. Delwar seems to be the architect of the highly-effective - if in a typically Afghan way - defensive strategy for Jalalabad.

He appears to have a force of between 25,000 and 35,000, which is continuously shifting its defensive positions for tanks, rockets, and light artillery, digging new trenches almost daily.

Full the sense that perhaps the worst of the crisis is over, and the enemy has been driven to the north by the Americans, the Mujahideen have not been mentioned once.

Both the generals said they believed the Kabul government and the anti-Communist guerrillas could and should come to terms.

Talks on local truces have already taken place, they said. They blamed Pakistan for disrupting the process.

A monument to the men of the old city of Jalalabad, the Sikh Temple of Bavani, was evacuated in the northern part of the city by shrapnel, it has become a haven for many of the 8,000 old-city residents.

A total of 57 Sikhs have died in the siege, and 102 are reported injured.

Inside the temple old men lie huddled in the corridors and cellars as the city is destroyed by shrapnel, it has become a haven for many of the 8,000 old-city residents.

Food was available, explained the community leader, Dabair Singh, but bread from the government was scarce. "What can I say about this war?" he shook his white beard. "All we do is fire on unsuspecting people."

Americans in the party of journalists - they proclaimed themselves with their baseball caps - were verbally assailed by the residents, who was a proud shopkeeper until March 19 when a rocket smashed his stall, killing his mother and his two-year-old son.

"Why does George Bush send these rockets?" he yelled. "America, Pakistan, go home. We here do not make war with anyone."

The vehemence was undoubtedly sincere, and the protest was loud and clear. The Mujahideen fired at different stopping points, at broken mud houses, at one totally destroyed house (though it was not killed), and at the Nangarhar High School, where a young guard was killed two days ago.

"Yes, we have seen really severe fighting, three or four times in the past two months. Really massive attacks," explained the principal of the school, Hafizullah Nuri, 48.

"All the teachers are now enrolled in the militia. We have received new rockets this week. Rocket on the school alone. I hold the United States responsible. Why they are giving rockets to the Mujahideen to kill innocent people.

One of the most skilful propaganda plays by the government was an escort of a dozen rockets along the roads with remarkable nonchalance. But the masses of the bond and Arab in the city and every shop in the outlying villages were firmly shut down.

The station itself sits in groves of palm and eucalyptus, its austere front galvanized with white, to be the most magnificent clouds of purple bougainvillea outside the Atlantic.

Inside we were given the dry statistics that the station generates 5,000 kilowatts for the city and 2,800 for the region.

The message was clear. Electricity is still in constant supply in Jalalabad. The towns throughout the central area, and fresh water is available at almost every public fountain and tap.

The garden of the power station was littered with bits of rocket, but now the enemy is far away, we were told, and to emphasize the point the army unit in the groves along the river fired off four rockets towards the distant mountains.

The Nangarhar Provincial Hospital is a melancholy maze of concrete and stone corridors, peopled by the swelling tide of disease and mortality.

In one ward a young mother yelled against the perpetrators of the chest wound to her young son who was later killed by rocket fire.

In another room three infants had the vacant expression of shock. They had lost limbs.

But the director, Musamal Karwar, a rocket-fight veteran, gave the director of the most plausible statistics to date of the effects of the two months of battle in and around the city.

Three thousand civilians had been killed, he explained, and 523 killed, 128 dying in his hospital alone.

Ninety percent of the war victims, he suggested, had been hit by rockets. Only one per cent had bullet wounds.

"TAKING the helicopters to fly to Jalalabad from the Afghan capital is a real life version of a funfair wall of death."

For some days during the two month's siege of the southern city, helicopters were the only means of supplying the beleaguered garrison. Today, they are under less demand as road convoys get through.

But the journey across the razor-backed of the mountains south of Kabul and into the broad plain of Jalalabad running down to the Khoyber Pass still has its moments.

Yesterday, the Afghan government invited a party of Western journalists to make the switchback ride to Jalalabad.

The carriers are better-equipped SL-28s and MI-24s, moving in pairs and escorted by MI-24 Hind gunships, five for the journey out and six for the way back.

For the first stretch of the 75-mile journey, it is plain sailing over a patchwork of brown hills, dotted with nomads and their flocks. Beyond the Kabul Gorge, the roughly 200-mile, British-built Monolithary Force was massacred in 1934, flying becomes serious.

The helicopters are vulnerable to ground fire from automatic weapons and Stinger shoulder-launched missiles. Keep low enough and you avoid the Stinger. For the rest, it is a story of dodging and disengage.

On the hills south of the garrison of Surobi, the Mujahideen maintain an uncertain presence. Rising over the ridges of rock and bare earth, the Hind gunships spout flares to attract heat-seeking missiles, and use their own rocket pods blasting the hillsides to keep the Mujahideen fingers off their triggers.

Suddenly, a loud clang comes from the side of the Hind transport, sounding suspiciously like incoming rocket fire, but these are missiles from the helicopter's own pods.

During the test flight of 50 missiles, for the real test of nerve for all concerned: a ridge, deceptively named Tangi Alkfirm (Silk Valley Ridge).

The helicopter pulls up on to the Afghan to its right to climb 400 feet down the gully at an angle of 45 degrees, rotors and undercarriage at times clearing the rocks by less than 10 feet.

The performance is repeated half a dozen times on each journey, but for the passengers, familiarity merely breeds respect for the pilots and the machines.

On the way back behind gunships, like tigers with their bright camouflage, they form up for the dash over Silk Valley Ridge. This time, the six go to wide formation and blast the shallow ridges repeatedly, for Mujahideen have been seen in the distance.

On the ground at Kabul a dozen sweaty hands shake those of the pilot and his team. He is an insouciant, 24-year-old senior captain of the air force, Omayee, a former Soviet fighter regiment. He is wholly Afghan trained and proud of it.

"The mountains in that area are particularly difficult," he voices safely when he himself has already been on the run for months. He makes the journey in most days of the week, though things are easier with the convoys getting through by road.

And he and his co-pilot, Amin Jee, 24, and engineer, Saif Ula, 28, are keen to demonstrate that they are loyal Afghans, the new breed running the government's air force.

They have the skill and courage of fighter aces.

Western subversion is being beaten in Afghanistan, and the Goebbels propaganda hysteria of the 'free' world press has been humiliated, as has the cynical defeatism of the ultra-left petty bourgeois politicians who in reality are anti-communist as the rest of the middle class. The IIM's Leninist understanding of the potential victory for revolution due to the international balance of class forces has been vindicated, which will be the final outcome of the historic class war in Afghanistan, and whatever criticisms must still be made of the continuing revolution in the world revolutionary outlooks of Moscow and Kabul (and the rest of the socialist camp). Build Leninism.
West drowning in hypocrisy

After more than 100 years of American imperialist domination of Latin America via an endless series of fascist-dictator stooges in every Central and South American country, the US government is considering the ultimate humbug by preparing invasion plans against Panama for holding elections which were "not democratic enough," and in order to "defend the free will of the Panamanian people" by a US blitzkrieg military occupation of the country.

Washington's claim that the fat bourgeois chieftains of Panama have "popularly elected" the CIA's former mafia strongman Noriega is ludicrously unconvincing to even the tiny handfuls of big business and middle-class pro-US demonstrators who have put up feeble rent-a-crowd protests under banners from the American embassy but who had virtually disappeared within 24 hours of the staged CIA 'scenarion' against the election, so unconvinced that the US will not slaughte the US tanks, bombers, artillery, and warships are thought likely to make Panama and the rest of the world see things the White House way.

President Bush last night urged world leaders to remove Panama's military leader, General Manuel Antonio Noriega, and did not rule out the use of military force to impose his will on the dubious victory of the opposition in Sunday's elections.

In his first comment on the Panama election President Bush said there had been "massive irregularities" and demanded General Noriega relinquish power. "I call on all foreign leaders to urge General Noriega to honor the clear results of the election. The opposition has won a clear-cut overwhelming victory. "The Panamanian people have spoken and I call on General Noriega to respect the voice of the people," the President said in a hastily-called Oval Office news conference.

Mr. Bush refused to be drawn on what retaliation the United States might take until Panama announced the formal election results. However, he indicated he had been in touch with high-level Panamanian officials.

Armed with the support of the bipartisan congressional delegation, the Bush Administration is expected to move quickly to bolster the number of US combat troops in Panama. However, the US might be reluctant to act unilaterally against General Noriega for fear of inciting anti-Americanism throughout the continent at a time of political and economic tension.

Mr Bush is understood to have recognized the sense of urgency and taken the view that the situation could not be allowed to fester. It is reported today he consulted former President Carter who negotiated the 1977 Panama Canal Treaties and led a separate delegation of observers.

It would be a relatively simple matter for the United States to airlift troops and warships to its bases in the country.

Calm had returned to Panama City by yesterday morning. Marchers who were met by a burst of riot police and by paramilitary thugs on Monday were nowhere to be seen a day later.

Public transport was operating normally, and traffic had returned, despite the sabre-ratting in Washington.

Mr Bush, as Governor Michael Dukakis frequently pointed out during his 1988 presidential campaign, has a particularly serious problem with the Panamanian dictator. As a former CIA director, Mr Busch has been repeatedly told that General Noriega is an intelligence asset.

General Noriega, for his part, has frequently claimed to have a dossier on Mr Bush which, he alleged, could affect the outcome of the US elections.

American frustration with Panama is particularly acute, since it is a central American country over which it had genuine colonial power, exercised through its full control of the canal and US military bases in the region.

Just over 100 days into his administration General Noriega has come back to haunt Mr Bush and his country. By this time, armed with bipartisan evidence from the US observer delegation that Noriega stole the election with massive fraud, Washington is determined to try some old-style gunboat diplomacy.

Washington: President Bush and his national security aides last night discussed plans for removing General Noriega.

Among the immediate steps being considered is a show of force with the Pentagon airlifting thousands of US troops directly to the American bases in the Canal Zone. Such an operation might be linked to an evacuation of the dependents of US forces in Panama.

The decision to confront Gen Noriega was taken at an afternoon session at the White House attended by President Bush, the Defence Secretary, Mr. Richard Cheney, and the CIA Director, Mr. William Webster.

A CIA operation to kidnap Gen Noriega and bring him to justice in the US was ruled out when Mr Bush apparently urged some caution.

American fascism-imperialist aggression is being considered because their former stooge Noriega has temporarily chosen to play the Panamanian nationalist card against the USA.

Having won some local popularity by raising Panamanian sovereignty (on paper at least) over the Canal under former boss Torrijos, the Noriega regime has maintained a degree of independence political line by being awkward over Pentagon plans to put military pressure on socialist Nicaragua and Cuba, and to generally use American military bases on Panamanian territory for furthering US imperialist tyranny in the region at large.

Washington is incensed enough when hard-to-beat revolutionary socialist move-
obishop of Panama; but all whipped up to suit the Nazi aggressive mood of invading without provoking too much international outcry or opposition should Washington decide upon blitzkrieg.

By US imperialist most recent version of Panamanian sovereignty over the canal (albeit still with many monstrosities offensive to Americans and still called "Panamanian") and that tumultuous mood of incomprehension that any American government could ever seriously contemplate not continuing to rule the roost over Panama (and everywhere else come to that, especially in Latin America with its own "back yard"), was plainly evident in the sour surlyness of returning US congressman telling Bush that "something must be done" after completing theirikes's election observatory posturing in front of US television cameras in the Panamanian polling booth or two, as instructed by their US big business paymasters, and endorsed by the CIA's black propaganda department.

Whether the most outright American imperialist reaction is disappointed or not, it does not mean or indicate that the invasion of Panama may be clearer by next week, but that the US imperialist stogue congressmen were feeling that the paralysis affecting the "wimp" president Bush might fail to dissolve Noriega yet again, thus inviting more international action to avert an imperialist impotence, — was clear from their snarling, dog-in-the-manger faces.

Even more disgusting was the incoherence of the "free world press" (i.e., the BBC/ITV/Fleet Street lie machine) which objectly and increasingly bullying line-aggregating exploiting el's-propaganda tricks put out by the CIA as "mounting international pressure is calling for Noriega's resignation", which turns out to mean just the vaguest of comments about "Wishing Panamanian public opinion to the pressure" and three palliatives or most indebted US client states — Costa Rica, Venezuela, and Peru; plus an obvious reactionary thrust from the Ar

serious stand against the whole world of US imperialism, calling it to this day the "major partner" in the joke "free world alliance". On top of that, it has always been the Labour Party which has been responsible for all the worst acts of British colonial nastiness against the revolutionary national-liberation movements of the world from the 1946-47 brutal suppression of Greek and Malaysian partisans-led socialists independence onwards (see IIMF Books vol. 6, 7, 9, and 10).

But even without all these endless self-defeating acts of US imperialism's "free world" domineering or British colonialism's legitimation of interests, Labour's embrace of capitalism would be sufficient by itself to damn this reformist trade-union movement as incurably reactionary, as the un-revolutionary for ever more.

For in the end it is not actual national approval of particular acts of Western imperialist-fascist aggression which holds the capitalist class domination of the planet together, — (as welcome Labour endorsement is to the --sectional imperialist counter-revolutionary circles). It is just support for capitalism itself which does the damage. Or to put it another way, — just support for the parliamentary democracy system itself which is sufficient to continue the imperialist assault without ever causing any inquiries after inquiry is held into one domestic or international capitalist atrocity after another producing "criticisms" or "reprimands" or "recommendations" for better practices which serve solely to "put up imperialist interest in each domestic or international crisis, and prepare the way only for the next atrocity and the next inquiry.

It was the soft-left "solidarity" crowd in Central Hall giving Daniel Ortega a proper welcome to Britain who paradoxically are mainly supporting the imperialist invasion as a way for the legions of "democratic illusion (propping up British imperialism, enabling Thatcher to insult and injure Ortega) remaining unbroken.

The spontaneous "trade-unionist" consciousness of the labour movement and politics in Latin America is clearly actively denounced and opposes the US-run and financed Contra-fascist-military retribution of the socialist Nicaragua is trying desperately to build. But that selfsame "left" has continued defused support for the Western "free-world democracy" system in general is all that the hidden monopoly-bourgeois dictatorship needs to keep its domination intact, it's the imperialist, monopoly-propaganda, defusing indefinitely. Inquiries and exposures can come and go, but the ruling class will rule on for ever until unless they are overthrown—and only the programme of proletarian dictatorship can put that (the programme of the Leninist Bolshevik party).

At some point, Ortega's audience will have to be asked if they really will the survival of revolutionary Nicaragua, then their only ultimate effective solidarity would be the political overthrow of capitalism in Britain and all its rackets—Labour links to American imperialist domination of the modern world (including the propping up of Slavia for 50 years, and now the fascist sabotage of Solidarity in Nicaragua), — links which have actually been insidiously insinuated upon by Labour Governments as by Tory Governments. At which point the Labourism of Ortega's London audience would be bankrupt at any revolutionary disowning of the Labour Party’s post-war conflict with such an audience should begin, — however mildly in the light of the special diplomatic requirements of Nicaraguan immediate support and solidarity facing renewed direct Western threats.

But the jokes of empty "appeal" to democratic capitalism when no such thing is possible and when the leadership now openly admits that it has no such intentions any way, — has not much more historic room in which to continue bashing the working class because the international imperialism is now completely running out of space in which to posture "successfully!" any more. The "free world" is rapidly becoming a sick joke as the insoluble crises of imperialist trade war and revolutionary-national-liberation pressures relentlessly mount in every direction.

The latest warmongering-
desperation threats from

Irae fascist-bompanist religious-feudal regime are again showing the West to be hopelessly opportunist-
ically divided in response to the provocative 'kill five Americans, British, or French for every Palestinian
killed'. As in the Eushi-

shie affair, half the

west world is far too bu-

sily cultivating its own po-

tentially lucrative trade

deals with Iran to want to

bother about threats to an-

other imperialist rival.

The essence of the German
gromony-bourgeoisie chal-

lenge to Anglo-Saxon impe-

rialism hegemony (see last
two Bullets and ILWP

Boook Vol 111) immediately
gets its first tentative

elaboration over Basranja-

nis death challenge. Imme-

diately, public opinion in

Guyana, Japan, Italy, etc will

vote a great deal more for

the Anglo-Saxon hegemo-

nists have been conducting

their leadership of Western

affairs with Iran, the Gulf

area in general, and the

muslim world in even wider

perspective, all possibly con-

trary viewpoint more de-

sireable to Anglo-US-French

commercial interests than

necessarily to the political

and economic benefit of the

West in general, and cer-

tainly at any expense to Ger-

man, Japanese, or Italian.

This is a good deal so-

much could be achieved without

coming too noticeable, etc.

Specifically, 'free world'

opinion may hold together

over the 'kill five Americans'

threat; or over the 'dump Norwe-

gians' manoeuvres; or over the whole Wash-

ington interest. Such details

are not predictable.

But the overwhelmingly

important point to make is

that in the long run, these

conflicting imperialist co-

mercial, political, strat-

eic, ideological interests will

not always hold to-

gether. Just the opposite.

They will come into allout

confrontation one with the

other. That is the perspec-

tive that matters.

And with the failure so

far for a general

boycott on Iran for demand-

ing the murder of Westerners,

attention is drawn to the

rapidly changing cir-

stances of the evolving

international balance of

class forces, to the back-

ground of which Arafat has

ruefully declared that a.

peaceful pressure alone is

needed to restore statehood

to the dispossessed Pale-

stine people, not empty

Indictments against the

West imperialists; and for

good measure that b.

the revered Palestinian

Charter calling for the Pe-

santine nation to fight

to the death to restore the

entire country of Palestine

united against Zionist infiltra-

tion and annexation, — is dead and

buried.

The same upheaval in the

international balance of

class and national forces

which is pushing German

imperialist forward independ-

ently of Anglo-Saxon hege-

mony; causing Norwegia to

deny US imperialist domin-

ation; driving the beleaguered

feudal-fascist Iranian reg-

ime towards ever more despa-

rate war-mongering gestures of

'independent' national

honour; etc; and providing

that South Africa will not

be outdone in this spirit; the

horrid Intifada which has

been commanded by Arafat

for his bourgeois-nationalist

compromising but which

in reality is in essence the

opposite of 'peaceful pressure' and the

epitome of revolution, revo-

cutionism, (even if only"locals" at this stage, — is also preparing the

conditions relentlessly for a

resurgence of internatio-

nal Leninism which will

weave aside the class-compro-

mising popular-front ineffec-

tive demoralized by ultimate

of Arafatism, (which dismas

the mass consciousness of the

Palestine people and the


time Arab national-division

and revolutionary socialist struggle by its

originally naïve delusion that

the death of the imperialist cl-

ass will ever, or could

ever, voluntarily abdicate from

dominating perpetually the

land of Palestine now that

they have conquered it)

petty-bourgeois reformism

remains permanently willing

because imperialism occasion-

ally momentarily (histori-

cally speaking) takes its

jackboot off peoples necks

(always solely because of

purely temporary paralysis and

regrouping requirements),

then the floodgates have

'opened' and been somehow op-

ened for social-democracy to

'at last' go all the way to a

real once and for-all

clean-up of imperialism

unpeckable act; — the last

150 years of war-mongering

arrestive domination and co-

colexial exploitation, that

abysmal cowardly defec-

tion and criminal opportu-

nism, potentially dooming the

working class to the next his-

toric round of widespread

war-mongering concentration-
camp fascist-imperialist ag-

gression before largescale

revolutionary fightback is

likely. Just because Bush

or US imperialism has not

invaded Nicaragua yet, or

because Thatcher at least

entertained Ortega, or beca-

use Zionism has not infil-

tered largescale genocide

yet, etc;—then all that is needed is talk nicely to

imperialist war-mongering and let it do the rest.

Western reeks to Zionist terror-

bashing or Pretoria's gun-

running to Orange fascists

is pure farce to hoodwink

people. When it Pretoria go-

ing to be bombed for really

supplying arms to the Occupied Zone of

Ireland, — as Tripoli was

fraudulently bombed by Anglo-

Saxon imperialism to suit

its war-mongering-fascist p-

urposes? Never. The CIA is

now even considering denou-

menting Lech Walesa and the

Poland workers for their

'mucky betrayal deal' with

the 'communist evil',

etc; — as traillayed by the

astonishing Jimmy Reid den-

cunciation of Solidarnosc

last week. The counter-revo-

ution is in this fight for

keeps, all the way. The rev-

olution is at least likewise.

Build Leninism.

ILWP Development

The party's successful

emergence from its recent

bitter experience of having

a fulltime cadre defeat from

Leninist politics to the na-

tional-subjective swamp
gives an opportunity to

consider what the real ba-

sis of Bolshevism must be

and whether sufficiently

satisfactory progress is

being made.

For arguments sake, it is

worth assuming that the

basis of Bolshevism will be

any attempt to build

Leninism in this complex

modern period of history in

the boom-buttressed but de-

caying West starts with a

totality of cynicism easily

persuaded that no serious

or effective Bolshevik Part-

y can exist in the modern

world. A mixture of cocky phil-

istine and sanctimonious

skepticism can amend the di-

versions of a boom quickly

convince small-minded, sub-

jective and self-pitying

people that party-building

tests were "bound to be

flawed", ―just like all the

rest‖, and "bound to show

up insuperable weaknesses

sooner or later", etc.

The great paradox is that

the ILWP started out with

mostly just such types in

the very beginning. And for

good measure, exactly the

same mentality had crept

back into the party in the

recent period and was mak-

ing a deadly serious at-

tempt to reimpose cynicism

universally throughout the

ILWP ranks. And on top of

that, similar attitudes wavered among those

vaguely sympathetic towards the

Party but who so far don't feel willing to fully

accept all the disciplines

needed for seriously build-

ing the ILWP.

So what is left which has

failed to succumb to these

various waves of cynicism?

(—and not only not su-

cumbed, but on the contrary

has so loyally sacrific-

ed for the Party that the

ILWP has been able to col-

lectively elaborate, and agree,

on a number of very

outstandingly current lines of

programmes and political

analysis embodied in nearly

500 weekly Bulletins and

more than a dozen major book

compilations and special

subjects).

Undoubtedly there is a

workable social basis of a

party spirit which potenti-

ally should know no limits.

Obviously, correct theory

holds the ILWP together, and

the collective struggle to

keep on elaborating a con-

cise and effective response

to every political, eco-

nomic and social pheno-

menon (reflecting the interna-

tional balance of class for-

ces) will remain effective

as the Party's immediate ne-

cessary conscious agenda.

The success of the party

less easily definable, Bol-

shevism develops through

tried and tested relations

between people.

This has been stressed

often enough verbally insti-

tutionally, etc, but it is ever

making too much of a song

and dance about it. But

the nasty shock of what had

been thought to be one area

of reasonably developing

Party relations turning in

to its complete opposite, and

revealing unsuspected

lines of cleavage between

Leninism and "everything is ro-

ten" defeatism, pointedly

raises the question of what

exactly the Party does con-

sist of beyond the purely

rational coincidence of vi-

ews on theory.

Philosophical outlooks in
terms of class solidarity
The IWP's survival and theoretical strengthening in the course of these struggles against revisionist leadership was not just a question of numbers. Votes had to be counted in the end, but the Party's ability to sustain the anti-revisionist campaign prevented revisionist opportunists from championing the IWP line.

It is this quality of achievement which needs to be kept in mind, not the crude numbers game of 'how many supporters?'. The old Bolshevik saying may be hackneyed but it remains true that sometimes it is better to be few but more reliable members, rather than opting for more but weaker members. Oddly enough, part of the recent opposition's behaviour could be linked to fundamental differences on this crucial question of discipline.

Under cover of an activist wish for 'smoother Party progress', the revisionist tendency was all the time inclined to reality shirk making a case in public for the full IWP line. This had nothing to do with any considerable numerical strength of the Party's entire programme in order to just concentrate on one or two key useful points relevant to the people, meeting, or public issue in hand. It had everything to do with a petty-bourgeois swindle to keep into check the group's underclass, a description which in essence is always necessary (otherwise temporarily diplomatically assuaged) at some point or other in any dealings with political outlucks less than 100% Leninist.

What finally was the achievement of this 'activist' approach to revolutionary struggle that could be made for the Leninist party by a 'softly softly' approach? It was the 'Leninist' cadre which got itself thoroughly fooled, not the allegedly gullible public which was supposed to be won over by being left in the lurch.

The pathetic outcome of this whole revisionist exercise in cynical feebility should lead to no factional conclusions that IWP cadres are expected to bare their chests for all-out combat on every possible occasion. But it does reinforce the Party's view that no one wants to get in the IWP way with subjective excuses which are turned against the Party in the form of scepticism about 'going over to the top', supporting revisionism. The odds are always ever arguing 'too noisy' in defence of the IWP's understanding must be millions-to-one against. The chance of being too timid or quiet in championing the IWP line are bound to be far far greater.

Moreover the opportunist hostility has quickly sunk without trace into the subjective idealist swamp, - feebly echoing fascist-Leninist propaganda which has attempted to smear the IWP as 'homophobic'.

Finally, it is anti-Leninist revisionism which is the truly bad news (for homosexuals as for all minorities who suffer the inurable prejudices of capitalist class society), - not the world socialist revolutionary movement.

Only the dictatorship of the proletariat can finally bring to an end capitalism (and thereby make a new deal possible for all minorities), nothing else; - and this is completely without prejudice from the Marxist-Leninist views, (doubling the philosophical claims of Marxist-Leninist politics), which alone make the achievement of proletarian dictatorship possible.

It is obvious in logic, - and endlessly plainly stated by the IWP, - that the cultural norms of future society will only finally become fully clear when the people actually living under communism eventually elaborate and perfect all their attitudes to all phenomena and evolutionary processes. The IWP's anticipation that homosexualism will ultimately be seen to have been a temporary deviation and dead-end for mankind (arising solely out of the deeply unnatural social and personal contradictions afflicting civilisation due to the monstrous distortions, frustrations and illusions inseparable from classist society), have no effect on the generations actually living under communism, and is not meant to.

The IWP's attitudes are geared solely to the relentless philosophical discipline without which no Bolshevik party capable of overthrowing the astonishing delusions of 400 years of bourgeois 'freedom' and 'liberal democracy' culture could ever make it.

Consistent Marxist-Leninist philosophy can only begin from a deeply sensually-grasped understanding of the consciousness facing mankind in unity and conflict with nature for the propagation of the species. Starting from God; starting from art-for-art-sake; starting from the campaign for real ale; starting from fascist-observing-the-routines of the black-in-beautiful; starting from paedophile rights; et cetera; - nothing of this can lead to Marxism.

Militant homosexuality is a reformist movement, and by definition a bourgeois reformist movement. No sincere person or position can do anything other than impede Marxism. The philosophy of militant homosexuality could pretend to adapt to a revolutionary Bolshevik movement; and support at the barricades for the overthrow of the capitalist state, and come from individuals of the bourgeoisie. But there is not the slightest possibility that the profoundly correct and deeply convincing revolutionary philosophical leadership for the whole of mankind (which alone can galvanise the human race from the drabness imposed by modern capitalist society) will be supplied by such an abnormal minority as the homosexuals (who can make a good job of sympathising with the family, reproduction, homemaking, upbringing concerns of ordinary people) who can only start by them towards a sufficiently-out of mass revolutionary consciousness.

The popular-front philosophical approach which claims to offer progress through a rainbow coalition of everything from homosexual rights to the liberation of the liberation front, - will end up helping no one. It will confuse revolutionary priorities and play the masses right back into the hands of anti-Leninist counter-revolutionary confusion-sowers of every description. Chaos and anarchy will continue to triumph until a revolutionary vanguard can be united in the only way possible, - by agreement on basic Marxist-Leninist science. Spread the IWP Bulletin.
Bush’s wardrums reply to catastrophic 'free-world' setbacks in the East

The humiliation for the West’s counter-revolutions in Afghanistan and Cambodia are the real world-shattering headlines— not the trivial excesses of spent revolutionary bourgeoisie thinking by Polish peasants, Baltic nazi-nationalists, or Chinese intellectuals (however clumsily they are dealt with by socialist camp revisionism’s painful ignorance of Leninism—see ILWP Books vol 13). Yet again, US imperialism sees the need to desperately try rearming itself—starting in the Americas, but also including Germany’s revolt inside NATO (see second story).

The capitalist press own admissions once more supply the best proof that it is military defeat for reaction (e.g., in Afghanistan and Cambodia) which ultimately alone can stop imperialist warmongering and counter-revolutionary intrigue—not the ridiculous ‘peaceful settlement’ illusions of Gorbachevism (see ILWP Books 11).

FOR a week now, the Afghan-watching industry has debated an interesting but irrelevant question: did civilian and Bhutto order the rebel Mohajedin to attack the eastern city of Jalalabad early in March?

The issue is irrelevant, because the answer is already known. She did not order the attack, because she had no power to do so. And even if she had given the order, the Mohajedin would almost certainly have ignored it.

The debate started when the New York Times reported that the Prime Minister, acting with civilian and military advisers, gave the go-ahead to the attack. The decision was said to have been taken in a meeting attended by the US Ambassador, Mr Robert Oakley, on March 5. The rebels launched their attack on March 6.

The dates, or rather their proximity, were crucial. For no one who has observed the rebel leadership in action, could believe it capable of organizing a lunch meet, let alone a strategic offensive, in 24 hours.

It is much more likely that the meeting was a briefing at which Ms Bhutto and others were informed that an attack was about to be launched. Indeed, it is now known that the first, successful part of the campaign—the capture of the fortress of Saraj Dara, which was the result of prolonged negotiations, rather than a frontal assault.

What happened next exposed the woeful inadequacy of the Mohajedin in conventional fighting. Inspired by the fall of Samarkhel, one of the groups pushed forward to Jalalabad airport, to be cut to ribbons in the minefields and by the concentrated heavy fire of the defenders. And ever since the rebels have been bogged down around the city perimeter, taking appalling punishment from the air and from the superior groundfire of the Kabul troops.

The battle for Jalalabad is now a debacle for the Mohajedin....

Others say that the defences are as strong as ever, that the blockade is incomplete, and that every day adds to the government's confidence and saps the credibility of the rebels. Even if the city falls, they say, it will be at appalling cost in civilian and military lives.

What is beyond doubt is that the military and political balance in Afghanistan looks startlingly different compared with the view on February 15, when the last Soviet soldier retired over the Oxus river.

With troops digging in around government buildings, President Najibullah declared an emergency and Western diplomats fled. In Pakistan, rebel leaders were preparing their alternative government, and in the Punjab the godless communist regime in a matter of weeks.

It was in those heady circumstances that it was decided to give the process a hefty nudge, by attacking Jalalabad. Capturing the city, it was argued, would also boost the prospects of the fledgling Mohajedin government in gaining world recognition, especially by the Islamic Organisation Conference, due to meet in March.

The decision to attack was strongly disputed by several of the Pakistan-based groups, who predicted that large scale civilian casualties, including an estimated attack of 70,000, would cost them dearly in public support.

But the militants won the argument, with the crucial backing of the Pakistan intelligence, the ISI, and the hawks in the US State Department and Pentagon (including Mr Oakley). Their strategic view of Afghanistan remains steadfastly uninformed by the Soviet withdrawal. Dr Najibullah remains a Moscow puppet, and must be removed before the Afghans decide their future.

In Pakistan, the battle for Jalalabad has brought the conflict remains a liberation struggle, not a civil war.

But a couple of months later, there has been precious little liberation, and the victors of the 10-year battle for Afghanistan. The Najibullah government is confident, almost cocky, telling journalists that the battle for Jalalabad has been won all but also, that the once-parous supply of munitions and essential commodities has been restored, and that more and more rebels are seeking an accommodation with Kabul.

In Pakistan, the Mohajedin's government has still to show significant recognition by foreign authorities. The air is thick with recrimination and doubt and Kabul Radio is gaining new audiences with its daily message that Jalalabad is 'only a part of the true nationalistic, fighting for Afghan independence against foreign-backed invaders.'

On the diplomatic front, Moscow and Kabul are close to the way in last week's UN security council debate. The Kabul Foreign Minister, Mr Abdul Wakti, could not persuade the council to give a recognition to Pakistan as 'agression'.

But elsewhere, according to well-informed sources here and in Kabul, diplomatic pressures on Pakistan have increased, especially in Iran and China.

Tehran, anxious to improve relations with Moscow as a source of help in the Middle East, is said to be encouraging the Iran-based Shi'a Mohajedin from reaching a rapprochement with the rebels in Pakistan. They hope to play off the conflicting accounts of negotiations between the Shi'a groups and the Kabul regime. Any deal which emerged would be an enormous bonus for Dr Bhutto.

China, too, is said to be pressing the case for a negotiated settlement of the war. As one of Pakistan's arms suppliers, and a major player in the confrontation with India, Beijing has much diplomatic leverage in Islamabad.

All of this amounts to a dilemma for the Pakistani Government, and in particular for Ms Bhutto, who favours the earliest possible end to the fighting and the repatriation of the Afghan refugees in Pakistan.

It has been clear from the outset that her fragile democracy depends heavily on the army, which has ruled Pakistan for most of its 41 years. That support in turn is conditional on non-interference with the military establishment and, most crucially, on the conduct of the Afghan war.

In effect, that means the ISI, not the government, is in charge of military policy, as well as of holding Soviet arms and cash to the rebels. The head of the service, Lieutenant-General Hamid Gul, is the last surviving proponent of the resistance. His ally is the Pakistan dictator, General Mohammed Zia-ul-Haq, that Pakistan and the Mohajedin together could contrive a great Islamic victory.

The government said its policy was to prevent the Soviet Union, in the throes of perestroika and mindful of the growth of Islam in the Central Asian republics north of the Oxus, would not interfere with the Mohajedin’s march on Kabul, even if that march was spearheaded, as some of the local developments showed, by Pakistan tanks. His short-term problem is that the Mohajedin are not marching anywhere.

In early March, the ISI chief left Kabul with the understanding that Kabul would fall in a few days. Now, the message is that the decision to attack was a mistake by the government. In other words, despite diplomatic pressure, we were only obeying orders.

This version is treated with derision by most close observers. They say that Ms Bhutto was not resolved to go to war until the start of March to recognise the Mohajedin government-in-exile.

Both she and her Foreign Minister, Mr Sabahadda Yaqub Khan, strongly resisted, on the grounds that recognition would strip the last vest from Pakistan's claims to neutrality. Not only would it be a blow to the prestige of last year's Geneva Accord. They said, it would be wholly absurd to recognise a government which could not even operate on its own territory.

This was taken as the signal to capture a major city for use as a temporary base for the 'interim government. Jalalabad, close to the border and commanding the highway to Kabul, was to be the target. And, when it refused to fall, the Prime Minister ordered the attack. It was, said the Scapegoat.

PRESIDENT BUSH yesterday warned the Soviet Union to cease its military activity in Afghanistan, warning that Washington was ready to hold the Soviet Union responsible for any obstacles to Washington's aim that Central America should move towards free-market democracy and enterprise. In a major policy statement, the President said his policy for Latin America was "the triumph of two great ideas — free government and free enterprise" and made it clear that he was judging the sincerity of President Gorbachev's "new
Pause in Labour pains but no outcome possible

To whatever level the influence of petty-bourgeois public opinion now registers itself, it is clear that the event which has taken place in Nicaragua is a turning point in the evolution of the world situation. It marks the beginning of a new phase in the class struggle, with the collapse of British imperialism, the traditional official Labour and trade union movement, and the recent temporary episodic victory of various kinds, such as the working class takes a passing look at different situations with greater, or more frequently lesser, enthusiasm.

This latest insistence on Soviet "good behaviour" in Central America suggests that the White House perceives Moscow as a competitor for influence in the region, and is ready to make more concessions to the triumphant mood of the Bush Administration.

"Looking around the world today, in the developing countries and even in the Communist bloc, we see the triumphant mood of the people of the world, the idea of free government and the idea of free enterprise," Mr. Bush said yesterday.

Citing this week's election in Panama, where the head of the US-backed junta himself campaigned for re-election, Mr. Bush said Panama had maintained "the spirit of change".

He challenged Western European countries to join America's denunciation of the Nor- gas trade, saying the US would support the movement.

"The US will not recognize the results of a fraudulent election engineered simply to keep Nor- gais in power." "The Soviet Union is still sending $500 million a year of military aid to Nicaragua, the President added that "Soviet bloc influence over the guerrillas is now being sent through Cuba to Nicaragua to the guerrillas, and that aid must stop." "Vowing to keep cancelling aid to Nicaragua until at least until the promised Nicaraguan elections next year, Mr. Bush accused the Nicaraguan authorities of "mismanagement".

Cuba, Nicaragua, and Nicaragua want to remain armed to the teeth and on permanent full alert. Intense encouragement of the revolutionary movements in Salvador, Guat- emala, etc., is the best and only answer to Bush's invasion threat. The first sign of any lack of communist resolve, and Washington's war machine will take advantage of a pack of wolves, as happened to Gren- ada when Havana temporarily lost its nerve and showed a weakness in Leningrad (see IDP Books vol 12).

Pause in Labour pain but no outcome possible

The economic difficulties, (as the world capitalist slump approaches) impose impossible limits on Labour and trade union movements. Equally, the long-term military/strategic-trade decline of British imperialism imposes the severest restrictions on what vanguarding diversions any London government (or other faking movements) can get up to for surviving financial or social crisis.

It is a meaningless irrelevance (and a rotten deception) for the traditional trade union movement to try pretending at such a time of imperialist crisis that "Labour and trade unionism will at least be less harsh on ordinary people", and more caring towards the community.

Labour, of course, will if anything act even more ruthlessly against mass interest-just as they, and similar social-democratic regimes worldwide, have always done when bailed into it by the international monopolist-imperialist financial concerns of the IMF (International Monetary Fund) and other imperialist agencies.

But while even any of these cowardly states in the working class's economic or living-standards back is the vicious deception Labour government will try to inflict on the people by pretending that "international forces beyond anyone's control are responsible for these force rad and drastic temporary measures", etc, etc.

These lies are far worse betrayal than anything else.
treachery that the reformists' class-collaborating weaknesses revile perpetrate. By first canvassing for and then taking working-class votes for an alleged 'solution to the imperialist crisis but then using that position of trust in order consciously to thoroughly destroy the cause - the complete collapse of capitalist ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange), and to deliberately deceive the masses into thinking they are helpless to do anything about it (the revolutionary seizure of power). - Laboris effectively hands the proletarist over trussed and gagged to the concentration-camp gates of fascist capitalist reaction.

But this constant hoodwinking of the masses which has been the sole basic basis for conditions of reform - is becoming ever harder to put across on workers. After eight Labour governments since 1924 and countless accumulated centuries of local government experience in the social-revolutionary class war which have failed to alter the essential murderous character of capitalism one little bit, the working class is now unmistakably cynical and reserved about reformist promises as a fulltime solution to anything. (If some sectors still fall for new faces and new gimmicks in isolated areas of struggle for a while longer.)

And this effective large-scale raspberry to Labour, on a nationwide scale -has itself not gone unnoticed as a major new upheaval in the crisis-management of British imperialist politics, and eventually can only further exacerbate class-conflict and sharpen mass consciousness towards a new revolutionary awareness.

Such understanding can definitely not be served by letting delight at any Tory or other bourgeois 'democratic' humiliation become identified with Labourism (who in their time have been even worse colonial assassins and middle-class hypocrites than any other opportunists in Parliament. See IWP Books, Vols 7, 9, and 10). Defects for Thatcherism would show growing difficulties for the imperialist state to any longer successfully manage its 'democratic' fraud - its best trick. Simultaneous humiliation for Labourism and all the other Parliamentary factors would demonstrate that bankruptcy even more alarmingly and completely.

If the perspective is one only of accelerating imperialiszation -of the collapse to inter-capitalist World War III and renewed fascist slump, then the notion of preserving a little bit more of the National Health Service for just a little bit longer than the Tories would have done is nothing more than a formal tectonic on the working class. Tell the working class the truth, the reformist day-dream of class-collaborating permanent prosperity for the masses under capitalism is a fool and dangerous illusion. Such make-believe fantasies can only totally disarm the proletarist just at the moment when it needs to start sharpening its most revolutionary aspirations and understanding.

And no one seriously believes in any case that Labour will ever again even try to carry out a 'socialistic' economic restructuring of the capitalist system (as it feigned in its notoriously phony 'socialist' 1945 government which did the exact opposite of 'ending capitalist exploitation and poverty for the majority') -and as it is still amusingly still boasted today by the buffoon Benn about the 1945 intentions), by unleashing the anti-communist Cold War, and state-subsidising the revival of private capitalist industry in Britain (Macmillan, Kimball and Co don't even play the 'socialist' game any more. So the charade of "at least get Labour back to sort the blows of capitalist crisis" is not even believable by those who put it forward but for another purpose entirely, it protects the 'progressive intelligentsia' from having to make serious thoughts and statements about what really must be done to match up to the truly menacing world situation and crisis of the imperialist system, - the one answer being for its revolutionary overthrow, but the implications of which are more terrifying to the petty-bourgeoisie than even the collapse of capitalism to the depths of small-minded philistinism and opportunism.

But since there is no real mileage in Kimmook, yet no revolutionary conditions have yet appeared anywhere for any length of time - the British capitalist crisis could be doomed to a lot more of the "proportional representation/new political mould" delusions et al. that the miserable illusionists already beached on the posturing Liberal-SDP farce.

This could well coincide with yet another change of gear and a new lease of life for an even more fascist Thatcher than ever, or another radical nationalist, newer, harsher regime under the Tory colours.

But the formidable obstacles facing that particular turn (and likewise any similar chaunistic obsessive fantasies from a Labour Government) are now even more graphically illustrated by sudden German diplomatic aggressiveness than are the monumental economic difficulties where Britain is outrivalled on the international market place.

Warmongering diversions, of course, do not have to be against the most obvious imperialist economic rivals as Thatcher demonstrated by the desperate Falklands War gamble to get the Tory Government out of a dead-end in 1982 as it is indeed advisable that such jingoistic stunts should be deliberately mounted against known weaker opponents who can be safely beaten, however obscure the 'cause'.

But the strategic resurgence of the West German and French imperialist bourgeoisie poses far greater problems for the sicker capitalist competitors than merely the irritation of making sure not to pick a fight with Germany.

Bonn's sudden decision to start speaking with a voice that domestically resonates the entire warmongering scene as far as the traditional Anglo-Saxon imperialist leadership is concerned. Confidence, decisiveness, style and bluster are everything in carrying out a strategy of dominating the Western imperialist state, and the Anglo-Saxon imperialist ephh has sometimes gained as much from pure know-how and bluff as from actually demonstrating armed superiority.

Astoundingy, German imperialists are detaching their readiness to call that bluff again, as twice before this century. The current international balance of class forces can never be the same again.

In their relations with other Western powers, the Germans feel ready to play a more assertive role. They believe that enough time has elapsed since the war for them to show the confidence, and occasionally the bloody-mindedness, that any nation with their economic strength should have the right to. In fact, they are less willing to take lessons from nations they consider to be slipping.

A German foreign correspondent who has recently returned from Germany says: 'The United States is, in German eyes, no longer an economic giant - so the Germans tend to look down on the American Government whose last stature, new, harsher regime under the Tory colours.

'Of course this reaction is impulsive and disproportionate, but it is a necessary readjustment in changing their minds a little at a time. It has to be either one thing or another. They feel that a new phase of history has started. Everything has changed again.'

We are speaking of Germany's attempt to rediscover its place in history, to discharge its debt to the historical past, and to take up once again the prominent role in human affairs to which its power and vigour entitle it. No wonder, therefore, that it is in a certain sense, that even a rag tag government heading anything like that of Chancellor Kohl feels it can and should challenge Washington and London.

Characteristically it was the German foreign minister, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, who yesterday expressed this idea, and said the United States stood most forcefully in the Bundestag debate. There was nothing more powerful or a powerful idea he had mentioned. Germany and Europe had a "historic chance". The other Nato partners should understand and not fear the consequences.

At one level, the Germans felt very pleased. That they are the only Nato country that has to live, day in and day out, with the training and preparation for a war with the Soviets, is a great burden for the casualties. At another, they felt that Washington and London were manipulating Nato in such a way as to develop a new relationship with the Soviet Union - one out of which could flow mutual economic and political benefits.

The worm turned a week ago when the West German coalitions parties, repudiating the conclusions of the European Council, decided that Germany must press for early Alliance negotiations on short range nuclear missiles. When Chancellor Kohl addressed Congress in the Bundestag it was clear that, in spite of American and British protestations, he has not retreated one jot from that position. Indeed, he has gone to the opposite extreme in searching for an issue with which to restore his government's momentum, has finally found it.

The German interest is for clear missile negotiations, narrowly defined. The conflict within Nato over this question will almost certainly dominate the summit next month, by some form of compromise. The issue is Ger-
many's right to act as a truly inde-
pendent state, after 40 years of In-
complete sovereignty, and its amb-
tually independent state. The
REAT shifts in international poli-
G
itics are comparable to the
subterranean movements of the tec-
tonic plates. They are both un-
stopable and unpredictable, in
that we cannot know in advance
when precisely the enor-
mous pressures building up will find
release. Such a release, hitherto un-
guessed, came yesterday when the
West German Chancellor, Helmut
Kohl, publicly asserted for the first
time that a war would break out
in world war that German national
interests must take precedence over
those of the United States and Brit-
in in determining Germany's foreign
and security policy.

The great hope aroused
among West Germans by Presi-
ident Mikhail Gorbachev's perestroika
perestroika, is swirled by a dis-
contentment with their role as the
Western alliance's parade ground
and nuclear missile base.

Germany has eased itself into
a more comfortable posture, no longer
turned exclusively towards the West but
with an eye on the lost Eastern territories
and areas of influence.

As German politicians and
businessmen are quick to point out,
there is no chance of Ger-
mans turning back to the West. German trade with the
Eastern Bloc could not in
any foreseeable future be more
than a fraction of its exchanges
with its Common Market part-
ners.

In a debate in the Bundes-
haus last week, Foreign Min-
ist Hans-Dietrich Genscher
said: 'Members of the Gov-
ernment talk an oath to devote
every urge to the good of the German people.

The duty which this oath
covers is not ended at the
border running through the middle
of Germany.

The indignation in Wash-
ington and London over West Ger-
many's desire to 'go it alone'
On the missiles and nuclear
aircraft are very recent.

In October 1983, a million
West Germans were on the
streets all over the country,
protesting agains
the deployment of cruise and Pershing II
missiles on their soil. The
Dutch, the Belgians and the
British were similarly agitated.

In the eyes of the rest of the
world, this is the face against an obviously
genuine and powerful popular
sentiment. He remained firm at
first when US officials asked him to go back on
that decision because agreement
with Moscow depended on such a reversal, but gave
in for the sake of the Western unity.

No sooner had he done so
than Washington was back on
the line asking him to give up the
old Pershing I missiles as
well (West German rockets
are used to launch warheads in US
keeper).

Thus the last missiles
on European soil capable of hitting
targets in the Soviet Union
were removed, and the way was
then cleared for the "zero option"
on medium-range rockets.

But as the champagne went
through the West German wine,
the nuclear weapons now left on
the European continent were
either stationed in Ger-
many, West and East, or de-
handed to go off on German soil,
or both.

Even the land-based part of the
independent deterrent owned by Bonn's most import-
ant defence partner, France,
could only hit Russians if they
obligingly advanced to within
frapping range — well into
Germany.

No wonder Kohl and
Genscher want to go on with
what INF began — the relief
of Germany from the threat of
nuclear devastation.

But the West is not satisfied
with the Anglo-Americans
by blocking mod-
ernisation of existing short-
range weapons; and just as
Washington and London were
not satisfied with perestroika
(indeterminate deferment)
On this, Bonn called for talks
aimed at a reduction, likely to
lead to abolition, of this kind of
lethality, and efforts to reduce
poor, but the logic looks incom-
faceable from West Germany.

Dr Kohl stood firm again
yesterday and took the next
step by hinting that he thinks he can be pushed into yet
another U-turn.

Already the language is alarming, even after so-
alight an initial diplomatic
initiative by Germany as to
doubt if now is a good time
for NATO to publicly renew
its Anglo-Saxon-controlled
short-range nuclear weapons
(which may yet be passed
off by the West as just a
simmering disarmament
timetable disagreement) if they have to concede to
Bonn intrusiveness,
coupled with some mar-
ignal-contract-supplies re-
arrangement to Germany's
advantage.

It never was real or slight
the differences (depend-
ing on how far tactically
Bon really wants to go to
over to go to
to Sign disarrangement proposals in
order to deliberately upset
the Anglo-Saxon hegemony,
which in reality is likely to
be just a way of bringing
——the damage that has been
done in the maximum possible
just by the very tone and
stance that Germany has sud-

un to adoption

It is a loud and clear mes-
sage to the whole world:
German imperialism is back in
business with a venomi-
organ in a very unflatter-
ing light indeed. Who is
impressed any more with clup-
appared British imperial-
ism as in the past? And how
ever $ized $ British imperi-
ial economy?

Looking further ahead,
how would Labour, or Tory, or a
National government try to play out the British
imperialist twilight, sur-

dared by vociferous stronger

rocker-in-chief comedies?

Whatver Thatcher's diffi-
culties might be alleged to be for the moment, the
one certainty of the de Gaulle,
Reagan, Thatcher, Japanese
Liberal-Democrat, and German bourgeoisie coalition
epoch is that while most
apparent, in the final analysis,
unsurprisingly in the era of
imperialism insolvent
terminal crisis,
only things which have appeared
to have worked for any length of time in
all to be curtailed' authoritarian attitudes
associated with Reaganism,
anti-communist, 'positions of
strength', colonial-aggr
essive, and anti-'liberal'
domestically.

And as this is also al-
ways just a great dream of
all the bourgeois in spir-
ity, - then even in the mid-
the Vale of Glamorgan
rational confusion, the only
certainty is that the next
illusions which appear to be
'the something done
British imperialism's para-
ysis, or at least offering to
'the something done', — will be some au-

ritarian populist/fascist
messianic nonsense or other
Thatcherism mark II, or
Owenism, or Kimooian
'solution to the greatBritish interest' jackboots, etc.

And all will be a farcic
miserable failure as Brit-
ish imperialism falls re-

ently still further
behind its age-old impe-
rialist rivals who are also
chasing their jackboots on
again, - inside and outside
NATO.

No one wants to believe a
single word about 'Labour
revivalism'. An authoritar-
ian coalition government is
the only serious longtem
plan for collapsing British imperi-
acy', which will then help to
the need to fight to
build a party of Lenin-
ist revolutionary theory
crystal clear to even the
most cowardly petty-bourgeois
philistines. Spread the
left-wing bulletin.
The West wants war

Gorbachev's revisionist idocy that the capitalist system has "accepted the need to live in peace with the real Irish population" has never looked slicker.

The entire Middle East from Lebanon, Occupied Palestine, and Jordan in the Near East to Afghanistan and the Pakistan borders of the Indian sub-continent is being relentlessly screwed up towards explosive international conflict which will already make the Gulf War look like child's play, itself one of the longest and bloodiest confrontations this century and still unresolved (and not irreversible).

As well as liberal supplies of Western arms to the 'free world' favourites in all these confrontations, US imperialism is incredibly still pouring yet more military and other aid into much more degenerate failures as the West's dislocation programmes on the borders of Kampuchea and Nicaragua using washed-up counter-revolutionaries. And the Thatcher regime moved heaven and earth to undercut the French regime in winning ghoulish contracts to supply the leagued fascist-Feudal Saudi tyranny (and its neighbouring autocratic stogue states) with the biggest arms deal in history worth £2 billions.

And the proliferating mass-weaponising of all these weapons made available to the West's "friends" (however disreputable) in the cause of anti-communism, - in made graphically clear by the disgusting tie-up in Paris between the Thatcher-protected racist psychopaths in South Africa and the Orange-Nazi British colonists occupying parts of Ireland's province of Ulster (pretending to be Irishmen as they wave Union Jacks in support of the SAS's death-squad tactics for murdering the real Irish population,- trying to continue the original Black and Tan, and ultimately maintain a 'British majority' within a ripped-out Occupied Zone.)

Meanwhile, even more dramatically, the Western imperialist 'allies' themselves are now seriously falling out to a background of open name-calling arguments, - the real pinnacle of the incurable drive to warmongering inseparable from all capitalist economic crisis which, in turn, is itself in-soluble, plunging unstoppable towards all-out trade-war and slump, and then military conflict, based on the iron laws of Marxist-Leninist science of free-market anarchy and surplus monopoly-capital. (See ILP Perspectives pp 5-6).

Appropriately, German imperialism is arguing once again with Anglo-Saxon imperialism about "how best to guarantee European security" against the "proper level and type of armaments in the continent", - exactly the same superficial matters which gave the appearance of eventually "leading to war" in 1914 and again in 1939.

In reality of course, both sides are now war-weary. The power war was actually about irreconcilable trade-war conflicts, effectively over who was to be the dominant imperialist economic power in the world, the Germans or the Anglo-Saxons. Deep down, it is exactly the same conflict this time.

The particular form the row is taking at the moment is a perfect reflection of the powerful new factors which since 1945 have overshadowed the deadly and unwavering inter-imperialist rivalry, - the unconquerable strategic might now of the Soviet socialist army, and its specific influence on Germany itself, now divided into a capitalist half and a socialist half.

The current pro-disarmament stance being adopted by the Bonn revanchists should fool no one. German imperialism can no more change its aggressive-competitive spots than any other imperialist bourgeoisie, and has not done so. The German capitalist state has stealthily become the most powerful continental military power in NATO in all but nuclear matters (in public at least), - second in prestige and influence only to US imperialism itself which still dominates - just - by the sheer size of its financial commitment to the arms race. But for military quality, confidence, discipline, and know-how, German imperialism is already once again the most powerful and feared voice in the West. And its shared authority within the overall NATO Cold War nuclear policy is growing with every passing year as the German economy steadily outstrips the rest of the West.

Bonn's "disarmament" stance over the short-range battlefield nuclear weapons within NATO is a way of appealing to the West German electorate for popular support to undermine US and British domination of NATO still further but without being seen, at this stage, - to be compromising for US nuclear triggers, (and a greater German say in the renewal contracts for the lucrative 'modernisation' process for short-range nuclear weapons), - which would be regarded badly throughout Europe, and could sink Gorbachev's best friend in Moscow.

So the sly progeny of the thousand Year Reich choose at this moment to present their dislike of being used as NATO's nuclear doormat by unreliable Washington policy makers, - the West's control, - and of being left out of the profitable and strategically vital direct nuclear management, - as a publicly proclaimed wish for Western (and Soviet) disarmament from this particular US atomic weapons monopoly.

Particularly irksome for the German bourgeoisie is NATO's present strategic plan of fighting a bogus 'containing' war against the non-existent 'threat of Soviet massive conventional-forces invasion of West Europe' by wiping out the whole of Germany where all the short-range nuclear weapons possessed by both sides would be bound to fall.

While Bonn is as aware as the rest of the West that the notion of Soviet expansion is a notion with the prospect of nuclear annihilation on German soil is nevertheless an unnerving and insulting one to Germany's very sensitive national pride, and an uncomfortable reminder of the humiliating post-1945 settlement with its echoes of the notorious Versailles Treaty whose savage reparations prepared the ground for World War II directly out of the 'peace' that was supposed to have settled World War I) which gives US imperialism the constitutional right virtually to permanently dictate what its forces will do inside Germany and what German forces will be limited from doing. (A similar constitutional diatka from Washington humiliating and frustrating Japan (to a prime cause of an identical resentment there against Anglo-Saxon domination, - with potentially even more explosive consequences ultimately because of Japan's even greater economic independence (compared to ageingridden Western imperialism).)

The German monopoly bourgeoisie has not the slightest interest in disarmament, no more than any other bourgeoisie. But in its complicity with the liberal forces, lively with the rest of the ultra-right camp which denies Germany its rightful leadership role within the capitalist system (and potentially threatens Germany when the trade-war comes to all-out military and political confrontation), - they are helping the Bond's cause, as now, to suddenly play the 'peace' card to totally wrong-foot Washington and London.

Germany wants to be the strongest power, just like any other imperialist bourgeoisie, - not in order to dominate the Soviet Union (a dream long since abandoned, as it has been by the rest of the West) but in order to dominate its capitalist rivals when trade-war inevitably becomes shooting war again. Even then that position of strength would be best accomplished with nuclear weapons too, - whatever is the most lethal death-dealing equivalent at the time; - but meanwhile it suits Bond's rivalry with the other NATO powers to play the non-nuclear card at this moment.

That the aim and spirit of all this 'disarmament' arguing has nothing whatever to do with 'peace' or 'friendship' is obvious from the bitter hatreds and conflicts which this whole process is unleashing. If there was just the faintest trace of
price collapse, then the weighty pattern of the German challenge for Western hegemony will indicate the shape of things to come more obviously than ever. Thatchers will in a way get what it wants, a menacing crisis in which the union jack can be waved against the "enemy without" to pull the ruling class through an economic bad patch by diverting domestic proletarian hostility outwards onto the world. The routine Imperialist method of warmongering one's way out of difficulty, exactly as the British government overcame crippling unpopularity in 1962 at the height of the Suez mini-slump by going to war against Egypt and will repeat in even more grandiose fashion when the real slump begins soon.

The German monopoly bourgeoisie will get what it wants too, demonstrating to its own electorate that national pride and prestige is now rising higher than ever, and to free the emphasis of the German state on "armament needs, including nuclear and chemical weapons," as soon as it is necessary to slight or switch the "reasonable differences" to 'aggressive differences' in the conflict with Anglo-Saxon hegemony.

The one thing that is certain is that for each and every imperialist bourgeoisie, one surefire guarantee of political support plays the war-gaming card once again. Bonn may have genuine difficulties now with German public opinion over widespread fears of renewed nuclear arms escalation (arising out of NATO's short-range modernization program and US threats toward destruction of "East of the Elbe's entanglement"). But the moment that any German government pushes the read-out button which says: "We are being threatened; Germany must remain strong," etc., that regime, just like any other, will join in this international capitalist system, will have the unifying loyalty of its masses right up until major defeat has forced the proletariat to have a re-think.

This inevitability of the war-gaming essence of international capitalist competition, scientifically described in enormous length and detail by Lenin (see INP Books vols 4, 11, and 13), makes Gorbachev's revisionism look so treacherously stupid. Only the most appalling philistinism could remain totally ignorant of the scientific lessons of all Marxist-Leninist theory, and remain totally blind to the fact that a crisis in front of one that the capitalist system is careering downwards towards another world-warming hell. - World War III.

The hopeless and confused bloody turmoil in the Lebanon still demonstrates this point. At the time of the Gulf War's supposed "cessation," the Bulletin pointed out that this turn to warmongering by two crisis-ridden capitalist regimes could not possibly find any other than to continue down the same hell- ingent route until either the war or a different war, and then overthrow by communist revolution the only possible realistic path to peace for all nations everywhere (see INP Books vol 11). No sooner said than done. Iran and Iraq are apparently the new forces standing firmly behind the sudden dramatic escalation of civil war in Lebanon which this US-backed war on Arab bourgeoisie forces who have themselves already demonstrated in 20 years or more of conflict that there is no solution to capitalist hegemony-rivalry, yet still another, other than total victory, or total annihilation, such as the European natural monopoly-imperialist market competition.

The offensively criminal stupidity of Gorbachevism pretends that "this is no longer the nature of capitalism," exactly as if this were some religious miracle out of the blue, (with about as much scientific "reason" behind it as that nonsense) — all based solely on the notion that because nuclear weapons are so destructive, the out-thrust rivalry of the two superpowers will completely change its character. What incredible idiocy. They slaughtered each other for nine years in the Gulf War (already the longest this century) using everything from modern rockets and rhetoric to the honed WW II trench bulldozing and sniping. If they could have got hold of nuclear weapons, they would undoubtedly have used them too. Or they would have staggered it out with bits of wood if they had to as well. They stopped only because both camps (after heavy US intervention on the Iraqi side) were reaching the point of revolutionary-crisis exhaustion, because they would have both been overthrown by communist revolution if they had not had a pause. But they will be back at it eventually, because both rotten bourgeois-feudal regimes are not intrinsically mixed in the irrational capitalist-monopoly system which no bourgeoisie ever could have been able to survive, the system itself now being completely out of date and desperately due for replacement by a planned world socialist revolutionary order.

Underlying this point, the Lebanon crisis has escalated because collectively the reactionary Arab bourgeoisie's money is running out as the worldwide imperialist economy stumbles towards the end of its post-war boom finally, and because too (so other feudal Gulf-state) oil money has plunged as international slump conditions take over former hold, and thus the chief subsidiser of every reactionary muslim regime no longer has the cash to keep all these tinpot emirates which supply the reactionary regimes such as in Afghanistan, Iraq, and the Gulf from Morocco to Pakistan, and from Iraq to Sudan.

The contradictory phenomenon of costly warmongering and meddling in the Lebanon by near-lavished reactionary Middle-East regimes is explained not by Arabism nor by muslimism but only by their character as capitalist regimes which are bound to try every last-ditch helicon trick to win a bit of gunboat-diplomacy foreign prestige in order by propaganda bits to keep the domestic population from the palace door for just a little bit longer. It will all come to nothing. But meanwhile Gorbachevism is busy blunting the revolutionary sharpness of the international proletariat. But just at the moment when it needs to be developing its keenest cutting edge.

And what good is all this degenerate revisionist simple-mindedness, abandoning the science of Marxism-Leninism, — doing Gorbachevism — doing "liberal" capitalism — doing "free market socialism" — doing "socialism in one country" — doing "no socialism in the USSR, China, Yugoslavia, etc? It is only encouraging the most petty-minded local chauvinism and petty-bourgeois counter-revolutionary opportunists by this headlong retreat to apathy which will ever be able to truly unite all of man-
Augmenting the clear run which Moscow's revisionist philistinism is giving to Western imperialist aggression, the non-stop rearmament, race provocations, - the 'free world' bourgeoisie never ceases intensifying its general anti-communist propaganda. The Soviet bureaucracy must be criminally negligent not to have noticed or to have responded to Washington's flag of war against the socialist countries, the history of revolutionary struggle, and the science of Marxism-Leninism.

From backing barbarous Feudal backwardness of the drug-wars to the trying to destroy socialist party's educational, medical, or economic progress, - to inventing farcical imaginary perspectives for turning the clock back to the vicious capitalist past in China, Georgia, Poland, Cuba, Vietnam etc. the policy remains increasingly dominated by desperate doomsday thinking about its own imminent demise, projecting that onto the world as a whole. And this apocalyptic pattern prevails and intensifies regardless of new additions to the pacific bogey cats which openly accept that revolutionary communism (not Gorbachev revisionism-class-collaborationism, as practised by the reformist apologists-for-CPs in Western Europe) must now be accepted or destroyed. In capitalist countries, violent struggle to Leninism tends to strengthen in the face of conditions forcing a serious revolutionary movement to begin growing, at which point only does the propaganda situation have a chance of being able to anoint the blackmailing defeats for the bourgeoisie regime, and nothing else.

It is a gross reformist-revisionist illusion to pretend, as Gorbachev does, that there is any reality, and slowly and gradually, 'reason will prevail' over capitalism, and that the entire world imperialist community will eventually be eagerly peacefully coexisting with the socialist camp and the world communist movement. It will be exactly the other way around. The collapse of Leninism will be relentless and crushed all the way to the re-introduction of Nazi concentration camps again in the West for combatting communist workers. Such is the inevitable logic of the capitalist class terminal crisis. Fascist-chauvinist fan-