

# The Line of March

Monthly Publication of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

May 2012

Volume 2 Number 4



**May Day - For the Dignity of Labour!  
There is an Alternative! Stop Paying the Rich!  
Increase Investments in Social Programmes!**

---

# Contents

## ***MAY DAY CALL OF RCPB (ML)***

Fight for the Alternative: The  
World as it Should Be Page 3

Locked-Out Rio Tinto  
Workers Continue to Raise  
International Support Page 4

## ***OUR NHS OUR FUTURE***

Unison Health Care  
Conference 2012 Page 5

The Fight to Save  
the NHS Goes On Page 6

## ***DISCUSSION***

Two Opposing Aims and Outlooks Page 7

## ***THE NEED FOR DEMOCRATIC RENEWAL***

Party Funding, Corruption and the  
Concentration of Power Page 8

The Respect Victory at Bradford  
West Page 10

## ***INTERNATIONAL***

Britain Must Get Out of the  
Malvinas Page 11

Statement from the International  
Relations Commission of the  
Cuban National Assembly Page 12

## ***CENTENARY OF KIM IL SUNG***

Celebrating the Centenary  
in London Page 12

The Legacy of President Kim  
Il Sung Page 13

---

## MAY DAY CALL OF RCPB (ML):

# Fight for the Alternative - For the World As It Should Be!

**M**ilitant revolutionary greetings to the working class of England, Scotland and Wales on May Day 2012; militant revolutionary greetings to the workers of all countries on this day of unity in struggle of the international working class; militant revolutionary greetings to all humanity fighting for the new, fighting to affirm their rights and to assert their own course of development in the face of the international dictate of the owners of capital and the imperialist system of states!

The objective conditions are pointing to the urgent need for the capitalist crisis to be resolved in favour of the new, in favour of the world's peoples, the workers, the women and the youth of the world. More than 17 million people in the eurozone were out of work in February, reaching 10.8%. In Britain unemployment stands at 2.5 million. The value of wages has declined from nearly 65% of GDP in the mid-1970s to 55% today. Over the same period, the rate of corporate profit has increased from 13% to 21%. The government pays £48 billion a year (an estimated 3% of GDP) in interest payments to the financiers. Hundreds of thousands of people have been pushed into part-time working and unpaid work. Pensions, education and the NHS are under attack, and the House of Commons constitutes itself as a pro-war government.

In the circumstances, an effective Workers' Opposition is necessary, urgent and key. The present direction of the economy has brought only insecurity and the wrecking of the manufacturing base. The government is refusing to take up social responsibility for the fate of society and the public good. It has defended the old class privileges, it is attacking social programmes and privatising public services, it is acting as the political executive of the monopolies, it is brutally exercising the dictate of a monopoly capitalist state.

It falls to the organised working class, the Workers' Opposition, to take up responsibility to bring into being a new direction in the country's political and economic affairs that genuinely reflects the socialised character of the economy and the modern way of living. A new and alternative direction means that the people must control their own political and economic affairs and exercise the right to make decisions that affect their workplaces and the direction of society as a whole. The deepest aspiration of the working class and people is that they exercise control over their lives. The British state, the EU, the international financial oligarchy all stand as a block to this happening. Using the power of the state and the immense wealth at their disposal, monopolies and private interests are attacking the livelihoods of the majority of the people and their interests.

For the people to have control over their lives means that people wherever they live and work have to be the decision-makers. This in turn entails that the owners of monopoly capital must be deprived of the power to disempower the people from being the decision-makers. An alternative direction for society, the fight for a society which is human-centred, means that social



product produced by the working class must be reinvested in social programmes, public services and the productive economy, especially manufacturing, so that all can prosper from industrial mass production and not just a privileged few.

The working class and people did not cause the deficit, and the so-called austerity measures far from resolving the crisis are intensifying it. The government has no mandate from the people to impose an austerity agenda that will wreck the social infrastructure even further. The working class must fight for its own independent political programme in order to occupy the space for change and defend its interests against the assault of state monopoly capital.

The working class can rally all of society, bar the rich and powerful, around its own independent programme and politics. Within the framework of creating a new society, lifting society out of the crisis and overcoming the blocks that the monopolies and their representatives are placing in the way of leaving behind this old world, the workers of all countries are fighting their immediate class battles. Only by persisting in these battles with the aim of achieving victory in these struggles can the workers advance along the line of march to a new society. The workers must build their unity in the course of fighting for their programme to *Stop Paying the Rich! Increase Investments in Social Programmes!* Their watchword is that the banner of the emancipation of the working class is the banner for all of humanity in the forward march to create the new world, the world as it should be. More and more, the working class and people are taking up the struggle for this as the alternative, and are rejecting the capital-centred outlook that spending on social programmes increases the deficit and is not an investment. This outlook is being rejected as irrational, immoral and serving only the rich.

Throughout Europe, the people are rising up against the so-called austerity measures. The same is true in North America. The peoples and countries of Latin America are strengthening their unity in defence of their sovereignty and progress, and against imperialist dictate. The socialist countries such as Cuba and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are standing



firm, charting their own way forward, and are providing an inspiration for the world's people and are a powerful factor for peace.

May Day 2012 is the time for the working class to pledge anew to leave the old behind, to resist the attacks of those who hold economic and political power who seek to block this advance, and organise to fight for and build the new even in these adverse conditions. It is a time for the working class and its communist leadership to meet the challenge set by history and the objective conditions, and to fight for its own alternative, the alternative of the modern proletariat and all humanity – a socialist society in which the working class emancipates itself, and

thereby emancipates all humanity, and ends war, aggression and the exploitation of persons by persons.

Let us go all out to build an effective Workers' Opposition around the alternative, to build its contingents across the country with conscious participation in the struggle to defend the rights of all! Let us go all out in fighting for a new direction for society and to plant the alternative on the soil of Britain! Let us advance along the *line of march* to a socialist Britain! Let us strengthen our unity with the workers of all lands who are fighting for that new world, for the elimination of class society, for another world fit for human beings!

***Fight for the Independent Politics of the Working Class!***

***Fight for the Empowerment of the People!***

***Fight for the Alternative - A Socialist Society Which Serves the Public Good and Deprives the Owners of Capital of their Power!***

***Fight to Turn Things Around and Resolve the Crisis in Favour of the Working Class and People!***

***Build the Workers' Opposition!***

***Hail May Day!***

***Workers of All Countries, Unite!***

## Locked-Out Rio Tinto Workers Continue to Raise International Support

On April 15, locked-out Rio Tinto Alcan Alma workers from Quebec began the second part of their international tour to mobilise global support for their struggle. This 10-day tour of Europe visited Britain and France. At the end of March, Rio Tinto Alcan closed the Alcan Lynemouth Aluminium Smelter in the Northeast, using the pretext of rising costs due to environmental regulations. More than 500 workers were thrown onto the streets and many more jobs connected to the smelter will be lost.

On April 19, workers and community members from various countries demonstrated outside the Rio Tinto shareholders' meeting in London against Rio Tinto's track record of attacks against the workers and communities. The delegation representing the locked-out Alma workers participated alongside workers from Unite, the International Transport Federation and others. The demonstrators also demanded that the International Olympic Committee drop Rio Tinto as its supplier of medals and an official sponsor of the Olympic Games.

The demonstrators asked that Rio Tinto lift its lockout against the Alma workers and sign a contract that is acceptable to them and the community. Demonstrators from Mongolia highlighted their concern about the Oyu Tolgoi copper and gold mining project, a joint venture between Ivanhoe Mines, Rio Tinto and the Government of Mongolia. Also denounced were the attacks on workers and the environment by Rio Tinto in West Papua and Bougainville, Papua New Guinea. Bougainville residents, who



*Protestors in London*

were part of the London action, have been pursuing a class action lawsuit in the US against Rio Tinto since 2000 for environmental degradation and war crimes.

A number of workers and community members intervened inside the meeting including Guy Farrell, the Assistant to the Quebec Director of the United Steelworkers, who denounced the lockout in Alma and asked that it immediately be lifted. Rio Tinto's CEO Tom Albanese arrogantly brushed off the concerns of the workers and of those who had travelled from the US and Mongolia to denounce the attacks on the environment. He repeated the lies and slanders according to which the just demands of the Alma workers about working conditions and in defence of the union are unreasonable and would cause a dangerous precedent in Rio Tinto's facilities across the world if they were to be satisfied. He was denounced by the workers present for his arrogance and cowardice.

## OUR NHS OUR FUTURE:

## Unison Health Care Conference 2012

The Unison Health Care Conference 2012 was held from April 23-25 in Brighton.

The conference took place at a crucial time for the all working in the health service in Britain. Over the last year since the last conference, the union has been one of the main forces in the massive organised opposition to demand that the Coalition government drop the Health and Social Care Bill. The bill was eventually rail-roaded through Parliament to get the Royal Assent on March 27. At the conference, delegates discussed how to continue the resistance to the implementation of the Act which is aimed at further opening up the NHS to further fragmentation and handing over provision and commissioning of services to the private sector monopolies. The conference theme Our NHS Our Future captured the need at this time to safeguard the future of the NHS, take forward the resistance of health workers and professionals and plant the alternative that a health care is a right that must be given a guarantee and publicly provided to meet the needs of all.

That government now claims to have some legal force with its Health and Social Care Act to wreck the NHS in favour the "right" of the monopolies to profit from health care. This must be countered by the legitimacy of all sections of the people that public right must prevail over the monopoly right that the coalition government is championing in health. The prevalence of monopoly right over public right gives no future to the NHS and to the right of the people to health care and has no legitimacy. The health workers and all sections of the people are fighting for the public good in opposing the implementation of the Health and Social Care Act and in fighting to safeguard the future of the NHS.

Unison health worker delegates summed up the their experiences in their struggles over the last year against the Coalition government and discussed and planned how to take their resistance forward to the attacks on the NHS and on their pay, pensions and other terms and conditions. The discussion focus groups and motions concentrated on these issues. They gave an important opportunity to build the organised resistance to the implementation of Health and Social Care Act, to the attacks on pay, pensions and other terms and conditions, whilst at the same time also on the fight for the alternative that has been the question taken up for solution by the whole working class movement since 2011.

Unison health worker delegates summed up the their experiences in their struggles over the last year against the Coalition government and discussed and planned how to take their resistance forward to the attacks on the NHS and on their pay, pensions and other terms and conditions. The discussion focus groups and motions concentrated on these issues. They gave an important opportunity to build the organised resistance to the implementation of Health and Social Care Act, to the attacks on pay, pensions and other terms and conditions, whilst at the same time also on the fight for the alternative that has been the question taken up for solution by the whole working class movement since 2011.

Among the important focus groups there were: Campaigning against privatisation in the new NHS which had the "aims to find out ways to challenge and confront the privatisation and fragmentation presented by the Bill"; Any qualified provider: how will it affect you? which pointed out that many health ser-



vices will be commissioned via this model in 2012 and that the "government has stated that TUPE will not apply if a provider fails under this model and staff will be forced to look new work on the open market"; Defending Agenda for Change which took up the issue that the government having imposed spending cuts and wage freezes now intends to impose changes to the national agreement and impose local pay and conditions in an attempt to destroy further the livelihood of health workers; Pensions – the next steps which outlined the latest steps in the pension campaign "as well as looking at how we can protect NHS pensions in the future".

Among the motions there were: NHS Reforms and the threat of Privatisation moved by the Health Service Group Executive which among other things called for developing "an organising strategy to meet the new challenges for the union presented by Any Qualified Provider"; and the Invest in Health Care – Stop the Bill moved by Gateshead health which called for the fight for the alternative. "The alternative is to stop using the economy to pay the rich and instead invest in health care and other social programmes." These and other motions were composited in composite F.

The Unison Health Care Conference very much focused on carrying forward the resistance and the fight for the alternative. The Unison leadership is calling for a national demonstration for the alternative coming out of the conference, which keeps open a space for the working class and people and the Workers' Opposition to develop the resistance and plant the alternative. In these circumstances, it is also very necessary to further the work of building groups of writers and disseminators with conscious participation, which will be key in bringing about change.

The Line of March congratulates the delegates on the success of their deliberations.

See also UNISON Health Care – Our NHS Our Future:  
<http://www.unison.org.uk/ournhs/>



# The Fight to Save the NHS Goes On

“The message from this conference must be: ‘We may have lost the battle, but we have not lost the war’” on the Health and Social Care Act, service group executive speaker Mary Locke told Unison health delegates in Brighton on April 25. “We need to make sure that government looks back on getting the Health and Social Care Bill passed as the easy part.” Looking back on the 18 months of Unison-led campaigning since the government’s white paper “appeared out of thin air”, Ms Lock recalled: “We made the NHS toxic all over again for the Tories. No one will believe that airbrushed poster of David Cameron saying the NHS is safe in his hands ... because he is a liar, liar, liar!”

Moving a composite motion on the new Act and privatisation, Maddy Nettleship of Gateshead health branch asked: “How can we organise from here? That is the important question. Health workers at all levels are not reconciled to what the Act will mean. The struggle to prevent the NHS becoming totally controlled in the interests of the big health monopolies will surely continue. There is also great anger and bitterness about the arrogant use of power by the ConDem government against the will of the people. They reasoned without an effective opposition in Parliament and with a guarantee of being in power till 2015 that they could just ride roughshod over the public good. And as you know despite all the opposition that resulted in over 180,000 people signing the e-petition against the Bill and many thousands on paper petitions. All sections of the people are opposed to this.”

Maddy noted that “before the Bill has become law, as we have been told earlier in the conference, Virgin Health Care has taken over the whole of Surrey’s community services and Devon’s paediatric service. Circa have taken over Hinchinbrooke Trust and living up to their name they are circling like vultures over other so-called failing Trusts”.

She continued: “Up and down the country individual Trusts are attacking our terms and conditions, trying to move towards local pay bargaining that will benefit no-one, but the health monopolies waiting to move in. With the business model in place mergers will become the norm – we know in our area in Gateshead it is likely our trust will be gradually eaten up by Newcastle, and that is already happening to our paediatric service. In our Trust, we have had one of the main movers in privatisation McKinsey Consultants in over the last few weeks. The Trust is not telling us how much this costs because it is commercially sensitive but we know that it is costing thousands. We found out this week that McKinsey has told the directors to take a 5.8% increase. This is when as you know we are facing a three-year pay freeze and that is because they are introducing the business model to incentivise the directors to make cuts that affect the people under them. Already with only the welfare of our patients at heart we are feeling the brunt of the cuts that are masquerading as efficiency savings.

“But what is certain is that we, together with our local communities, will oppose the government health reforms every step of the way. The opposition has been shown clearly as the Bill has passed through Parliament and will not disappear. Some people say that this was the last chance to save the NHS. But for us it

is a chance to sum up what has been achieved in the development of the movement to safeguard the future of the NHS. The movement, the movement for the alternative has grown and

grown over the last two years and shown that there is an alternative to the wrecking of the NHS and the whole social economy that has been carried out by the ConDems. Roughly every eight weeks over the last year we have demonstrated outside of our Trust raising the profile of the opposition to the Bill as has happened throughout the country. Actions such as these must continue, locally, regionally and also nationally finding new ways of organising.

“We must put forward that the real alternative is to stop using the economy to pay the rich and invest in health care and other social programmes. All of us together with our local communities must continue to declare that health care is a right and that this right has got to be given a guarantee. We must fight nationally, regionally and locally united to defend all those who oppose the coalition’s mission to privatise the NHS and do the bidding of the health monopolies no matter what party they are in, or what organisation they are in. No still means No! Our Hospitals! Our NHS Our Future!”

Examining the services that private “any qualified providers” are already looking at in just one trust, Pat Davies of the PT ‘B’ sector committee noted that, “again, this government is targeting most vulnerable groups in society with AQP”.

But there is an alternative, as Roger Nettleship of South Tyneside health noted.

Although the prime minister had “thrown a grenade into the NHS” to fragment it and wreck it, the Coalition government has no legitimacy. “The challenge for the whole movement for the workers’ opposition is the fight for the alternative. It is about building the resistance and organisation that undermines and overthrows the monopoly dictate in Parliament and throughout society. This alternative does not accept health care being turned into a commodity in a health market. Health care is not a commodity; it is a need that must be provided for. The alternative does not accept that any government has the right to champion the claim of the monopolies over the claim of the public. Our alternative is that public right must prevail throughout society over monopoly right.”

Conference agreed and voted to continue and intensify the Our NHS Our Future campaign, working with other organisations and pushing the case that there is an alternative.



## DISCUSSION:

## Two Opposing Aims and Outlooks

K.C. Adams

*First Published in The Marxist-Leninist Daily  
April 13, 2012*

Control of the economy is related to ownership but reaches beyond this to its aim and outlook. Control of the economy in the present era is divided according to the two main social classes: owners of capital and the working class. The two main types of ownership within the socialized economy, not its peripheral of small family businesses, reflect this class division: private ownership by capital and public ownership through the government as representative of society and the people. The two forms of ownership in the present era and their respective aims and outlooks can be characterized as capital-centred and human-centred.

The capital-centred aim and outlook put capital and its well-being, growth and dominance at the centre of all decisions. The human-centred aim and outlook put people, their well-being and the general interests of the economy and society at the centre of all decisions.

The clash between forms of ownership and divergent aims and outlooks of the two main social classes permeates the present era. Given the suffocating dominance of owners of capital and their capital-centred aim and outlook through their control of competing parts of the socialized economy, the state machine and mass media and the age-old traditions of class exploitation of former systems of ownership, the human-centred aim and outlook and form of ownership of the working class has to fight to find space for its expression and development, importantly within the thinking of the working class itself and its organizations.

The working class movement must resist all penetration of its thinking by the capital-centred aim and outlook. Owners of capital and their representatives use their immense wealth along with the power of the state and mass media to overwhelm the human-centred aim and outlook and banish it to irrelevance. Even in the face of admitted failure and destruction of the economy



and the turning of millions of lives upside down, owners of capital refuse any discussion of an alternative to their control of the economy and their capital-centred aim and outlook.

Such was the case February 13-16, 2012 at the Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium in Washington where owners of capital and their leading representatives -- specifically General Electric CEO Jeff Immelt, a political confidant and operative of President Obama -- organized a forum of U.S. captains of industry called "American Competitiveness: What Works."

Within the conditions of a continuing economic crisis in various regions of the world, a jobless recovery and general failure of the present direction of the economy, owners of capital still banished any suggestion of a human-centred alternative from the forum and discussion. Instead, the talk centred on the inevitability of what transpired and how to make the best of the changed conditions for the benefit of capital. The headline of the Reuters item summing up the conference, which was reproduced throughout the monopoly-controlled financial media was, "After 'lemming-like' exodus, U.S. manufacturers look home."

The Reuters' item writes, "Big U.S. manufacturers moved their production out of the country too quickly over the past decades and now see a competitive advantage in building up their footprints back home, top executives said on [February 13]. The chase for lower-paid workers drove the migration, which resulted in employment in the U.S. manufacturing sector falling by

40 per cent from its 1980 peak... a brutal 2007-2009 downturn and high unemployment.... 'We, lemming-like, over the last 15 years extended our supply chains a little too far globally in the name of low cost,' said Jim McNerney, chief executive officer of world No. 2 plane maker Boeing. 'You are going to see more [manufacturing] come back to the United States'."

The capital-centred aim and outlook led to the "lemming-like' exodus" and anti-social technical productivity to destroy livelihoods yet they want workers to believe that the same aim and outlook can lead to something other than more attacks on the rights of the working class, a decreased standard of living, recurring crises, and war among competing centres of capital for markets, raw material, cheap labour and spheres of influence.

They want the working class to accept that a new human-centred direction for the economy is not necessary and that the same owners of capital who put the people and their economy into the present mess can provide a solution. But even they admit their "lemming-like" slavishness to what serves their capital within the moment. Their capital and its well-being, growth and dominance was at the centre of all decisions during their "lemming-like' exodus" and anti-social drive for productivity and big scores, and they are doing the same now within the conditions of high unemployment, jobless recovery and the "return of manufacturing."

Owners of capital are demanding concessions from workers, both those currently employed and others when they return to work, and a destruction of all established social norms. This proves that recovery and a return to manufacturing under the control of owners of capital are based on what serves capital and its well-being, growth and dominance, and not the well-being of the people and the general interests of the economy and society.

The people should grasp that the capital-centred aim and outlook is too narrow for the modern economy. The narrow outlook drove owners of capital by their own admission towards a "lemming-like' exodus," destruction of livelihoods through anti-social productivity, big scores and economic crisis. The same narrow aim and outlook is forcing them to drive down the standard of living of those who do the work and to destroy all social norms of a modern society within a context of "more [manufacturing] coming back to the United States."

The working class must reject with contempt the disequilibrium of a "return to work and manufacturing" under the dictate of capital and its demand for concessions, a lower standard of living and destruction of all social norms that defend the well-being of the people. A "return to work and manufacturing" must be based on the recognition of the rights of the working class and established social norms that provide some protection for the people's well-being.

The working class must organize itself into powerful collectives that can defend workers' basic interests and fight for the rights of all and for a new human-centred direction for the economy in opposition to the present capital-centred direction. This requires workers to reject the aim and outlook of owners of capital and to put forward forcefully their own human-centred aim and outlook. Workers must uphold in their minds and inscribe on their banners that this modern economy is their economy and they must be in control with their own modern human-centred ownership, aim and outlook that puts people, their well-being and the general interests of the economy and society at the centre of all decisions.

## THE NEED FOR DEMOCRATIC RENEWAL:

# Party Funding, Corruption and the Concentration of Power

On March 26, Francis Maude, Minister for the Cabinet Office, made a statement to the House of Commons on party funding.

The statement was made in the context of the scandalous revelations of the cash for Cameron affair. The previous day, the Conservative Party co-treasurer, Peter Cruddas, had resigned when it had been revealed by the Sunday Times that large donations to the party could secure access to the Prime Minister. This boast was described by Francis Maude as completely unacceptable and wrong, and much of what he said was simply not true. This was obviously seen as preferable to the interpretation that the Tory Party had systematically been flouting the electoral law which demands that any donation to a party above 7,500 have to be declared to the Electoral Commission.

This example serves to underline that the issue of party funding is a running sore to the big Westminster parties. How are they to be funded when they are not mass parties of the electorate, but cartel parties charged with the administration of the state in the interests of the rich and powerful? The issue becomes even more acute when decisions in Westminster which affect the direction of the economy, of society, of peace and war, are made not through debate between contending interests in parliament, but by an executive the Prime Minister and Cabinet which is effectively unaccountable even to the House of Commons let alone the electorate as a whole. This throws light on why the cash-for-access channel was considered so appropriate for the government.

An obvious way for the Westminster parties to receive their funding as administrators of the state at the behest of the monopolies is to be funded directly by the state. For these cartel parties, this would solve the problem of fund-raising and consolidate the mechanisms whereby the electorate is completely shut out of decision-making. For them, the issue of standards in public life has always been one of finance, and of combating egregious self-serving from the holding of political power. The Committee on Standards in Public Life itself was set up by the John Major government in 1994 after the Nolan Inquiry into the cash-for-questions affair. In 1997, Tony Blair extended its terms of reference in order to review issues in relation to the funding of political parties, and to make recommendations as to any



changes in present arrangements. Out of this arose the requirement for political parties to be registered after the model of company registration, and indeed this was first done through Companies House. The regulation of loans to political parties in addition to donations was reviewed after the 2005 election campaign.

The present chair of the Committee is Sir Christopher Kelly. Francis Maude referred to his report of last November in his Commons statement. However, the recommendation for increased state funding is on the face of it considered too sensitive to be implemented when cuts and austerity are the watchwords.

While the Conservatives accuse Labour of being in the pay of the unions, Labour accuses the Conservatives of being in the pay of the wealthy. In reality, all of the big parties receive massive amounts from rich benefactors.

A large portion of Labour Party funding indeed comes from the unions. Yet the experience of thirteen years of Labour government and two in almost-silent opposition championing war and the anti-social offensive has completely discredited any notion of the old arrangement between the Labour Party and the trade union movement. The Labour Party has sought to restrict union influence, while the unions themselves have been beginning to question their allegiance to Labour and to raise issues of working class representation afresh.

To call for capping donations can be seen as both a public relations exercise, as well as to move further from established sources of support. In order to continue to dominate the political process, especially during elections through huge campaign expenditures, the implication is that this will have to be funded through increase state subsidies, which already runs into the



millions in various direct and indirect ways.

Access to wealth should not be a block to anybody exercising their right to elect and be elected. However, moves in the direction of state funding of political parties will do nothing to reduce the role of money in politics, but will further entrench it and will itself become a source of further corruption. Moreover, it will embed the narrow definition of parties as electoral machines whose aim is to come to power, increasing the separation of the electorate from the political process.

The alternative lies in bringing about new political arrangements where parties do not present candidates for election. Candidates, able to provide a voice for the interests of women, workers, youth and other collectives of the people that they directly represent, should be selected and have their agenda set by these collectives themselves.

There should be no funding of political parties by the state. Parties should be funded by their own members and supporters, and further, should be barred from selecting candidates and coming to power. The state should instead fund mechanisms of selection and election designed to prevent the domination of the process by a political cartel and aimed at facilitating the participation of the people in governance.

The whole issue of party funding has become a scandal. Even the trade unions in this context are seen as nothing more than special interest groups whose funding of parties has to be kept in check, completely denying the necessity for the voice of the organised workers movement to be heard in the legislative body as the decisive voice in favour of the public good. The present state of party funding is completely unacceptable, and flies in the face of the right of the electorate to elect and be elected. The parameters of the discussion on the issue in parliament do not touch on this nub of the matter at all. That the state should fund political parties is impermissible. On the contrary, funding should be allocated to a political process which facilitates the right of the electorate to elect and be elected. This is no more than what is acceptable in a modern political process, where parties do not present candidates for election. Candidates, able to provide a voice for the interests of women, workers, youth and other collectives of the people that they directly represent, should be selected and have their agenda set by these collectives themselves.



# The Respect Victory at Bradford West

**G**eorge Galloway won an unprecedented victory for the Respect Party in the Bradford West by-election, held on March 29 due to the resignation on health grounds of Labour MP Marsha Singh. By taking a pro-social and anti-war stand, the party was able to mobilise popular support. In one of the largest swings in British electoral history, Galloway won the election with a majority of over 10,000 votes (nearly 31%).

The big parties, by contrast, all suffered heavy losses. Labour had its historically safe majority wiped out; the Liberal Democrats polled so low as to lose their deposit. The Conservative vote also collapsed.

The movement for the alternative has been developing among the electorate. The half-million "March for the Alternative" manifested the consciousness that it is the working class and its allies who represent the alternative that there is a different way of doing things, a different direction for the economy that invests in social programmes rather than paying the rich, where the people decide through new political mechanisms rather than deferring decision-making power to the big parties. The anti-war movement has also taken up this issue. The fight has also been waged over the defence of the rights of all, and it has shown that no movement of the working class and people can make serious advances without the defence of the rights of all being consciously taken up.

Democratic renewal is urgently required by society, and the lasting resolution of the offensive against the working class and people is constantly being blocked by the entrenchment of political power in the hands of the rich and powerful which excludes consideration of the voice of the working class and people. In fact, it could truthfully be said that the movement which gave rise to Respect was based on this need for democratic renewal.

The years since the formation of Respect have only served to underline the need to break the stranglehold of the three big parties over political life. These



years have also seen the crisis of working class representation stand out in sharp relief. It has become increasingly evident how Westminster taken as a whole constitutes a pro-war government as well.

The election of George Galloway has reflected the aspirations of the working class and people that their voice be heard at Westminster and that the government be held to account for its crimes against the people and for its offensive against society and its ordinary members.

## Results of the Bradford West by-election:

Turnout:	32,905	(50.0%)	-14.9
Majority:	10,140	(30.9%)	
Swing:	36.6% from Lab to Respect		

Candidate	Party	Votes	%	±%
George Galloway	Respect	18,341	55.9	+52.8
Imran Hussain	Labour	8,201	25.0	-20.3
Jackie Whiteley	Conservative	2,746	8.4	-22.7
Jeanette Sunderland	Liberal Democrat	1,505	4.6	-7.1
Sonja McNally	UKIP	1,085	3.3	+1.3
Dawud Islam	Green	481	1.5	-0.8
Neil Craig	Democratic Nationalists	344	1.0	-0.1
Howling Laud Hope	Monster Raving Loony	111	0.3	N/A



## INTERNATIONAL:

# Britain Must Get Out of the Malvinas

April 2 marked the thirtieth anniversary of the Falklands/Malvinas War in which nearly 1000 combatants from Britain and Argentina lost their lives. The anniversary has been marked this year by hypocritical statements from the Prime Minister and his government and by the despatch of a heavily armed warship, HMS Dauntless, to the Malvinas. In short, by its words and deeds the present government has shown that it is as committed to colonial invasion and military conquest as the Thatcher government was in the 1980s.

The Malvinas lie about 250 miles off the coast of Argentina but have been claimed by British governments since the early 19th century. The islands have been continually occupied and administered by Britain since 1833. For the last ninety years, Argentina has been pressing its claim for their return, a demand rejected by the British government both before and following the conflict thirty years ago.

On the occasion of the anniversary, Prime Minister David Cameron issued a statement in which he made much of what he referred to as “the part Britain played in righting a profound wrong”. This was a reference not to any action British governments have played in relinquishing sovereignty of territory adjacent to another continent thousands of miles away, but rather to the sabre-rattling and warmongering policies followed by the Thatcher government and its successors. Cameron also spoke of the importance of the principle of self-determination – “the fundamental principle that was at stake thirty years ago: and ... the principle which we solemnly re-affirm today.” In fact, as is well known, this a principle that is more honoured in the breach than the observance, since British governments refuse to uphold or defend it in relation to the peoples of Palestine, Korea and many other countries.

William Hague wrote an article in the Telegraph in which amongst other things he maintained that the government wishes to establish closer economic and other relations with the countries of South America, especially those with rapidly developing economies such as Brazil. According to the Foreign Secretary, Britain’s trade with that country and with Colombia and Mexico will double by 2015. While refusing to enter into any negotiation with Argentina over the sovereignty of the Malvinas, Hague attempted to invite Argentina to again discuss with Britain what he called “confidence building measures” including the government’s plans for the future economic exploitation of the region.

The president of Argentina, Cristina de Kirchner, speaking on the anniversary, condemned British colonial rule. She stated:



“It’s an injustice that in the 21st century colonial enclaves still exist in the world – and ten of the 16 that remain belong to the UK.” She added that it was “absurd” that Britain still maintained sovereignty over islands that are 8,000 miles away from its shores, and concluded by saying that the Malvinas “are a national, South American and global cause. All Argentina is asking for is dialogue.” Argentina is strongly supported by other South American countries as is evident from the recent statement submitted to the UN from the foreign ministers of the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) which condemned what it referred to this “anachronistic and colonial situation taking place on American soil”. The ministers regretted the fact that British government continued to flout UN resolutions passed on this issue since 1965. Venezuela’s Foreign Minister pointed out “There can not be a single colonial enclave in South America and the Malvinas cause is one of the fairest left in this 21st century. Decolonising Malvinas is going to be a great achievement for the independence, peace and stability of our region.”

Behind the government’s sophistry about the right of self-determination for the British citizens who have settled on the Malvinas lie the interests of the big monopolies that are determined to maintain control of the oil reserves that have been discovered off the Malvinas as well as maintaining a presence in a region that is the gateway to the unexploited resources of Antarctica. It is in this context that the current government remains committed to maintaining what the rest of the world considers an anachronism, colonial control of territory thousands of miles from Britain. However, there can be no justification for such a stance in the 21st century; British must get out of the Malvinas.



# Statement from the International Relations Commission of the Cuban National Assembly

*Havana, April 2, 2012*

Nearing the 180th anniversary of the eviction by force of Argentines from their Malvinas Islands, this sister people and their government are still claiming the restoration of sovereignty over this territory. The firmness of their just demand has found backing in reiterated resolutions approved by the United Nations General Assembly, the UN Decolonization Committee, all of the Latin American nations and various international parliamentary and pro-integration forums, among many others in the world who have added their voices to the claim. National Assembly deputies and members of the International Relations Commission of People's Power of the Republic of Cuba are in solidarity with the Argentine cause in this undertaking and reiterate their conviction that the Malvinas Islands are and will continue being Argentine.

Our Commission also adheres to the Statement of the Executive of the Latin American Parliament which "...ratifies in its entirety resolutions passed by the bodies of the Latin American Parliament, in the context of firmly supporting the unrestricted exercise of Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and other island territories such as the South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich and the surrounding maritime areas," and



which urges that the necessary steps be taken to make concrete this act of decolonization, with attention to United Nations resolutions and the basic principles of international law.

Similarly, it calls on legislators who comprise international, regional, federal and national parliaments to pronounce in favor of encouraging the process of negotiations which, in conformity with UN documents, must be undertaken in order to attain the restitution to Argentina of this legitimate right.

## CENTENARY OF KIM IL SUNG:

# Celebrating the Centenary in London

A memorial meeting and concert was organised at London's historic Marx House on March 31 to celebrate the centenary of the birth of Kim Il Sung, which falls on April 15. The meeting was organised by the Friends of Korea in fulfilment of its pledge of one year ago to make the occasion a big success. A photo exhibition of Kim Il Sung was on show, and there was a display of the collected works of Kim Il Sung. The banner Korea Is One! was displayed at the front of the hall.

The speakers included Michael Chant of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist), Dr Hugh Goodacre, John McLeod of the Socialist Labour Party, Dermot Hudson from the UK Korean Friendship Association and the Juche Idea Study Group of England and Mun Myongsin from the embassy of the DPR of Korea in London. It was chaired by Andy Brooks of the New Communist Party of Britain.

After the introductory remarks of the chair, Michael Chant as Secretary of the Co-ordinating Committee spoke of the character of the organisation, which unites organisations, parties and individuals who stand shoulder to shoulder with the DPRK. Its aim is to build solidarity and friendship with the DPRK and its



leadership and people. Friends of Korea stands as one with the Korean people. It does everything it can to unreservedly support the advances in socialist Korea, and combat all the outrageous and treacherous disinformation and propaganda that is put out by the reactionary forces to try and disorientate the people. Therefore, Friends of Korea views it of prime importance to provide information about the achievements of the socialist system and way of life in order to combat the imperialist lies and slanders against the DPRK. It encourages all progressive forces to take a stand wherever they are in favour of the magnificent achievements of the Korean people and in favour of their right to determine their own future. As is well known, it is US imperialism and its allies, including the British government, who wish ill on the Korean people, are the enemies of peace, and who seek to keep the Korean nation divided and interfere on the Korean Peninsula.

The celebratory meeting concluded with a film and a very spirited concert in which the whole meeting participated. The Song of General Kim Il Sung was sung and performed in a number of renditions, and the programme included a solo violin work by patriotic Korean composer Isang Yun. The programme



truly reflected the revolutionary spirit which characterises the people of the DPRK as they work to build a bright future, safeguard their independence and reunify Korea.

To conclude the proceedings, a congratulatory message to respected comrade Kim Jong Un, supreme leader of the Korean people, was read out and adopted by the meeting with unanimous acclaim.

## The Legacy of President Kim Il Sung

**K**im Il Sung was the founder of the Worker's Party of Korea, the President of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (in perpetuity), and the father of socialist Korea.

Having embarked on the road of revolution in his teens, Kim Il Sung led the Korean revolution from victory to victory until he was in his eighties. In his lifetime, he achieved the liberation of the country, built a people-centred socialist system in the DPRK, and at the same time rendered distinguished service to the development of revolution on a world scale.

That the DPRK is not only still in existence, but is advancing and flourishing based on Kim Il Sung's legacy, under the leadership of Kim Jong Il and now the respected Kim Jong Un, is testament to the quality of Kim Il Sung's human qualities and ability to meet the requirements of the times.

### Leadership up to National Liberation

Kim Il Sung was born into a revolutionary peasant family in 1912, in the midst of the military occupation of Korea by the Japanese imperialists (1905-1945). In his early years, his family moved between Korea and China. In June 1926, he was admitted to Hwasong Uisuk School, in Huadian, China, where he organised the Down-with-Imperialism Union (DIU) and was acclaimed its leader on October 17 the same year. Later, while studying at the Jilin Yuwen Middle School, he reorganised the DIU into a more mass-based organisation the Anti-Imperialist Youth League on August 27, 1927, and founded the Young Communist League of Korea on August 28. By the time he was 18 year of age, he had already formed various mass organisations of the Korean people and was leading the anti-Japanese struggle.



In the autumn of 1929 he was arrested and was imprisoned until the following May. In prison, in Kim Il Sung's words: I analysed the situations of the nationalist and communist movements in our country and decided that the revolution should not be conducted in that way. I believed that the revolution in my country would emerge victorious only when it was undertaken on our own responsibility and by the efforts of our own people, and that all the problems arising in the revolution must be solved independently and creatively. This was the starting-point of the Juche idea, as it is known nowadays."

Thus Kim Il Sung summed up that the revolution should be carried out on the strength of one's own people and on one's own responsibility instead of conducting it after obtaining someone else's recognition or under someone else's instructions, and that



all problems arising in the revolution should be solved independently and creatively to meet one's own situation.

On July 3, 1930, Kim Il Sung formed the first Party organisation, the Society for Rallying Comrades, which was like an embryo of the Party, or the preparation for founding a Party. Unlike many in the communist movement at that time, Kim Il Sung chose not to go to Moscow to study at the Communist University. Rather, the Comintern expressed full support in his Juche-orientated line for the Korean revolution, and pinned great hopes on his leadership.



*Kim Il Sung with the KPRA*

In the key struggle which Kim Il Sung led against the occupation by Japanese imperialism, he succeeded in uniting all anti-Japanese patriotic forces, with the active involvement of the people through guerrilla warfare that put the Japanese on the run and ultimately defeated them. This armed struggle was carried through with the vanguard role of Party organisations.

Kim Il Sung said of the founding of the Anti-Japanese People's Guerrilla Army (later reorganised into the Korean People's Revolutionary Army, the KPRA) on April 25, 1932, the aim and mission of the people's guerrilla army is to overthrow the colonial rule of Japanese imperialism in Korea, and bring national independence and social emancipation to the Korean people."

The people's revolutionary government envisioned by Kim Il Sung and put into practice was a popular and democratic government that embraced not only the workers, peasants and the masses of the soldiers but also the youth and students, intellectuals, conscientious capitalists, religious people and other broad anti-Japanese forces, and represented their interests. Kim Il Sung resolved to do everything by means of self-reliance, including the production of weapons, rather than simply relying on fraternal forces such as the Soviet Union. His saying was that once a person was determined, nothing was impossible.

The anti-Japanese struggle was at this time taking place within China, to be expanded into Korea. The work of Kim Il Sung side by side with the Chinese communists was a shining example of the formation of the international anti-imperialist united front working under the banner of proletarian internationalism.

Kim Il Sung in this context formed the Association for the Restoration of the Fatherland in 1936, as well as the Homeland Party Working Committee. And the following year, he put forward the slogan Let Us Inspire the People with Hopes of National Liberation by Advancing with Large Forces into the Homeland. With this guideline, the Battle of Pochonbo was organised and commanded by Kim Il Sung against the Japanese on June 4, 1937. Its significance was not in the fact that some Japanese had been killed; it was significant in that it demonstrated that the Korean nation was not dead but alive, and that it convinced the Korean people that if they fought against the Japanese imperialists they could win.

After the Sino-Japanese war broke out in July 1937, Kim Il Sung published *The Tasks of Korean Communists* in November of that year. He said, only when they [Korean communists] maintain a firm independent position in the revolutionary struggle can they formulate revolutionary lines and policies corresponding to the actual conditions in their country, safeguard and implement them thoroughly and fight to the last for their country's revolution no matter what the difficulties and hardships. In the face of the difficulties caused by the offensive of the Japanese occupiers, Kim Il Sung took the initiative and maintained revolutionary optimism. Under his leadership, the KPRA undertook in 1938 its arduous march to break the enemy's encirclement and attack, which opened up a new phase for the defeat of Japanese imperialist aggression.

In the context of the gathering storm of the late 1930s, the growth of fascism to destroy the growing communist and workers' movement and the aspiration that people should control their own destiny, the Japanese imperialists, prompted by their ambition to carve out a greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere extended the flames of war to Southeast Asia, even though they were still attempting to conquer China. They thus found themselves all the more isolated from within and without, driving deeper into the abyss politically, economically and militarily.

So in 1940, the two tasks presented themselves, the final do-or-die battle and the building of new country an independent stand in the struggle for national liberation. Around mid-July 1942, Kim Il Sung discussed with Soviet and Chinese military cadres an alliance of the armed forces of Korea, China and the Soviet Union, to be known as International Allied Forces: it was based on the principle of the independence and identity of each country and that of international solidarity and co-operation.

As Nazi Germany was defeated and Japanese imperialism was suffering defeat after defeat, Kim Il Sung, assessing how rapidly the situation was developing, in May 1945 put forward the operational policy for liberating the country by the efforts of the Korean people themselves.

Kim Il Sung said, Korea's liberation was the great result of



*Kim Il Sung First Congress WPK*

the struggle of the forces of our people and the KPRA themselves in the favourable circumstances created by the Soviet forces' destruction of the Japanese Kwantung Army. In August,



the liberation of Korea from Japanese imperialism (from 1905), was achieved. Under Kim Il Sung's leadership, the people won back the sovereignty of the Korean nation, opening up a path for the building of a new society, with a revolutionary spirit.

### Leadership from the time of National Liberation

Kim Il Sung and his fellow revolutionaries formed the Central Organising Committee of the Communist Party of North Korea and proclaimed the founding of the Party on October 10, 1945. The Workers' Party of North Korea would later emerge from the union of the Communist Party and the New Democratic Party in August 1946.

After he returned to Korea, Kim Il Sung was elected Chairman of the Provisional People's Committee of North Korea on February 8, 1946. At that time, People's Committees were present all over Korea with the aim of reuniting the country. Korea had been divided at the 38th parallel as a decision of the Moscow Conference of 1945 when the Soviet Union and the US agreed to receive the Japanese surrender and hold Korea in "trusteeship" for five years and pave the way for Korea to be handed back to the Koreans. The majority of Koreans who felt that they were quite capable of running their own affairs resented this. From 1945 to 1948, Kim Il Sung was active in leading the fight for Korean independence in the face of the brutal campaign of terror the US was waging to suppress the Korean independence movement and establish a permanent military presence in south Korea to launch its wars of aggression. Hundreds of thousands of Koreans perished or were imprisoned during this period. Fraudulent "elections" were organised to install the Syngman Rhee puppet regime in the south all against the wishes of the Korean people.

On September 9, 1948, the DPRK with its unified central government of the Korean people was founded. This was done to guarantee the base for Korean independence, reunification and self-determination. Kim Il Sung was elected Premier. He organised the first democratic election and established the People's Assembly of North Korea where he was elected Chairman of the People's Committee of North Korea, the new central organ of state power, and set out the tasks for the period of transition to socialism. Under his leadership, the KPRA was transformed into the Korean People's Army (KPA), a regular revolutionary armed force, in February 1948. He called the Joint Plenary Meeting of the Central Committees of the Workers' Parties of North and South Korea on June 30, 1949, where he was elected Chairman of the Workers' Party of Korea.

On June 25 1950, President Kim Il Sung and the Korean people were forced by the US imperialists into the Korean War. The US was overconfident about a quick victory over the nascent DPRK. Despite the US military attack across the 38th parallel at dawn June 25, 1950 which began the war, Kim Il Sung and the KPA were prepared and able to go on the counter-offensive moving steadily south. In a little over a month, the KPA liberated 90 per cent of the territory of south Korea and 92 per cent of its population.

The United States, attempting to "encircle and annihilate" the KPA units, called the troops of 15 other countries including Britain to the Korean front, as part of an infamous and illegitimate UN "police action." In response, President Kim Il Sung ordered the KPA to make a strategic and temporary retreat, thus

keeping the initiative.

The KPA, taking advantage of the mountainous terrain of the country, developed tunnel warfare and employed a wide range of tactics to frustrate and weaken the enemy forces. As Supreme Commander, Kim Il Sung adapted to the ever-changing situation, ultimately leading to the defeat of the US aggressors in July 1953, after three years of bloody warfare in which an estimated four million Koreans were killed the vast majority civilians by military massacres, napalm attacks, carpet-bombing, germ warfare and other crimes. General Mark Clark, commander of the US/UN forces admitted in a surrender document that the KPA had emerged victorious thanks to General Kim Il Sung's command.

The US imperialists' spirit of revanchism and striving for global domination has meant that ever since the end of the Korean War, the US has refused to sign a peace treaty while it has continuously violated the Armistice Agreement. This means that technically there is still a state of war on the Korean Peninsula which requires the DPRK to expend great efforts to maintain the peace and make sure that never again will the US be able to rain death and destruction by occupying all of Korea as it attempted to do in the 1950s' war. Meanwhile, the US has maintained a brutal economic blockade, continued to garrison troops in south Korea as well as various weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons. It has committed innumerable acts of espionage, military provocations and war games which continue to the present.

In the early 1960s, when the situation worsened owing to US schemes to ignite a new war, President Kim Il Sung made sure that the US did not achieve its aim of keeping Korea vulnerable. He led the people to simultaneously push ahead with economic construction and ensure that defence-building projects were put in place while looking after the people's well-being. The military was further strengthened and modernised and defence training provided to all citizens, thus turning the whole country into a veritable fortress against foreign aggression.

On the front of international relations, far from permitting the DPRK to be isolated by the US imperialists, President Kim Il Sung did his utmost to build links with the peoples of the world on behalf of the Korean people. He met more than 70,000 foreign guests including heads of state and government and party leaders, and paid official or unofficial visits to 87 countries. In June 1994, he met former US President Jimmy Carter in Pyongyang and created favourable conditions for the opening of DPRK-US negotiations about the nuclear issue and for a north-south summit. His life-long efforts lead to the establishment of diplomatic relations with most countries of the world with the exception of the countries which committed aggression against the DPRK during the Korean War. To date, the aggressor states refuse to right historical wrongs or normalise relations on the basis of upholding the principle of the right to self-determination.

In recognition of his achievements, Kim Il Sung received more than 180 top decorations from more than 70 countries and international organisations, titles of honorary citizenship from more than 30 cities and honorary academic degrees from 20 foreign universities.

Kim Il Sung worked tirelessly for the Party and the revolution, for the country and the people, for global peace until the last moment of his life. President Kim Il Sung died on July 8, 1994.



# John Buckle Centre

## Centre for communism and communist and progressive literature from Britain and around the world

Please contact us by phone or email before visiting.

170 Wandsworth Road, London SW8 2LA

Tel: 020 7627 0599

E-mail: [jbbbooks@btconnect.com](mailto:jbbbooks@btconnect.com)

The title *The Line of March* is taken from the programmatic document of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist), "The Line of March to a New Society". It signifies that the goal of the movements of the working class and people and their struggles is indeed a new society, a society that puts human beings and their rights at the centre of all considerations. It signifies that the movements of the working class and people are aimed at removing the obstacles which are placed on the progress of this line of march.

## Order Your Copy of Line of March Now!

Subscription rates within Britain (including p&p) are £35.95 per year. Political contributions to support this important work are also welcome. Cheques should be made payable to 'RCPB(ML)' and sent to 170 Wandsworth Road, London SW8 2LA. For any subscription applications from abroad or for bulk subscriptions, please contact RCPB(ML) directly. For all other enquiries regarding the Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist), please visit our Website: [www.rcpbml.org.uk](http://www.rcpbml.org.uk)

## Workers' Weekly

Newspaper of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

Website: [www.rcpbml.org.uk](http://www.rcpbml.org.uk)

Published weekly online

Workers' Weekly Email Edition Subscribe by e-mail weekly

Address: 170 Wandsworth Road, London, SW8 2LA. Phone: 020 7627 0599

## Workers' Daily News Feed

Daily On Line News Feed of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

Website: [www.rcpbml.org.uk](http://www.rcpbml.org.uk)

e-mail: [office@rcpbml.org.uk](mailto:office@rcpbml.org.uk)

Published by RCPB(ML)  
170 Wandsworth Road,  
London SW8 2LA  
Tel: 020 7627 0599

The **Line of March** 

Monthly Publication of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)