

# REVOLUTION

THEORETICAL JOURNAL OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

**AUGUST 1979** VOLUME FOUR NUMBER ONE

PRICE 30p

**THE ANTI-LEAGUE FACTION  
ITS HISTORY AND MAIN FEATURES  
THE PARTY OF LABOUR  
OF ALBANIA –  
A NEW CENTRE OF REVISIONISM  
INTERVIEW WITH  
COMRADE POL POT  
BUILD THE PARTY AT  
THE POINT OF PRODUCTION**



# THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

The Revolutionary Communist League is a national organization with branches in half a dozen towns and cities in Britain. It is dedicated to the task of rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class.

Since the Communist Party of Great Britain was taken over by a band of revisionists, the working class in Britain has had no vanguard party to lead it. Without a party giving leadership it is impossible to overthrow the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie and the capitalist system; it is impossible to establish socialism and to enforce a dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie to prevent them seizing power back again.

Without a vanguard revolutionary Communist Party the working class cannot sustain their existing struggles against the attacks of the monopoly capitalists through to the end and cannot raise them to a higher level.

For these reasons building the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class is the central task in Britain today, the task around which we must arrange all our work.

The Revolutionary Communist League of Britain was founded in July 1977 out of the militant unity forged between two former organizations, the Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) and the Communist Unity Association (Marxist-Leninist). This militant unity was won through active ideological struggle, the weapon for ensuring unity.

The Revolutionary Communist League takes Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as the theoretical basis guiding its thinking. It strives to integrate this scientific theory of the international working class with the concrete conditions of the socialist revolution within Britain.

In its mass work the Revolutionary Communist League concentrates particularly on sinking deep roots among the industrial working class. The Revolutionary Communist League implements democratic centralism in its internal life in a centralized and lively way. It has published a Manifesto as an important step towards the programme of the future revolutionary Party.

The founding of the Revolutionary Communist League is an important advance in rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class.

## BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION!

For information about the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain contact:

The Secretary RCLB  
c/o New Era Books  
203 Seven Sisters Road  
London N4

For criticism, correspondence and contributions to 'Revolution' write to:

The Editor, 'Revolution'  
c/o New Era Books  
203 Seven Sisters Road  
London N4

## CONTENTS

EDITORIAL.....	pi
THE ANTI-LEAGUE FACTION - ITS HISTORY AND MAIN FEATURES.....	p1
THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA - A NEW CENTRE OF REVISIONISM.....	p9
INTERVIEW WITH POL POT.....	p27
BUILD THE PARTY AT THE POINT OF PRODUCTION.....	p37
MESSAGES TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA.....	p41
MESSAGES TO THE PARTY AND GOVERNMENT OF DEMOCRATIC KAMPUCHEA.....	p43

# EDITORIAL

This issue of *Revolution* has been published late, after a long interval. It should have been published at the beginning of the year, but was postponed so that the internal struggle against the Anti-League Faction could be summed up. Inevitably, following such a two-line struggle, there is much work to do and priorities have to be re-ordered but following this delay *Revolution* will now resume regular publication.

In January of this year the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain expelled Neil Redfern, former Secretary of the Central Committee and Phil Dixon, another Central Committee member, for bourgeois factionalism after they had set up a faction consisting of three individuals. This was an open faction which all three openly boasted about. They were later joined by one other rank and file member.

The forming of the faction in December 1978 was only the culmination of a process of development and exposure in which Redfern has arrogantly refused to approach contradictions between comrades in the spirit of "Unite, Don't Split". Despite mounting criticism on the Central Committee and by the rank and file of the League he dug in his heels and became an incorrigible splittist.

In the course of struggle about the application of the theory of the three worlds to British conditions, Redfern finally came out attacking some basic aspects of the theory itself. In spite of the fact that he constantly claimed to be in favour of a "revolutionary" application of it the Anti-League Faction was finally formed opportunistically by allying with P Dixon who had suddenly come out and attacked the theory of the three worlds as "opportunist"; Dixon has since stated that China is a revisionist and social imperialist state.

Since their expulsion the faction have now launched themselves on the Marxist-Leninist movement under a new signboard. They have made themselves publically known in their first pamphlet under the name "Communist Unity"! A fine title for a gang of splitters. But this statement only serves to show their opportunism. They claim to be fighting revisionism, but manage to avoid all mention of the theory of the three worlds, which is one of the major lines of demarcation with revisionism. This is how "principled" their fight is.

Even the name they have chosen exposes their opportunism. They hoped to give the impression in the document that the split was between the two founding organisations of the RCL - the old Communist Federation of Britain (ML), and the Communist Unity Association (ML). They refer a number of times to "the CFB/RCL" in their pamphlet. But this is a calculated lie on their part. The unity achieved at the Founding Congress of the League in 1977 has stood the test of time. Of those in the faction, only two were former members of the CUA. There has been no split along the lines of the founding organisations of the League.

The faction chose to struggle for their political line by attacking democratic centralism - the fighting organisational principle of the proletariat. The reason for this was their petty-bourgeois individualism and arrogance. Why was this? It was because the success of the RCL in winning victories against small group mentality meant that petty-

against both superpowers, in particular against Soviet social imperialism and its agents in Belgium."

The RCL sent a warm message of support to the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Bangladesh when in April it united with the Communist Party of East Bengal (Marxist-Leninist) into a single Party. The message pointed out, "The people of Bangladesh are a great people with a rich anti-imperialist, anti-feudal history...But the military dictatorship of the feudal bureaucrat-comprador capitalist classes serves the two superpowers and Indian expansionists in suppressing and exploiting the people mercilessly...The Marxist-Leninist Party alone is able to unite the people, first and foremost the workers and peasants, unfold the struggle against the superpowers and their agents in an all-sided way, and lead the national democratic revolution to victory."

April 5th 1979 marked the 20th anniversary of the Pan-African Congress of Azania. The RCL joined "with the whole of freedom loving mankind in saluting the PAC and the fighting people of Azania," on this "truly historic occasion." "These have been twenty years of struggle, heroic sacrifice and victories...The PAC teaches that a non-violent resistance and the struggle for reforms ended in 1960 with the massacre of unarmed men, women and children at Sharpeville. Imperialism perpetuates itself with the gun. The only cure for the ills of colonialism and imperialism is the armed struggle. The organised, conscious armed struggle of the Azanian people is invincible."

"...The PAC is already an influential spokesman of the third world, a respected member of the OAU, of the UN and the Non-Aligned Movement. The PAC stands in the forefront of the international struggle against the superpowers, imperialism and neo-colonialism and has made an enormous contribution to the struggle of the working class world-wide."

The two Marxist-Leninist Parties of the Dominican Republic, Linea Roja and Bandiera Proletaria, united into one. The National Congress of Unity, held in late April, was dedicated to Mao Zedong and the countless martyrs and heroes of the Dominican Revolution. The RCL message pointed out: "Throughout the dark years of the US/Balaguer fascist dictatorship, the Dominican Communists proved themselves to be the fearless and competent leaders of the people. Tempered in struggle you have integrated the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought with concrete conditions, successfully combined legal and illegal work and unfolded broad mass movements. Since the collapse of the fascist dictatorship you have created new opportunities to expand and broaden your work." The message concluded, "The consolidation of the Dominican Communists is a major step forward in the glorious struggle of the people for national and social liberation against the local reactionaries and the superpowers."

The RCL also sent its warmest greetings to the Unity Congress of Spanish Communists on July 1st. The unification of the Workers' Revolutionary Organisation (ORT) and the Party of Labour of Spain (PTE), like the unification of the other fraternal parties, is the outcome of a principled process of ideological and political struggle. The message pointed out, "Each Party has made a sterling contribution to the fight against fascism and superpower domination, in the struggle for independence, democracy and finally socialism in Spain."

Every message reaffirmed the RCL's determination to support and unite with our fraternal parties abroad, uphold proletarian internationalism and learn from their rich experience.

We are also publishing in full two recent messages, one to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and one to the Ambassador of the People's Republic of China, along with two messages to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kampuchea. These are significant in a situation where revisionists of both right and "left", line up with imperialism, especially Soviet social imperialism to attack socialist China and Kampuchea. The interview with Pol Pot, reprinted in this issue, has been published by the Canadian Communist League. It is a powerful refutation of the lies of the imperialists and social imperialists about Kampuchea, and so exposes the true motives of the Vietnamese invasion of that country.

Editorial Committee.



# THE ANTI-LEAGUE FACTION its history and main features

In January, the RCL expelled a tiny faction of three members for forming themselves into a faction and attempting to split the organisation. This faction consisted of N Redfern, the former Secretary of the RCL, P Dixon, a member of the Political Committee, and a rank-and-file member. Shortly afterwards, they were joined by a second rank-and-file member.

This grouplet has already exposed itself to the Marxist-Leninist movement through publishing a pamphlet called *Exposure and Defeat of the RCLB's Social Chauvinism is a Major Task in Party Building*. (see *Class Struggle* Vol.3 No.2). This pamphlet is published under the name "Communist Unity".

Throughout this pamphlet, they fail at any time to state clearly their own political stand. Do they support the theory of the three worlds as a new strategic line of the international communist movement? Do they denounce China as revisionist? as an aggressor against Vietnam? or uphold China as a socialist state? Where do they stand? They do not say. Many of the attacks on the RCL in the pamphlet are based on attacks made by one or other of them when they were in the RCL, but opposed by the others. On some they have shifted their position since they were in the RCL. This constant shifting of position by them is not new. As Lenin said, "You cannot catch an opportunist with a formula."

The style of work of the faction is thoroughly opportunist. They sabotaged the proletarian democracy of the RCL in relations between the centre and the districts, and they sabotaged it through making principled struggle on the Central Committee impossible. Later, they attacked the centralism of the RCL. Finally, after a major struggle against Redfern's splittism, P Dixon helped to build a faction as a final attack on the Democratic Centralism of the RCL with the clear intention of splitting the organisation. They failed. They were expelled. It is on the question of Democratic Centralism and all that it entails, including conscientious criticism and self-criticism, and seeking truth from facts that the major line of demarcation was drawn. This in itself was opposed by the faction, who characterise the RCL's emphasis on these correct ideological principles as "the absurd elevation of organisational and petty matters to the position of the highest principle." They metaphysically counterpose basic questions of style of work and the strengthening of Democratic Centralism to "ideological and political line". This is a total failure to grasp that these questions are precisely fundamental questions of "ideological" line, and that they are indispensable to any principled struggle to reach political clarity and unity at a higher level. It is not surprising that their pamphlet shows no sign of greater political clarity on their part.

## REPUDIATING BOURGEOIS FACTIONALISM

The faction was formed in December. In early January they produced a thoroughly splittist document "appealing" to the membership of the RCL. In it they admit that they had been working together. In innocent terms they add that they "did so openly but have been accused of bourgeois factionalism." They had the vain hope, characteristic of their contempt for rank-and-file comrades, that RCL members were too naive to know that the issue of "openness" or "secrecy" was totally irrelevant, and that either way they had flagrantly attacked Democratic Centralism and had indeed established a bourgeois faction. This opportunist mask of injured innocence, like much of their statements was an out-and-out fraud. P. Dixon himself stated at a meeting of the Political Committee in December: "My association with comrade Redfern is an open one, and I know it is a factional one." Trotsky's faction in the CPSU(B) was "open". It makes not one bit of difference.

Their tiny clique had been meeting behind closed doors to plan their strategy and tactics for overthrowing the line and leadership of the RCL, rather than working as individuals in their own units and committees. The establishment of such a faction is nothing less than a declaration of causing a split. It is a demonstration that they had thrown out of the window any idea of struggling over a period of time for their line, whilst testing the line of the RCL in practice. Such factionalism has not been tolerated by any other communist organisation. It was not tolerated by the RCL.

The faction complain in their pamphlet that their document was suppressed. It was suppressed for one reason - to uphold the principles of Democratic Centralism. The faction claims that the "real" reason was to suppress political struggle. Yet three weeks later, the Central Committee circulated a criticism of their document and the document itself to the entire rank-and-file!

The faction set itself up as a separate organisation within the RCL. Its utter hypocrisy is apparent when it berates the "bureaucratic centralism" of the RCL for upholding the united face of leading committees, and the principle of allowing those who hold a minority view to "reserve their views" whilst struggling "in an orderly manner." Yet simultaneously, the Anti-League Faction "struggled for unity" among themselves (something they refused to do with the vast majority of RCL comrades) and where they could not agree they adopted the "principle" of the united face of the faction, and avoided criticising each other in the RCL! So, for example, they do not mention the "theory of the three worlds" in either ~~the~~ document they circulated in the RCL, or in their public pamphlet. Why? Because whilst they are indeed united in their opposition to it, N Redfern poses as a solid supporter, whilst P Dixon openly attacks it as revisionist. As P Dixon himself said to the Central Committee at the beginning of December: "many arguments are put which thoroughly refute the theory of the three worlds but which do not make the final break with this opportunist thesis. Such are the arguments of NR. But that does not matter a lot, at least for the time being." Yet the faction attack the RCL for allowing comrades to "reserve their views" when in a minority, instead of expelling them! But the faction will have their unity at all costs, even on the basis of an opportunist compromise.

## THE FACTION WAS THE OUTCOME OF SPLITTIST ATTACKS

The establishment of a faction was itself only the culmination of a vicious splittist campaign waged by N Redfern. It was the result of N Redfern's attempt to change the line of the RCL, not through patient and principled struggle and criticism, but through the means of waging a personal war of extermination against the Chairman of the RCL, and on the basis of demagoguery. Opportunistically he first directed his fire at an individual, when in reality, as the faction only admitted at the very end, he was attacking the Manifesto of the RCL itself. His tactics were to sling more and more mud at an individual. It was a splittist stand from the start. The RCL took a stand that the principled method of struggle was to "nail errors, not comrades". He went on. It reached an extreme form when he denounced the Chairman as a "traitor to the working class". He had no desire to struggle for clarity and unity at a higher level, and thus strengthen the ideological and political line of the RCL.

The first time he brought a major political difference to the Central Committee in June 1978, he proposed that at the next Congress of the RCL the united face of the Central Committee and the Political Committee should be dropped. He kept up this demand through to his expulsion. The Central Committee refused to discuss the form of the next Congress until preparations for it were begun. The real issue was why N Redfern raised it at that time and continued to raise it. It was because he never had any intention of struggling consistently to win the Central Committee to his position, but looked only to making a grand demagogic appeal to the rank-and-file. He denied that principled struggle is the means to reach unity and rejected unity on a higher level as the aim of inner-party struggle. He had no faith in the Central Committee at all.

In December, the faction opportunistically shifted its position again. At that time, once they had made a definite decision to split the organisation, they attacked the concept of having a united face of the Central Committee at all. This was not a principled line of demarcation. They had always claimed to support it before. It was a new line only because it served their immediate aims of splitting the RCL. The united face of the Central Committee exists precisely to ensure that struggle is carried out in a principled manner and to avoid the germs of splittism. The main duty of the Central Committee is to give leadership to the RCL as a whole. Principled struggle should take place on the Central Committee. Once a decision is taken it is taken to the rank-and-file. They have the right to hear the reasons behind the decisions that have been taken, and to struggle with the leading comrade representing the Central Committee. This clarifies their viewpoint. They make criticism upwards to the Central Committee. As they carry out a decision and test them in practice, they make further criticisms showing through experience what was right and what was wrong. It is the task of the Central Committee to sum up these criticisms in a self-critical manner. Always the line is strengthened. Sometimes it is proven quite wrong and the minority position is strengthened. The struggle goes on on the Central Committee. The minority on the Central Committee not only have the right but the duty to speak out on the most authoritative committee in the RCL and argue their viewpoint. Through the process of Democratic Centralism, theory becomes even more integrated with



practice. This is true also of general analysis, as the rank-and-file centralise their opinions basing them on what is actually happening in the world. All comrades including leading comrades have some one-sidedness and see only part of the picture. Through the process of Democratic Centralism the organisation becomes more all-sided.

The faction's stand on Democratic Centralism replaces this proletarian stand with a fine-sounding appeal for the rights of the individual. They separate theory and practice and see inner-party struggle as a war to the death between abstract ideas. They show contempt for rank-and-file comrades by crying that the RCL can only be "saved" if N Redfern is allowed to make a personal appeal. No rank-and-file comrade, they think, can come to a "correct understanding" and make criticisms of Central Committee decisions without his individual leadership. Through their organisational "principles" they would encourage leading comrades to try to win "their" local units as their personal mountain strongholds. They would undermine collective Central Committee leadership. They would sabotage patient and conscientious struggle for clarity and unity at a higher level on the Central Committee and replace it with constant demagogic appeals to the rank-and-file. They would reduce the communist organisation to an irrelevant sect permanently consuming itself in internal warfare.

And, as they promised, they would, in fact, sabotage genuine proletarian democracy by expelling all comrades holding a minority position once a decision has been reached, rather than testing the line in practice. That is the reality of ultra-democracy, of bourgeois democracy. As we shall see N Redfern sabotaged proletarian democracy in other ways as well.

N Redfern's splittism took other forms besides unprincipled personal attacks and opportunist switches in his stand on Democratic Centralism. Once he had unleashed his campaign, he threw issue after issue into the melting pot. At every meeting he had changed his mind on half a dozen issues and demanded that they be debated immediately. He mixed up major issues with minor issues and prevented progress on important struggles by raising many <sup>new</sup> secondary ones. He answered criticisms of his stand on one line, with an attack about another, and used this to reduce the struggle to a struggle between two personalities. This relentless attack inevitably partially paralysed the centre, constantly side-tracked the struggle over the main issues and sowed confusion - as it was meant to do.

Inevitably this led to the demand to struggle in an "orderly manner" to which he again replied that the Political Committee and the Central Committee were trying to "reduce" the struggle to "petty" issues of method of work. Inevitably this led to action against him at the centre. First, in September, he was removed from the position of National Secretary, then he was removed from the Political Committee, when he refused to make a self-criticism for his splittism. But, even then, he was allowed to remain on the Central Committee and put forward his views! He was finally expelled only after he formed a faction. All these steps were supported by the membership of the RCL. Now the faction turn round and attack the RCL for "suppressing political struggle". No! It was N Redfern who suppressed principled political struggle through his splittism, and the Central Committee after experiencing it for some time took steps to suppress splittism whilst still giving N Redfern a

way out. What is more P Dixon who is now part of the faction propagating the lie that N Redfern was silenced because of his political line knows this well because he himself supported the initial disciplinary action against N Redfern at a meeting of the Central Committee in September 1978, as did every other member of the Central Committee. It was only at a Political Committee meeting in November 1978, at the same time as P Dixon came out with an open attack on the theory of the three worlds and on the People's Republic of China that he simultaneously and opportunistically changed his line against splittism.

When the Central Committee, in December, had the gall to unanimously (apart from NR and PD) remove NR from the Political Committee, P Dixon walked out of the meeting with N Redfern in protest. This was the only time that they were unable to put their political line at any meeting of their committees, but it was only their self-enforced absence which prevented them from doing so. Even then P Dixon said, "I uphold the Democratic Centralism of the RCL", and added, "I have not vacillated on the question of Democratic Centralism." He went on: "I am mentally prepared for a protracted struggle." Yet within days, he had formed a faction with N Redfern and a rank-and-file member! The scenario that the faction tried to paint (in its January document "appealing" to the RCL rank-and-file) of the "minority" ie NR and PD being suppressed by the "majority" for "nearly a year" is an out-and-out lie. But, of course, "any means necessary" - including lies - are acceptable in the "struggle against revisionism", and the RCL is dealing with "petty matters" again!

The faction claims in its pamphlet that struggle over political line is not permitted. We have seen what they are really covering up! Political struggle continues in the RCL in an "orderly manner" - how terrible! - at every level. The faction knows that just one example was a document dealing with some aspects of the international class struggle. Both P Dixon and N Redfern took full part in several struggles on the Political Committee over this document. Then they took full part in a struggle at the Central Committee. Then again they struggled on the PC. Finally it went back to the Central Committee in December. They did not take part then - but only because they walked out. All their amendments were even then voted on by the Central Committee. Finally, when it was sent to the full membership for discussion, N Redfern's main amendments were also circulated to enable comrades to draw a clear line of demarcation with his left opportunist distortion of the theory of the three worlds. This is how political struggle is "suppressed" in the RCL!

#### REDFERN'S BUREAUCRATIC LEADERSHIP

In a pathetic attempt to pose as the upholders of "democracy" against "bureaucratic centralism" in order to push what was really ultra-democracy, the faction claimed to the RCL membership in their document: "We stand for a Central Committee which encourages lower levels and the rank-and-file to use their heads...and question Central Committee directives, lines and policies... (and) feel free to voice their opinions." This is rich. No one can disagree with such a fine statement. But coming from N Redfern it only produced a roar of laughter. At the RCL Conference against splittism in March, rank-and-file members, cell leaders, district and branch secretaries got up,

one after the other, to denounce Redfern's activities as Secretary of the Central Committee. They gave example after example of his suppression of criticism and his refusal to make self-criticism. It was precisely N Redfern himself who as Secretary of the Central Committee wielded a sledgehammer against any lower committees who dared to criticise his leadership. It was N Redfern who attacked those who disagreed with him in a manner that suppressed democracy at every level. It was N Redfern who gave arbitrary instruction, who closed his ears when members told him that his demands were not practical, and who flew into a rage and spouted lofty phrases in retaliation, branding them as "revisionist" or "tailist". It was N Redfern's approach that totally divorced theory from practice, and that could not see a distinction between scientific revolutionary optimism and building castles in the air. In reality N Redfern demanded ultra-democracy for himself and bureaucracy for others.

All three matters are precisely fundamental questions of ideological line. From his stand on Democratic Centralism, to his arrogance, to his failure to practice self-criticism to his refusal to seek truth from facts, N Redfern backed by the faction, takes the class stand of the petit-bourgeoisie, whilst hiding behind a cloak of proud phrases.

#### THE IDEALIST METAPHYSICS OF THE FACTION ON PARTY BUILDING - THE RESULT OF DIVORCING THEORY FROM PRACTICE

Redfern was fond of proud phrases. This is one characteristic of the ultra-leftist who commonly mistakes his high-flown ideals for reality. The ultra-leftist relies on idealism as opposed to investigating reality. He prefers separating theory from practice to the struggle to integrate the two.

In total disregard for concrete reality and actual conditions, the faction wildly attacks the party-building strategy of the RCL. This "line" of theirs only started to be put together in their January document to the RCL membership and was added to in their public pamphlet. In particular, their latest addition is their opposition to the RCL's line on the struggle to unite the Marxist-Leninist movement. We have not the space to deal with this here. Instead we shall concentrate on the aspect of the RCL's work of building the party among the masses. This as a question of pace of work and of orientation of work. The two are inseparably related.

#### Practice! Practice! Practice!

Whilst he was Secretary of the Central Committee, N Redfern pushed a line of frantic activism (for others) in the RCL. At the beginning the RCL agreed with this. There was a need to be more active after the long period of internal struggle leading up to the founding of the RCL and the publication of its Manifesto. But N Redfern pushed "practice practice, practice" to such a limit that experience soon started to show the incorrectness of his line. Eventually N Redfern accepted that in fact, theory was still primary over practice, but he accepted it only in the realm of abstract ideas. At that point in summer 1978, the work of the RCL was running into problems. Members were so overworked in direct practice, that in most areas, there was no time to study or prepare for meetings. Firstly, this meant that leads from the Central Committee and from N Redfern were not being carefully studied

and criticised. Democracy was objectively being suppressed. N Redfern's response was a diatribe against the membership. Rather than looking for the cause of the problem, he accused them wholesale of suffering from "employee mentality". Secondly, it meant that comrades' grasp of theory and RCL policy was weakened. Practice began again to grope in the dark. Thirdly, experience was not properly summed up - again weakening the integration of theory and practice. Fourthly, less and less time was spent in working with the most advanced workers and revolutionary intellectuals and thus bringing supporters into membership. The obvious net result was that the development of practical activities was itself held back in the long term. N Redfern's "practice, practice, practice" line was sabotaging practice itself. When N Redfern accepted, with the Central Committee, that the line of "practice is primary" was wrong, and that practice should be guided by theory, he only accepted it in the realm of ideas. His response was ludicrously idealist. He proclaimed that the solution to the problem was to do even more practice, but to do a great deal more "theoretical work" on top. He showed his total inability to integrate theory with practice by refusing to investigate the actual situation by refusing to grasp that there are only 24 hours in a day; and by his inability to see that all aspects of our work need to be correctly and consciously balanced. What elementary facts we have to spell out.

#### Concentrating resources on the industrial working class.

The faction also attacked in their January document, the RCL's policy of concentrating its practical work at the present time on the working class. He demanded that the RCL lead the political struggles of all classes and strata in Britain. What proud revolutionary phrases! The RCL is still a small organisation with scarce resources. It is an immediate practical question to decide where we concentrate these scarce resources. When these elementary points were made, the faction's reply was to avoid the awful reality of the world and say "stop bleating, and get on with it!" The faction's demand that the RCL leads all struggles of all classes and strata betrays another aspect of their idealist outlook. Leadership is based on knowledge of seeking truth from facts; it is based on investigation of the particular contradictions; it is based on grasping the present level of the masses; it is based on learning from the masses. Only those who thoroughly reject the mass line (despite their protestations to the contrary) as the scientific method of leadership can demand that the RCL leads all struggles, even if that leadership was confined only to articles in our political paper *Class Struggle*. No wonder N Redfern could only say "You lead workers by leading them."

#### THE FACTION'S LIES ON RCL "ECONOMISM"

In the same manner the faction attacks the RCL for working "only in individual factories." Of course the RCL does not work in all factories. It could not! The faction goes on with the lie that the RCL is only interested in economic issues. They know that nearly all factory bulletins produced locally by RCL units have not only given a lead (it is another lie that the RCL gives no leadership) in economic struggles, and in the struggle to turn the unions into fighting class organisations but have also carried agitational material on the



oppression of national minorities in Britain; on the nature of the Labour Party, and the British imperialist state; on the struggle in Zimbabwe; on the two superpowers, and the struggle against hegemonism; on Kampuchea; on China's counter-attack against Vietnam's aggression: on Polish workers' struggles and the struggle for workers' trade unions in the USSR; on the Concordat, unemployment, technology etc, etc, etc. "Seeking truth from facts" is certainly not one of the faction's strong points! The factory work of the RCL is precisely carried out with the aim of building communist, not economist cells in the factories in order to ensure that the future party builds deep roots in the only really revolutionary class - the proletariat.

In fact the attack on the industrial work of the RCL is an attack on the general aim of ensuring that the revolutionary Communist Party will be a party organised primarily on factory branches. How the faction has retreated into revisionism. To them the factory is no longer where the workers are brought together in large numbers, where they are actually exploited and where they learn to unite. For them the factories are primarily places where workers have been split up by the bourgeoisie.

These examples ( and there are many more of them) show what a dangerous thing the left idealism of the faction was. Pushed mainly through Redfern's leadership it threatened to spread confusion and demoralisation throughout the RCL. It is certainly not better to be "left" than right.

#### LEARN FROM NEGATIVE EXAMPLES

The faction have given the Marxist-Leninist movement a lesson by negative example. They have rejected Democratic Centralism; the organisational principle of communism through which the proletarian organisation strives to integrate theory with practice, and to strengthen its collective and unified leadership. They have rejected principled and protracted struggle over major questions as the means to reach unity. They have rejected criticism and self-criticism as the indispensable motor that ensures that Democratic Centralism operates correctly. They have rejected the method of thorough investigation and seeking truth from facts. They have rejected the mass line as the scientific method of leadership.

All this they have replaced with a petit-bourgeois concept that truth is grasped in the course of a war to the death between abstract ideas and personalities. In such a stand, Democratic Centralism loses any real purpose and is replaced by a combination of ultra-democracy and bureaucracy. To such people, the task of communists becomes only to take those abstract ideas which have won out in the demagogic battle for supremacy to the working class with the cry of "this is the way - follow me."

This was the essence of the two-line struggle in the RCL. It was over such "petty matters" as style of work and organisational principle. This struggle was directed against splittism and the petit-bourgeois left idealism of the Anti-League Faction. In essence it was a question of whether to build a Bolshevik or a Menshevik organisation.

## THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA—A NEW CENTRE OF REVISIONISM

The history of the international communist movement has been marked by splits. In the First International, Marx and Engels battled constantly with those like Bakunin who tried to lead the workers up the wrong path. The imperialist war of 1914-18 exposed those like Bernstein and Kautsky who wanted to take the right opportunist path of accommodation with the bourgeoisie. In the late 1950's, the Communist Party of China (CPC) allied then with the Party of Labour of Albania (PLA), waged a bitter struggle against Khrushchev's modern revisionism and splittism. At each stage it was necessary to expose revisionism and the revolutionary line grew stronger in these struggles with the wrong line.

It was through the works of Lenin and Mao Zedong, which summed up these battles that the workers movement came to understand revisionism. The essence of it is that it is bourgeois ideas dressed up in Marxist clothes. As the international proletariat increasingly took up Marxism, the bourgeoisie was forced to resort to this trick of penetrating the workers' movement and disguising its ideas. At this stage revisionism was always right opportunist in essence - it sought to accommodate with the bourgeoisie and tailed behind the workers' movement. But as revisionism became increasingly exposed through the struggles of the CPC against the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), then revisionism began to re-emerge in "cleverer" more "revolutionary" forms. In 1908, Lenin argued in *Marxism and Revisionism* that there was such a thing as "Revisionism from the left", but, he went on:

*"...which as yet is far from having developed to the same extent as opportunist revisionism: it has not yet become international, has not yet stood the test of a single big practical battle with a socialist party in any single country."*

It was not accidental that revisionism from the left developed and carried out its first great battle in China, precisely because the CPC had done a thorough job of exposing revisionism from the right. This left revisionism was represented clearly by the political line of Lin Biao and the "Gang of Four". As a recent article in *Beijing Review* put it:

*"...the nature of the political line of Lin Biao and the "gang of four" was not Right, but ultra-Left. It was "Left" opportunism. This opportunism from the "Left" which appeared under cover of the slogan "opposing revisionism and Right deviation" was extremely iniquitous, as we all know now." ("On the nature of Lin Biao's and the "Gang of Four's" Political Line" by Wu Jiang, *Beijing Review*, 15, 1979).*

But the influence of the "Gang of Four" spread far beyond China; in many senses their ideological influence spread to an international

level. It certainly affected the RCLB for a period of time, in the shape of the faction who pushed left opportunist idealism and tried to split the League. Its influence was clear in the cases of those parties who, prior to the death of Mao had seemed to be Marxist-Leninist parties, but who, after his death, at the time of the overthrow of the gang attacked the new leadership of the CPC, and targetted the theory of the differentiation of the world into three as the butt of their most venomous attacks. In Britain this trend was represented by the so-called "Communist" Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) and the "Communist" Party of England (Marxist-Leninist). The issue at this time seemed to be for or against Mao Zedong. But as the polemics of the Party of Labour of Albania against the CPC became open, it was soon clear that this was not the issue. The PLA was opposed to the CPC before and after the death of Mao. So it was not the political line of the gang that these parties followed, but the ideological influence of the "gang" - their left opportunism.

This latest split in the movement, between the CPC and the PLA took many by surprise. The PLA appeared to be a strong Marxist-Leninist Party. Tempered in struggle with German and Italian fascism in the 1930s and 40s, the PLA had led the Albanian people to liberate themselves and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in their country. In the anti-revisionist struggles of the 50s and 60s the PLA appeared to stand firm in support of the CPC. Since then it seemed that the PLA had continued on the correct road, constructing socialism at home and maintaining a firm stand internationally against the two superpowers, Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism. Differences in line between the CPC and PLA were there but these were not thought to be significant by the majority of the movement.

It is therefore all the more important to grasp the seriousness of the present split, provoked by the PLA. It is no longer a question of differences between two fraternal parties which can be overcome through discussion. It is an open and consummated split, prompted by the idealism, dogmatism and splittism of the PLA. The PLA is now publishing regular and slanderous attacks of the People's Republic of China (PRC), on its present and past leaders, and in particular on Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai. The PLA declares that Mao Zedong Thought is a "new brand" of revisionism.

The PLA accuses the PRC of imperialist designs on the world, of being a superpower and of following social chauvinist policies. It argues that the CPC has never based itself on Marxism-Leninism, has never followed a consistent line. It encourages international meetings like last year's in Europe, and the recent circus in Canada where it lines up with, among others, known agents of the KGB like Hardial Bains.

The purpose of this article will be to trace the development of the PLA polemics, and to refute the major points of their line. It is necessary to do this both to expose local agents of the PLA, like the "Communist" Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) now calling itself the "Revolutionary Communist" Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) and to continue the struggle to unite the Marxist-Leninists in Britain around the correct international strategic line.

#### HOXHA ON THE THREE WORLDS THEORY

It was at the 7th Congress of the PLA that Enver Hoxha launched his

first open public attack on the CPC. Although criticisms by innuendo had been made before, the Congress Documents opened up a public breach. But at this stage, Hoxha did not make Mao the target of attack. He chose instead the theory of the three worlds. Hoxha described the terms third world, second world, non-aligned world, and developing countries as terms which "cover up and do not bring out the class character of these political forces, the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, the key problem which is predominant today on a national and international scale, the ruthless struggle between the bourgeois-imperialist world on the one hand, and socialism, the world proletariat, and its natural allies on the other." (Albania Today, No6(31) 1976, p46.) (our emphasis)

This same point was repeated and expanded in Hoxha's most recent work, *Imperialism and the Revolution* where he says,

*"The fact that socialism has been betrayed in the Soviet Union and the former socialist countries does not in any way alter the Leninist criteria of the division of the world. Now as before, there are only two worlds, and the struggle between these two worlds, between the two antagonistic classes, between socialism and capitalism, exists not only on a national scale but also on an international scale."* (p258)

These statements sum up the main line of demarcation with the CPC theory on the international class struggle. According to the PLA, the main contradiction is between socialism, the world proletariat and its natural allies and imperialism, with no distinctions drawn between the superpowers and the lesser imperialisms. Secondly, there can be no distinctions drawn within the camp of socialism, the world proletariat, etc" regarding the main force and the leading force, because the concept of the third world as the main force in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism does not make any distinction between what the PLA calls the "genuine anti-imperialist, reactionary and fascist forces in power in a number of developing countries". That is to say that it is always and everywhere the contradiction between the proletariat and its "natural allies" and the bourgeoisie that is the main one, nationally as well as internationally. The class contradiction is always and everywhere primary over the national question.

#### THE DIVISION OF THE WORLD INTO THREE IS BASED ON THE UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT OF IMPERIALISM.

So, for the PLA there is only one way to divide the forces in the world - bourgeoisie or proletariat. It is inadmissible to include in the camp of the people national bourgeois elements who struggle to a greater or lesser extent against imperialism. Although Hoxha, and the PLA shout their faithfulness to Lenin and Stalin from the rooftops, it is necessary to remind them of a few elementary points.

As Lenin himself argued:

*"...the focal point in the Social Democratic programme must be that division of nations into oppressor and oppressed which forms the essence of imperialism and is deceitfully evaded by the social chauvinists and Kautsky."* (Lenin, *The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination*) (our emphasis)

This division, to which Lenin attached so much importance, is one of the four fundamental contradictions in the world in the era of imperialism. Hoxha shouts a lot about these fundamental contradictions, but in



essence he denies the existence of this one, by stressing always the need to distinguish between the leaders of the oppressed nations. He seeks, in typical opportunist fashion to merge it with the contradiction between capitalism and socialism, and that between the world proletariat and imperialism to produce this vague formulation about "socialism, the world proletariat and their natural allies". Hoxha's "all-embracing" category cannot measure up to the reality of the world today. Because for Hoxha the countries of the world must be divided into bourgeois-capitalist and socialist - not oppressor and oppressed.

The theory of the differentiation of the world into three does not use such idealist terms. It is based on the concrete analysis of the relative significance of the basic contradictions under imperialism. Such a division has precedents in the international communist movement. At the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin spoke about "oppressed colonies", "financially dependent countries" and those "benefitting from the partition of the world".

At a later date Stalin spoke of the "fascist bloc", the "anti-fascist bloc" and the "neutral countries". These contradictions do not mention the contradiction between imperialism and socialism. Yet the PLA leaders do not accuse Lenin or Stalin of removing the class content from their analyses.

The theory of the three worlds is based on concrete analysis. As such it takes new phenomena into account. The emergence of the two superpowers is one such new phenomenon in the history of the development of imperialism. The division of the world cannot be carried out according to abstract moral precepts. It must be done according to reality.

*"Imperialism means the progressively mounting oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of Great Powers; it means a period of wars between the latter to extend and consolidate the oppression of nations. Today this 'handful' of Great Powers has become only two - the Soviet Union and the USA which are now the common enemies of the peoples of the world with the Soviet Union as the most dangerous source of war". (People's Daily Editorial, Peking 1976, p28)*

The division of the world is carried out "in proportion to capital, in proportion to strength" according to Lenin. The facts today show that the lesser imperialist powers, the second world countries cannot compete with the superpowers for a redivision of the world. This, of course, means that we must draw distinctions between the superpowers and the minor imperialist powers. This too is nothing new in the history of the communist movement. If such a thing were "anti-Leninist" then both Stalin and Hoxha themselves would be guilty.

Stalin, in the Report to the 18th Congress of the CPSU said:

*"It is a distinguishing feature of the new imperialist war that it has not yet become universal, a world war. The war is being waged by aggressor states who in every way infringe upon the interests of the non-aggressive states, primarily Britain, France and the USA, while the latter draw back and retreat making concession after concession to the aggressors."*

*Thus we are witnessing an open redivision of the world and spheres of influence at the expense of the non-aggressive states, without the least attempt at resistance, and even with a certain connivance, on their part."*

To be sure, the role played by Britain, France and the USA then was

not identical to their roles now, but this was the bloc of countries which was to become, after 1941, part of the anti-fascist bloc.

Hoxha himself pointed out in 1944:

*"Our war is part and parcel of the great anti-fascist war of the whole world, and the alliance of our people with the Anglo-Soviet-American bloc and with all the national liberation movements in the world is a vital condition for us."*

Thus there are clear precedents for making distinctions between imperialisms according to their relative strengths and power to redivide the world.

### THE THIRD WORLD IS THE MAIN FORCE OPPOSING IMPERIALISM, COLONIALISM AND HEGEMONISM

Hoxha asserts that the term "third world" removes the class content from international relations. For him "countries are grouped according to the social system prevailing in them, into bourgeois-capitalist and socialist countries." And this distinction is the only distinction between countries that Hoxha will admit. Again Hoxha not only fails to study reality, he fails to grasp those principles of which he is supposed to be such a staunch defender.

Stalin had this to say about the contradiction between capitalist and socialist countries:

*"It is said that contradictions between capitalism and socialism are stronger than the contradictions among the capitalist countries. Theoretically of course that is true. It is not only true now today; it was true before the Second World War. And it was more and more realised by the leaders of the capitalist countries. Yet, the Second World War began not as a war with the USSR but as a war with capitalist countries..."*

*"Consequently, the struggle of the capitalist countries for markets and the desire to crush their competitors proved in practice to be stronger than the contradictions between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp." (Economic Problems of Socialism, Beijing Edition, p34-35)*

This analysis of the relative importance of the different contradictions led Stalin to defend the thesis of the inevitability of war between capitalist countries, even in the period of existence of the socialist camp in the 1950s. How much more applicable is it today then, when a socialist camp no longer exists?

Hoxha on the other hand insists on arguing over and over again that the distinction to be made between countries is that between the capitalist and the socialist and to insist that a socialist camp does exist. Hoxha cannot tell us what this camp consists of. It cannot include China because China is no longer socialist. It cannot include the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe because these too are no longer socialist. So what does it consist of? Albania alone?

This is rubbish. Because when the socialist camp did exist after World War Two, it was a large bloc of countries which formed in Stalin's terms a "parallel world market" which served to weaken and restrict the opposing capitalist world market. When the Soviet Union and its satellites degenerated and restored capitalism this bloc became a competing capitalist bloc. The remaining socialist countries could not exert the force on these two capitalist blocs that the former socialist



camp had on the western capitalist bloc. This was the importance of the existence of the former socialist camp, its disappearance was obviously a setback for world revolution. Hoxha cannot see this. For him it is enough for one socialist country to exist to call it a "camp".

The dissolution of the socialist camp was indeed a setback for the world revolution.

Yet despite this the sphere of exploitation of the world resources by imperialism is restricted. Why? Precisely because of the struggle of the third world countries and peoples - a force which Hoxha denies. Again it must be said that Hoxha does not understand the theory of imperialism.

Lenin and Stalin were quick to point out that the development of imperialism had changed the significance of nationalism - the struggle of the oppressed nations. Nationalism in the era of imperialism was no longer a question of combating national oppression in Europe, but became one of the emancipation of the oppressed peoples, colonies and semi-colonies from imperialism. In Stalin's terms this created "a new front of revolution."

The three worlds theory defends this analysis. It points out that, since the end of World War Two, the thesis of the unity between the international proletariat, and the oppressed peoples and nations has been confirmed again and again. The revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have waged a number of revolutionary armed struggles. More than 80 countries have won independence in the last 30 years. The old colonial system has fallen apart at the seams and US imperialism, which emerged all powerful at the end of the war is now a superpower on the defensive and in decline.

The new superpower, Soviet social imperialism finds its plans for expansion blocked at every turn by the struggles of the third world countries for genuine independence and by the armed struggles of the peoples of Kampuchea and Eritrea against its plans for hegemony. So the thesis of unity between the proletariat and the third world countries and peoples stands confirmed by reality.

Hoxha recognises the role of the "revolutionary peoples" in struggle. But the key factor for him is that the theory of the three worlds stresses the role of "countries" in this struggle. It stresses the role of the "oppressed nations". Hoxha then is forced to oppose the struggle of countries with the struggle of peoples, under the banner of opposing the "reactionary rulers" of some third world countries.

Again this complies neither with reality, nor with the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the national question under imperialism. Marxist-Leninists, unlike the reactionary rulers of the Soviet Union do not judge the role of third world countries primarily on the basis of the degree of internal democracy. To be sure, there are reactionary rulers in some third world countries - or to be more precise - there are comprador bourgeois regimes tied to US or Soviet social imperialism and some tied to the minor imperialist powers. Some regimes are national bourgeois ones. Their leaders vacillate in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism. But when a "reactionary" ruler takes a stand against imperialism, from whatever motives this is to be supported. Again, to quote Stalin:

*"The revolutionary character of a national movement under the conditions of imperialist oppression does not necessarily presuppose*

*the existence of proletarian elements in the movement, the existence of a revolutionary or a republican programme of the movement, the existence of a democratic basis of the movement. The struggle of the Emir of Afghanistan is waging for the independence of Afghanistan is objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the monarchist views of the Emir and his associates, for it weakens, disintegrates and undermines imperialism; whereas the struggle waged by such "desperate" democrats and "socialists", "revolutionaries" and republicans as, for example, Kerensky, and Tsereteli, Renaudel and Scheidemann, Chernov and Dan, Henderson and Clynes, during the imperialist war was a reactionary struggle for its result was the embellishment, the strengthening, the victory of imperialism.*

*(Foundations of Leninism, Beijing Edition, p75)*

Marxist-Leninists do not sum up the struggle of the oppressed nations from the standpoint of "formal democracy" - which is what Hoxha's stand would have us do, but from the standpoint of the overall results or the "general balance sheet of the struggle against imperialism" - "not in isolation but on a world-wide scale" as Lenin put it.

It is precisely the world-wide scale which is ignored by Hoxha. It is only from this standpoint that the significance of the third world's struggle for the New Economic Order, for fairer commodity prices, for the 200 mile nautical limit can be appraised. And these struggles are precisely the struggles of nations which are daily weakening the hold of imperialism, especially that of the two superpowers.

#### THE IDEALISM AND DOGMATISM OF THE PLA

Hoxha's method in attacking the theory of the three worlds is to snatch at one or two formulae and thrash around with them asserting them against reality. His insistence that there can be only one way of differentiating nations - between the "bourgeois capitalist" and the "socialist" for example. This is characteristic of the dogmatist who Mao says is a lazy-bones;

*"They refuse to undertake any painstaking study of concrete things, they regard general truths as emerging out of the void, they turn them into purely abstract unfathomable formulas, and thereby completely deny and reverse the normal sequence by which man comes to know truth."* (Mao Zedong's *On Contradiction, Selected Works, Beijing Edition, Vol.1 p321*)

Why is it correct to describe Hoxha's standpoint as left-opportunist? In essence his line is that the fundamental contradictions in the world must be reduced to one - that between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Whether on the national or international level, he insists on this point. But dialectics views all things as a process of development. There are many contradictions in the development of a thing, and at any stage one of them is primary. In looking at the class struggle internationally this means that we must assess the forces involved and decide who are our friends and who are our enemies. Hoxha will not do this. In insisting that the sole contradiction is that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, he is forced to consign elements of the national bourgeoisie in third world countries into the camp of the enemy, so weakening the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. He refuses also to make the distinction between imperialist powers, so attempting to weaken the international united front against

superpower hegemonism. The platform he proposes in fact serves the interests of the superpowers, especially Soviet social imperialism. This is not the method of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, but the method of Trotsky. Hoxha's stand is that of the left phrase monger. As Mao describes him:

*"The thinking of leftists outstrips a given stage of development of the objective process; some regard their fantasies as truth, while others strain to realise in the present an ideal which can only be realised in the future. They alienate themselves from the current practice of the majority of the people and from the realities of the day, and show themselves idealist in their actions."*

(On Practice, Mao Zedong's Selected Works, Vol.1 p307)

Hoxha's pronouncements certainly outstrip the given stage of development of contradictions in the world today. It is only in his imagination that all contradictions can be reduced to that between socialism and imperialism, between the world proletariat and imperialism. Hoxha and the PLA have alienated themselves also from the practice of the majority. In the Marxist-Leninist movement, the PLA at its international meetings to condemn the PRC can rally only a handful of so-called Marxist-Leninist organisations, many of these having no basis in the working class whatsoever. And in opposing such struggles as those for a New Economic Order Hoxha runs counter to the aspirations of the peoples of the third world countries.

Hoxha's left opportunism is based on the twin ideological errors of idealism and dogmatism. It is idealist in the sense that in Hoxha's thinking there is a divorce between theory and reality - between the subjective and objective. It is all very well to uphold certain positions of the communist movement which were correct at one time - at a certain stage of development of world contradictions. But if it is not grasped that knowledge at a particular stage of the development of a process is only relative and one-sided, and that it must develop as concrete conditions develop, then principles become useless and abstract. Mao says:

*"Marxism-Leninism has in no way exhausted truth but ceaselessly opened up roads to knowledge of truth in the course of practice."*

Like the true dogmatist, Hoxha refuses to acknowledge the development of Marxism-Leninism. He cannot grasp that its principles must constantly be tested in practice, integrated with concrete practice, in continually seeking truth from facts. If someone thinks that the "absolute truth" is enough, and assumes that he possesses it and does not need to proceed from reality then the chances are that his ideas will not reflect reality at all. It is only such a dogmatist who could be content with announcing that the contradictions between socialism and imperialism is of greater importance than that between the oppressed and oppressor nations in the world today.

#### THE OPEN LETTER TO THE CPC WAS A CONSOLIDATION OF HOXHA'S REVISIONISM

It is possible that even after the 7th Congress of the PLA, these errors could have been overcome, if Hoxha had paid attention to criticism which came from a number of parties and organisations. But the PLA's answer was to step up the open polemic against the CPC, and to engage in other activities, like provocations against a number of parties, representatives of which were resident in Albania up to this

time. The publication of the Open Letter to the CPC in July 1978 marked the point at which a different assessment had to be made.

This was because of the nature of the charges brought by the PLA against the CPC and the PRC. These were:

- that the CPC used economic aid to exert pressure on the PLA and to sabotage the Albanian economy.
- that the CPC leadership has constantly vacillated in the struggle against modern revisionism and the CPSU
- that the character of inner party struggle in China since 1949 has been "unprincipled"

- that bourgeois and revisionist elements seized power in China before Mao's death, as a result of this struggle.

There are a number of charges made about "internal interference" in the affairs of Albania including attempts to sabotage Albanian defence by encouraging a military alliance with Yugoslavia and Romania "to the detriment of Albanian independence."

The summary of charges and accusations shows that the PLA had launched struggle against a party which it now considered to be revisionist, unprincipled in its stands since 1949, and imperialist and social chauvinist in its policies since 1970. The essence of this was summed up by Hoxha in his speech to Tirana electors in November 1978:

*"The stands of our Party and state towards China have always been correct, open, sincere and friendly, while the stands of the Chinese leadership toward Albania on the face of it appeared to be Marxist-Leninist, but as the facts have shown, right from the time when contacts between the two countries were established to this day, it was not Marxist-Leninist, was neither sincere nor well-intentioned nor internationalist."*

*"The Chinese leadership has not defended, not implemented the Marxist-Leninist principles in the construction of socialism and support the cause of the revolution and liberation of the peoples. This is the source of their constantly changing and extremely unclear and complicated stands within China as well as the continual changes in Chinese strategy and tactics over international problems. The anti-Marxist-Leninist and pragmatic policy of the Chinese leadership is also the source of its hostile anti-Albanian attitude which led to the rupture of the relations of friendship between China and Albania."*

These are reactionary attacks on the PRC which must be refuted. This article will not try to refute each and every one, but will concentrate on three main ones; concerning the CPC's policy on aid; on the struggle against Khrushchev's revisionism; and on the PLA's own record in the struggle against revisionism.

#### The CPC was forced to cut off aid to Albania

The PLA charged that the PRC used aid to exert diplomatic pressure, and that the cessation of aid was done for purely political motives, because the PLA did not share the line of the CPC. The charge itself does not ring true, and it conflicts with the experience of the Marxist-Leninist movement, and with the experience of a number of third world countries who have received aid from the PRC.

China has long been known to give aid to genuine anti-imperialist movements which are involved in armed struggle. It was on this basis that the PRC gave aid to all three national liberation movements in



Angola, up until the time of the defeat of Portuguese imperialism. It would be absurd to think that all three organisations shared the outlook of the PRC. They had different programmes but all received Chinese aid. Again, Zambia, and Tanzania do not see international affairs in the same way as the CPC, yet the leaders of both countries have publicly acknowledged the benefits of China's aid, of which the Tan-Zam railway is the most outstanding example. This aid is given on the basis of non-interference in internal affairs, and mutual benefit.

All genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations will testify to the fact that the CPC does not impose its views on others. When explaining their political line the CPC comrades always stress that their views are put for other's reference. They always stress that Marxism-Leninism must be integrated with the concrete conditions in each country. So why should the PLA be singled out for the treatment they claim to have received?

If aid had been stopped for political motives, then this could have happened any time from 1970, when, according to the PLA, China entered "the imperialist dance", with the visit of Nixon to Beijing (Peking). Yet this aid continued for a further eight years, during which time the PLA was constantly attacking China's policy by insinuation until 1976 and publicly after that. In 1977, the PRC was still agreeing new projects and deferring the repayment date for credits.

The scale and scope of China's aid to Albania is immense. China provided food grain to Albania when her own people were short of food. She provided steel products when China's steel production was inadequate for her own needs. She provided tractors when agricultural mechanisation was a high priority in China. Are these the actions of an imperialist state? No. They are the actions which could only be motivated by proletarian internationalism.

But the PLA, after carrying out a series of actions calculated to force China to cancel aid, now turns and says that the aid was insignificant anyway. This is unbelievable. The Albanians calculate that no one can disprove what they say because only they and the Chinese know the full extent of aid. But as the Workers Communist Party of Norway points out in their extended criticism of the Open Letter (see *Class Struggle*, international bulletin of the WCP(ML) of Norway No.11 September, 1978) China's aid was concerned with the very cornerstone of the Albanian economy. Most of the heavy industry, power stations etc are equipped with Chinese machinery, or with machinery purchased abroad through the PRC. Visitors to Albania have seen for themselves such machinery at the Berat Textile Mill (named after Mao Zedong) or the Fieri Nitrate Plant. Chinese aid, as the Norwegian comrades point out, changed the overall structure of the Albanian economy and "contributed decisively" to Albanian industry in the 60s and 70s.

#### The CPC initiated and led the struggle against modern revisionism and the CPSU

According to the Open Letter, the CPC did not firmly struggle against modern revisionism. They vacillated in 1960 and later because they did not genuinely wish to break with the CPSU and Khrushchev and were only forced to in 1963. When the break did come it was because of Chinese "great state interests", and was a purely tactical measure. On the one

hand say the Albanians, their stand was always strong and consistent and they opposed Khrushchev alone before 1963.

Reality again easily disproves these wild assertions. The struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism was a protracted and difficult one which demanded above all the combination of firm principle with tactical flexibility on the part of the CPC. Facts show, in the form of documents written at the time, by both the PLA and the CPC that this was grasped by the CPC throughout, but was not grasped by the PLA.

In 1956, shortly after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, Mao summed up the essence of Khrushchev's speech very accurately. He said:

*"I think there are two "swords"; one is Lenin and the other Stalin. The sword of Stalin has been discarded by the Russians, Gomulka and some people in Hungary have picked it up to stab at the Soviet Union and oppose so-called Stalinism...."*

*"As for the sword of Lenin hasn't it too been discarded to a certain extent by some Soviet leaders? In my view it has been discarded to a considerable extent. Is the October Revolution still valid? Can it still serve as the example for all countries? Khrushchev's report at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union says it is possible to seize state power by the parliamentary road, that is to say, it is no longer necessary for all countries to learn from the October Revolution. Once this gate is opened by and large Leninism is thrown away." (Mao's speech at the Second Session of the Eighth Central Committee, November 1956. Selected Works, Vol.5, p341)*

Mao's criticism was not limited to internal meetings. Strong criticism was also directed at the leaders of the CPSU as early as 1956. on the question of the assessment of Stalin, and on the "peaceful road" of transition advanced by Khrushchev. Mao's statement above, and the points of early criticism put forward by the CPC show that he had a clear grasp from the start of the meaning of the 20th Congress. But it was not clear in 1956 that revisionism had irreversibly come to power in the Soviet Union. It was still possible then that by combining unity with struggle the situation could be reversed. In January 1957, Mao said of the leaders of the CPSU: "Our present policy is still to help them by talking things over with them face to face." (ibid, p365)

Mao's speech at the 1957 meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties also made the tactics of the CPC's struggle clear. He said:

*"The unity of opposites is a fundamental concept of dialectics. In accordance with this concept, what should we do with a comrade who has made mistakes? We should first wage a struggle to rid him of his wrong ideas. Second, we should also help him. Point one struggle, and point two, help. We should proceed from good intentions to help him correct his mistakes so that he will have a way out."*

*(A dialectical approach to inner-party unity, Selected Works, Vol.5 p515)*

Mao went on to point out that at each tactical stage it is necessary to be good at making compromises as well as at waging struggles. The guiding line running through the documents of this period is the integration of principle with flexibility, to ensure struggle against revisionism, while guarding against driving the middle forces over to Khrushchev's side.



As the polemic ensued up to the 1960 Bucharest Meeting the CPC maintained this attitude never compromising on principle. Again the stages of the polemic are well documented in "Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves" (in the *Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement* Beijing 1965, pp55-114). This document was praised by the PLA when it first became public. In 1957 and 1960 there were two important meetings of the Communist Parties. Both produced statements which sought to lay down a common line for the international movement. It was through determined struggle at both meetings that the CPC temporarily stemmed the tide of revisionism by opposing the formulations of the CPSU, and insisting on the inclusion of statements of principle. Due to the CPC's efforts, supported by some other parties, the 1957 Declaration pointed out the road of "non-peaceful transition", and carried the statement "*Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily*" (op cit p72). It also included the statement that "*US imperialism is the centre of world reaction and the sworn enemy of the peoples of the world*". The CPC also struggled unsuccessfully to delete references to the 20th Congress of the CPSU - all this prior to 1960.

The 1957 Declaration did not deter the CPSU from continuing the revisionist road. But it provided a rallying point for the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and it also provided a valuable weapon for exposure of the CPSU when it blatantly disregarded the Declaration in its subsequent statements.

At the 1960 meeting the leaders of the CPSU launched a vicious and splittist attack on the CPC. When the PLA took a similar stand the CPSU tried to take measures against them too.

It was following the Bucharest meeting that the CPSU recalled all Soviet experts in China, tore up trade and aid agreements and created tension on the Sino-Soviet border.

Late in 1960 there was a third meeting in Moscow. Again there was principled struggle between the two lines. Many of the theses of the CPSU were rejected. A generally correct statement was again approved.

Subsequently, the CPSU again disregarded the united statement and carried out more attacks on the CPC and PLA culminating in the 22nd Congress of the CPSU in October 1961. This was when the break was fully consolidated. But it was only through following the path of unity and struggle that the CPC was able to expose the CPSU as the "greatest splitters of our times."

In its Open Letter, the PLA has great difficulty in finding a concrete instance of "failure to struggle" or "vacillation". Indeed it cannot find any, because the facts show that the struggle waged by the CPC from 1956 was determined and principled, and at the same time tactically flexible.

The truth is that it is this latter aspect that the PLA cannot grasp. They cannot understand Mao's dialectical approach to struggle. This failing is made clear by the one concrete instance of "vacillation" that they quote. This is the fact that after the fall of Khrushchev in 1964, the CPC leaders sent a delegation to the Moscow celebrations of the anniversary of the October Revolution. The Norwegian comrades, in their detailed criticism of the PLA point out:

*"It is a characteristic feature of the Albanian leaders that they make no attempt at describing the concrete historical situation in 1964, or the nature of the relations within the international communist movement at that time. They refer the steps taken by the Chinese completely out of time and space and forget everything Lenin said about a "concrete analysis of the concrete situation" being the "living soul of Marxism"*  
(Class Struggle No.11 September 1978)

In 1964, there were still uncommitted parties like those of Romania, Korea, Vietnam and Cuba. It was therefore correct to continue to expose the leaders of the CPSU while continuing to unite all those who could be united against revisionism. It was also necessary to show concretely that leaders like Brezhnev and Kosygin were cast in the same mould as Khrushchev. So the CPC temporarily called off polemics and resumed relations. As a result of this it was the CPSU who resumed polemics in attacking the CPC so showing that they had inherited the splittist mantle of Khrushchev.

Again, the PLA demonstrates its idealism and dogmatism in their failure to investigate the concrete situation and adopt suitable tactics. They stand on a high pinnacle at the 7th Congress and in the Open Letter shouting about principle but never advance towards integrating their principles with concrete reality. But more than this - they fail to look at their own practice at the time - and even lie about it to show themselves to be "holier" than the CPC.

#### THE PLA VACILLATED IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST MODERN REVISIONISM

Two things are very clear about the practice of the PLA in struggle against revisionism. Before and after 1960 they showed very little grasp of the situation, and were slow to take a firm stand, especially in grasping its class content. And when they did begin to show understanding they vacillated in the struggle. Again, the facts must speak in the shape of the PLA's own statements. Documents of the PLA from 1956-59 in Hoxha's Selected Works Volume 12 carry scarcely any reference to the 20th Congress Speech. There is certainly no criticism that comes anywhere near Mao's criticisms of 1956 and 1957. There was certainly criticism of the CPSU made by the PLA at this time but most of this concerned Khrushchev's approaches to Yugoslavia, and questions concerning the Hungarian and Polish parties. In fact at the 3rd Plenum of the Central Committee of the PLA in 1957, Hoxha was still declaring that the offensive against Marxism-Leninism was headed both by imperialism, and by "*revisionist elements headed by the Yugoslav leaders*" (p685) Hoxha in other words did not understand that the Khrushchevite clique was firmly in the leadership of modern revisionism.

But much more damning is Hoxha's speech at the 40th anniversary of the October Revolution of November 2nd 1957, where he declared:

*"It will be known that the 20th Party Congress, a significant event in the history of communism and of the international communist movement, has not only developed a great number of Marxist-Leninist theses, such as the thesis of peaceful coexistence, the thesis on the possibility of averting wars, on the roads that will assure the conquest of power by the working class etc but it has also elaborated the grandiose programme for the transition from socialism to*

communism, the task of catching up with and overtaking the per capita production of the developed capitalist countries within a short historic period, for demonstrating the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist by way of peaceful economic competition." (From a German transcription, quoted in English in *Class Struggle* No.11 September 1978, p15)

It was only in 1960, at the November Moscow meeting that Hoxha roundly criticised the leaders of the CPSU. So who was it who failed to struggle before 1960 - the CPC or the PLA?

Even when the PLA came out in struggle directly against Khrushchey, this fight was far from consistent. But what was clear to the PLA at the time was that the CPC was waging a fierce struggle against revisionism. There is no hint at all in their documents, internal to the PLA that the CPC was believed by them to be vacillating or unprincipled. At the Plenum of the Central Committee of the PLA in 1966 (July 1st) Hoxha said:

*"We are strong, and we are not alone. The CPC which remains unwaveringly on the principle of Marxism-Leninism, supports our attitudes. Chou En-lai has given the Soviet Union a stern reply in connection with Kosygin's answer."* (*Albania Today* No.4(29) July-August 1976)

On November 5th 1961 Hoxha said:

*"China plays a major role in the international communist movement. The Communist Party of China takes a sound Marxist-Leninist stand. It is a great party and with long experience, which terrifies Khrushchev."* (p43)

If Hoxha is now to accuse the CPC of vacillating in the struggle, then he should explain why these statements were made at the time of the struggle against modern revisionism. These quotations, published by the Albanians themselves only three years ago give the lie to their charges.

During this period, the CPC and PLA seemed to be struggling side by side against the leaders of the CPSU but at the same time Hoxha could make pronouncements stressing the "leading role of the Soviet Union in the socialist camp" and calling for "unity in the socialist camp" being reached through talks (see Hoxha, *Speeches and articles* 1963-64, Tirana 1977, pp376-78). Such sentiments went far beyond the tactics of the CPC in calling off polemics in 1964. Whilst doing this they did not deem it necessary to make incorrect public statements stressing unity and not struggle. For Hoxha, the victory of revisionism in the Soviet Union did not mean the end of the socialist camp and the impossibility of resolving differences through talks. Whereas Mao had already summed up the Soviet Union as a capitalist country and a dictatorship of the fascist type. For the CPC the calling off of polemics was purely tactical. For the PLA confusion reigned.

#### THE PLA LEADERS NEVER DEVELOPED A GRASP OF THE CLASS CONTENT OF REVISIONISM

It was through the propaganda of the CPC in the struggle against modern revisionism and mainly the works of Mao that the international communist movement developed a deep understanding of revisionism. The PLA on the other hand did not develop such a grasp and did not learn the lessons of the CPC. In fact the PLA leaders never acknowledged

Mao's role as one of the great Marxist-Leninist teachers, even when they had close unity with the CPC. The most striking illustration of this point is their inability to analyse events which followed the victory of modern revisionism in the USSR.

There are two good examples of this. The first came in 1964, when Mao first raised the criticism of great nation chauvinism against the USSR because of its claims on the land of neighbouring states. Mao first raised the criticism in connection with the Soviet occupation of the northern Japanese islands, saying that these should be returned. The PLA objected to this and to the fact that the question had even been raised at all. They said "...we must not start a controversy and polemic over whether or not the Soviet Union has appropriated other countries' land." (Open Letter...pp29-30).

The PLA first raised this question under the excuse that it is incorrect to criticise Stalin. But leaving aside the metaphysical attitude demonstrated by the PLA towards Stalin, it was further evidence that the PLA did not understand at all the cardinal point about modern revisionism. The coming to power of revisionism is the coming to power of the bourgeoisie. And so, it was inevitable that the Kremlin leadership would begin to reverse the principled foreign policy of the Soviet Union when it was a socialist state. It was inevitable that the Soviet leaders would begin to put forward claims on the land of neighbouring states, and extremely likely that they would begin by exploiting contentious border areas and disputes left over by history. This they did. It was only five years later that the Soviet Union was stirring up trouble on the border with China, and claiming parts of Chinese territory. This should have been proof enough of the Soviet expansionist ambitions. Yet the PLA never once retracted this criticism. In fact after a further decade of Soviet expansionism in Asia and Africa, they choose to repeat it again.

The second example of the lack of understanding of revisionism on the part of the PLA comes from 1968. By this time the CPC had carried out a considerable amount of propaganda to expose revisionism and its bourgeois nature. When the Dubcek regime came to power in Czechoslovakia, the majority of the movement were well aware of his shortcomings, but recognised the importance of Dubcek's opposition to the Novotny regime and his stand in favour of national independence. Because of these factors Dubcek had widespread popular support in Czechoslovakia.

What was the PLA's view? Hoxha said:

*"They are openly going over to capitalism, to the system of more than one party to the capitalist state system and the undisguised liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the capitalist system in economy, education and culture."*  
(*The PLA in Battle with Modern Revisionism*, Tirana 1972.)

Hoxha's approach here is to draw a line between revisionism in power (Novotny) and the bourgeoisie in power (Dubcek). For Hoxha the main question is whether or not capitalism will be restored in Czechoslovakia, despite the fact of a revisionist clique having taken power some years previous. For Hoxha the main question was capitalism or socialism - not Soviet imperialist domination or national independence.

But the article we are quoting from went much further. Written shortly before the Soviet invasion, Hoxha had this to say about Soviet intentions:



"What will the Soviets do? Nothing but to take Novotny for their collection, if he is available, and install him in a villa near Rakosi's." (ibid p402)

How could Hoxha arrive at a conclusion which is as far removed from reality as it could be? Firstly, the PLA had not grasped, never did grasp, that revisionism meant the bourgeoisie in power. It was not a question of two qualitatively different groups in power, or of revisionism being a "middle force" between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. And neither is it a question of whether or not capitalism is "restored openly" or not, as the quote from Hoxha suggests. The Novotny government itself was a bourgeois regime, just like the Khrushchev and Brezhnev regimes. But secondly, the PLA could see at that time only the aspect of collusion between the two superpowers. Hoxha "foresaw" that the Warsaw Pact and Comecon would "disintegrate", and Eastern Europe would be gradually integrated with Western Europe. Hoxha summed up the likely course of events as a great "Soviet defeat". (ibid p405).

What Hoxha missed completely was the aspect of contention between the superpowers. But it was inevitable that the PLA would not grasp this because they did not grasp, and still do not, the aggressive nature of Soviet social imperialism, as we have already shown. But it was this nature which was exposed by the events of 1968, and which meant that the Soviet Union would increase its hold on Eastern Europe. The last thing the Soviet imperialists were prepared to do was sit on the sidelines and watch its "empire" disappear before its eyes.

#### THE PLA IS A NEW CENTRE OF REVISIONISM

Such were the flimsy and lying charges of the Open Letter, and such was the actual practice of the PLA in its struggle with modern revisionism. It is not surprising that Hoxha's book *Imperialism and the Revolution* should complete his degeneration by siding with Soviet imperialism in declaring Mao Zedong Thought to be "an anti-Marxist theory". Under this heading Hoxha throws a barrage of dogmatic, arrogant and even racist criticisms at the CPC.

According to Hoxha:

"Mao Zedong Thought' is a variant of revisionism, which began to take shape even before the Second World War, especially after 1935 when Mao Zedong came to power. In this period Mao Zedong and his supporters launched a 'theoretical' campaign under the slogan of struggle against "dogmatism", "ready-made patterns", foreign stereotypes' etc, and raised the problem of elaborating a national Marxism, negating the universal character of Marxism-Leninism. (p395).

This passage like the rest of the book, is meant to be an indictment of Mao Zedong Thought. In fact it is an indictment of Hoxha and the PLA. In openly stating that they oppose the struggle against dogmatism, they condemn themselves as the ultra-leftists they are. This article has already shown that the PLA did not grasp the essence of Marxism, that is the concrete analysis of concrete conditions. They did not grasp that the coming to power of revisionism is the coming to power of the bourgeoisie. They did not see how to combine unity with struggle in the battle with modern revisionism. Out of their own mouths, in this book, they now say that they reject the rest of Marxism-Leninism.

Mao Zedong Thought as well. Mao's great teachings on the handling of contradictions among the people, the thesis on the class struggle under socialism, even the CPC's correct strategy for their revolution which saw the peasantry as the main force and the proletariat as the leading force - all these are thrown out by the PLA. They even criticise the Chinese for using "typically Chinese formulae" which they call "stereotyped" (p389) as opposed to the PLA's own formulations, which are "pure" Marxism-Leninism. But we have heard all these criticisms of the CPC before - from Trotsky, Khrushchev and Brezhnev.

The Marxist-Leninist movement, with one or two exceptions, has not followed the PLA road. It has continued to uphold Mao Zedong Thought as a development of Marxism-Leninism. Mao's works are a weapon in the battle against revisionism of both "left" and right. The Cultural Revolution, led by Mao prevented the victory of revisionism in China. And Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, integrated with the concrete conditions in each country is the basis of the growth of genuine Marxist-Leninist organisations and parties all over the world today. So, it is clear that the attack on Mao Zedong Thought can only serve Soviet social imperialism and all other imperialisms. The PLA has gone on to open up a second front of attack on the CPC and on Marxism-Leninism in support of the Soviet imperialists. That is why the Soviet imperialists now quote PLA statements approvingly in their press.

As we have shown in this article, this position has a long history and stems from long standing errors in the ideological and political line of the PLA. The metaphysical one-sidedness of the PLA has led it consistently to underestimate the danger of Soviet imperialism, and to vacillate in the struggle against revisionism. This position has led the PLA now openly to side with Soviet imperialism.

On June 24th 1978, Zeri-i Populit published a reactionary pro-Soviet editorial entitled "Imperialists, Hands off Vietnam". Who was it talking about? Soviet social imperialism which stands behind the attempts of the Vietnamese leaders to impose their local hegemony on South-East Asia was not mentioned. In fact the "imperialists" are the Chinese. The editorial came out shortly after the suspension of Chinese aid to Vietnam after a series of provocations by the Vietnamese. It goes on to accuse "foreigners" of stirring up border troubles and says:

"Those who...refuse to sit down at the negotiating table to solve disagreements which can arise between neighbouring countries...they are the culprits."

And this was published at a time when Kampuchea was refusing to negotiate with Vietnam when the latter refused to stop armed provocations. Hoxha's Speech to the Electors of Tirana (Albanian Telegraphic Agency November 1978) condemned "the Chinese social imperialists" for stirring up trouble between Vietnam and Kampuchea "two fraternal peoples". No wonder the Soviet imperialists approve of Hoxha. He is still saying one month before the brutal invasion of Kampuchea by Vietnam that the conflict can be resolved through negotiations. The "mistake" is familiar. In 1964, it was border disputes, in 1968 Czechoslovakia. But it is now no longer a question of a "mistake". The PLA has gone right over to the support of Soviet imperialism. If further proof is needed, then look at their latest pronouncements on the conflicts in Indo-China. In *Albania Today* No.2 (45) 1979, p65, they come out in the



open. They say:

*"In Cambodia, the people, the communists and the Cambodian patriots have risen against the barbarous government of Pol Pot, which was nothing but a group of provocateurs in the service of the imperialist bourgeoisie and especially of the Chinese revisionists, which had as its aim to discredit the idea of socialism in the international arena."*

The slanders of the Soviet imperialists, of the US imperialists, of the British imperialists are here repeated by the PLA. They say scarcely a word against Soviet attempts at hegemonism in the area. They have nothing but praise for the Vietnamese revisionist clique of Le Duan, who has tied the people of Vietnam to the Soviet imperialists, and who has attacked a number of Asian Marxist-Leninist Parties as "terrorists". Their only criticism of this revisionist clique is that their alliance with Soviet imperialism and membership of Comecon is not "justifiable". That is to say - the PLA dare not "justify" it.

No, it is no longer a question of "mistakes". It is a question of a new centre of revisionism, with the PLA clearly lining up with Soviet social imperialism and pushing its sinister line. This new centre is dressed up in Marxist-Leninist clothes. It came from left opportunist errors, instead of right opportunist ones. But this "revisionism with a left face" is no less revisionist for that.

# INTERVIEW WITH COMRADE POL POT

Secretary of the Central Committee of the  
Communist Party of Kampuchea  
Prime Minister of the Government of  
Democratic Kampuchea

to the  
delegation of Yugoslav journalists  
visiting Democratic Kampuchea  
March 17, 1978

*First question: Respected comrade Pol Pot, you are going, soon, to celebrate the third anniversary of the liberation of your country. Please tell us what are the outstanding achievements in national edification during these past three years.*

**Answer:** It is a pleasure for me to answer your question. During these nearly three years, we have got a number of satisfactory results in the restoration and edification of our country. But, first of all, I would like to say that we still have a lot of work to do.

The first outstanding result is that we have solved the agricultural problem, especially in rice-growing. To have the problem of rice production solved means to have enough rice to feed our people. In 1976, we planned to get a yield of 3 tons of paddy per hectare. We achieved 80 to 90 per cent of this objective, which allowed us to solve the living conditions of our people and also to export rice. In 1977, we planned a yield of 3 tons of paddy per hectare for one crop and of 6 tons per hectare for two crops a year. We fulfilled this plan at nearly 100 per cent. Therefore, in 1977, we had a paddy production higher than in 1976. We could then improve the living conditions of our people and export more rice.

Our slogan says: "If we have rice, we can have everything.", because our people can eat their fill, we have rice to export and we can import the products we need. The result achieved in the agricultural production lay on the bases of the fundamental hydraulic projects that we have already achieved. The hydraulic projects are an important result to ensure in the future, the agricultural and rice production. We have solved the agricultural problem and from these bases, the other sectors, like industry, cottage industry, cultural and social sectors, can also be developed.

Another outstanding result is that we have eliminated malaria which was a scourge for more than 80 per cent of our compatriots. In the past, every year, the number of the people suffered from malaria were very high and they faced many difficulties in their work. Now, we have eliminated malaria at 90 per cent. So, the living conditions of our

people have been considerably improving in the domain of health.

Another outstanding result is the basic elimination of the illiteracy which was a blemish in the former society. In that society there were indeed, faculties, high schools, secondary schools and primary schools in the cities. But the majority of the people of the countryside were illiterate. Now, we have fundamentally solved this problem. Our people can read and write. This is the basis which allows our people to progressively increase their cultural level. It is not only a part of the society but the entire people who can learn and study. We rely on these bases to further develop our education and schooling.

As for the other results, they are less important, but I would like to tell you that we have established and developed a sanitary network throughout the country. Each cooperative has its own medical centre and its own centre of making traditional, national and popular medicines. That has then allowed us to greatly improve the health of the people. The present situation is different from that in the old days. Previously, there were doctors only in Phnom Penh and in the big cities. Now, we have doctors all over throughout the country, in all cooperatives and even in the most remote areas of the country. The level of these medical men is still at the elementary stage, but relying on this basis, we will progressively develop their skills.

Concerning the cottage industry and workshops, there is no spectacular achievement. But, everywhere we have established a network of workshops. Every cooperative has its own cottage industry and workshops. They are the bases to further develop our cottage industry and lead it progressively towards industrialisation.

These are a number of outstanding results. They have been achieved thanks to our people's endeavours under the leadership of the Communist Party of Kampuchea. The people work with their own hands, see with their own eyes the results of their works and they have enthusiastically enjoyed them.

*Second question: During our short stay in your beautiful country, we have had some evidences that your revolution radically cut off from the past. What model of society are you building up now?*

**Answer:** We have no model in building up our new society. The Special National Congress held at the end of April 1975 clearly specified the determinant role in the revolution, in the national liberation war, played by the worker and peasant people, who form the overwhelming majority of the people. It is this worker and peasant people who have endured the heaviest burden in the revolution. It is then this same worker and peasant people who must enjoy the most gains of the revolution, at present and in the future. The preamble of our Constitution has also stipulated this point. Our aspiration is to edify a society where happiness, prosperity and equality prevail for everybody, a society where there are neither exploiting class nor exploited class, neither exploiting people nor exploited people, and where everybody participates in production works and national defence. It is on these bases and goal that we are edifying our new society. So, the edification of the new society is undertaken in conformity with the aspira-

tions of the entire people, especially those of the worker and peasant people who are the overwhelming majority of the population. If the people consider that the edification of this society is being on the correct way, then they would carry on this way. On the contrary, if they are not satisfied with, they would then decide differently. That would depend on them to decide. According to our experiences, we totally rely on our people, in the revolution as well as in the national liberation war.

If the people undertake to do something by themselves, everything can be achieved, but if not, we could achieve nothing at their place. That is to say that we have no pre-established model of a new society. We edify our society in conformity with the aspirations of our people as being stipulated in the preamble of the Democratic Kampuchea Constitution.

*Third question: As we have seen at this stage of your revolution, you have mobilised all your national forces to develop agriculture. Would you have any intention to develop also industry? And how would you establish the technical basis, that is to say how are you going to train the necessary cadres for this orientation, because for the moment, at our knowledge, you have neither university nor technical school?*

**Answer:** We have our objectives and plans to quickly develop our industry. By relying on agriculture, we endeavour to develop industry. In order to have an independent economy we must develop agriculture, industry, cottage industry and other sectors. It is thus an orientation to which we are paying great attention. But, to edify industry, where could we find the capital? We rely on agriculture. For example, we have established trade relations with Yugoslavia. We export agricultural products and we import industrial products, at one and the same time for the needs of agriculture and industry. In the parallel direction with that, we have a policy to quickly train many national technicians.

If we speak about universities, faculties and colleges like in the old days, there would seem to you of non-existence. But, we have trained our technical cadres from the basis. In the cooperatives there are many specialised workshops where studies are closely linked to the production works. It is likewise in the factories, in Phnom Penh as well as in the provinces. Before liberation, there were a number of graduates, educated in Phnom Penh, in provinces or abroad. But, as concrete results in the movement of cottage industry and industry, they had served with less efficiency than the national technicians coming from the basis can do at present. According to this experience, we have trained our technicians from the basis and we have progressively developed their technical skills. They participate in the production works and have gained concrete experiences - positive and negative - which permit them to move forward.

Before liberation, some of you had been for several times in Kampuchea. At that time, there were very few national technicians, there were many more foreign technicians. Now, we are attaching great importance to the training of national technicians. As concrete results of



our training system, let's take an example in the field of hydraulic projects. On the Prek Tnot river, while nothing has been achieved for many years, in 1976-77, we have built 5 dams. Therefore, with concrete practice we can draw concrete experiences, and we assess that if we had to wait for a long time, we could not serve in due time the movement of agricultural production, solve and improve the standard of living.

Let us take more examples. Now, we produce husking-machines and threshing machines, hydraulic pumps completely by ourselves. We produce them also with imported engines. These machines are manufactured by our technicians. Previously, they could not be produced in the country. All of them must be imported from abroad.

In brief, we pay great attention to this problem of industrial development and to the training of our national technicians. We shall develop the level of their knowledge by our own means. We think that we can do so at a certain degree. In combining closely the studies with the concrete practice, they have progressively gained more experiences. Then, they will go to friendly countries for training so that they could improve their scientific and technical knowledges. These are the principles on which we rely, but we will send our trainees only to friendly countries.

*Fourth question: We have seen that your cities have no population. Could you explain us what is the objective of this operation? Why have you abolished the role of the money, the salary system, the trade network? Would it be a passing orientation in the social and revolutionary transformation of your society or a model of society that you are really pursuing in building up?*

**Answer:** There are many reasons which led us to evacuate the population from Phnom Penh and other cities.

The first reason was an economic one, that is to ensure food supply for many millions inhabitants in the cities. After having taken the problem into much consideration, we came to the conclusion that we could not solve this problem as long as such numerous population remained in the cities. But, if we evacuated this population to the countryside, in the cooperatives, the latter could feed them for they have rice-fields, instruments of production and everything they needed. We had cooperatives which could receive this population from the cities by letting them participate in rice-growing thanks to their oxen, buffaloes and instruments of production. In the countryside, the conditions were favourable for us while in the cities they were not favourable. Then, in order to solve the food problem, it was necessary to evacuate the population to the countryside. It is only when we can solve the food problem that the people have confidence in the revolution. If in the cities, the population died by starvation, they would not have any confidence in the revolution. Such was the economic reason.

But relating to this economic problem, there was the problem of defence and security of the country. Before liberation, we already knew the plan of defeat of the US imperialists and their lackeys. According to this plan, after our victory and when we entered into Phnom Penh, they would create difficulties to us in Phnom Penh, in the

political, military, economic and other fields in order to destroy our revolution. Therefore, taking this situation into consideration, we evacuated the cities' population to the countryside, in the cooperatives in order to solve the food problem and at the same time, to crush beforehand the US imperialists' plan so that they could not attack us when we entered into Phnom Penh. Thus, the cities were not evacuated through a pre-established plan but they were in conformity with the situation at that time, that were the shortage of foodstuffs, the necessity to solve this problem for the population, and the US imperialists' and the lackies' plan aiming at destroying our revolution and taking back the power.

Concerning the function of the money, the salary and trade systems, I would like to tell you as follows:

In 1970-71, we already liberated 75 to 80 per cent of our country. At that time, we had the political and military power, but not the economic power. The economy was in the hands of landlords and capitalists. Thus, these latter amassed up the whole production for they had money. In the liberated areas, we fixed the price of paddy at 30 riels a tao (12 kilograms), the price at which the population must sell the paddy to the revolutionary power. But, the landlords and tradesmen bought it at 100 to 200 riels a tao and then they sold it to the Lon Nol clique. As for us, we had nothing. The population faced many difficulties in food supply. It was the same for our army. These difficulties had affected our national liberation war. After having well examined this situation, we decided to establish cooperatives so that they could take in hands the economy, the agricultural production in the countryside, the management, distribution, supply system and the exchanges between cooperatives on one hand and on the other hand between cooperatives and the State. That is why we could take in hands the agricultural production and solve the problems of living conditions of the people. The people were enthusiastic and sent their sons and daughters to join the Army to fight against the enemy. When the cooperatives helped one another and developed their exchanges of products between themselves, the function of money had been progressively reduced. In 1974, it was reduced by 80 per cent. Before liberation, only the State used money. It used it to buy various products in the areas not yet liberated for the needs of the liberated areas under its control. After these experiences, we asked the people's opinion who judged that money had no utility for the cooperatives already succeeded in handling the exchange of products between themselves. Therefore, at that time, in the liberated areas, which had extended over more than 90 per cent of the country, with nearly 5 million inhabitants, we had already solved this problem. When the population of the cities were evacuated to the countryside, they were fully taken in charge by cooperatives. This practice led us to give up the use of money up to now. What will be the situation in the future? That would depend on our people. If the people judge it is necessary to use money, they will then decide accordingly. Therefore, in the future this problem would depend on the concrete situation. That is why we have told you that we have no mould or pre-established model. That would depend on the development of the people's revolutionary movement and the progressively acquired experience.

Concerning the salary system, there were also habits acquired in the past. In the revolutionary movement, especially during the national liberation war, there was no salary both among the cadres and in the Army. As for the inhabitants, they also had no salary. Before liberation in the liberated areas, cadres, army, population, that is nearly 6 millions inhabitants, had already used to live without salary. We have noticed that in the old days, the majority of our people had no salary. Only the functionaries had salary. Therefore, with these acquired habits, the population of the cities incorporated themselves in the cooperatives, the military and civil cadres, men and women fighters and workers have continued to live following the regime of supply in practice during the war. We consider that this practice has avoided a heavy burden of the people and allowed us to keep this money mainly for national defence and edification. What will be the situation in the future? That would depend on the concrete situation and the people.

Concerning the trade network, the State and cooperatives cooperate with each other to organise it. The State gathers cooperative productions and distributes them throughout the country or exports them abroad. The State imports the products from abroad to distribute them throughout the country. So far, we have done so. Those are the practices acquired during the war. What will be the situation in the future? That would depend also on the concrete situation. That is why we have not determined that it is definitive or provisional. We have acted following the concrete situation and we continue to do so. The people are the fundamental factor.

*Fifth question: If we have understood well, Democratic Kampuchea faces many problems and difficulties of all kinds with her neighbours. What is your opinion and how could you solve these problems and overcome the present difficulties?*

**Answer:** Like all the newly liberated countries, Democratic Kampuchea has to face difficulties. That is normal. As far as I know, in the history, the difficulties of Kampuchea are not as great as those faced by some newly liberated countries. But, it is a fact that Democratic Kampuchea has difficulties.

The main difficulty is that we have abode by the position of independence, sovereignty and self-reliance and of deciding by ourselves our own destiny. This position runs counter to some countries, that is the expansionists and the imperialists. But we assess that in abiding by this position of independence, sovereignty and self-reliance our difficulties are less serious than those we would face if the nation and the people of Kampuchea were subjugated or disappeared. Therefore, we prefer to stand by our position of independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, of non-alignment, of deciding by ourselves our own destiny in overcoming all obstacles.

How to solve these difficulties? This problem would depend on the factors of our side and those of the opposing side. We have successively sought to solve this problem through meetings and negotiations.

Immediately after liberation, in June 1975, myself and other comrades leaders, we had been to Hanoi. We decided to go and showed our goodwill in seeking to solve the problems existing since a long time. There were

many problems but there was one problem, the problem of borders to be discussed. We said that Kampuchea wants only to live in peace and, in order to preserve, develop and strengthen the friendship between our two countries and peoples, she considers as State borders between the two countries the present borders that Vietnam has solemnly recognised in 1966 - 1967 and committed itself to respect them. We have not claimed our former territories. We have not also claimed our former islands. We have not claimed even an inch of territory. The Vietnamese did not deign to reply for they have fostered greater ambitions, that is to take possession of the whole Kampuchea under the form of "Indochina Federation" by sending every year many hundreds of thousands or millions of Vietnamese to come and install themselves in Kampuchea. In 30 years or more, the people of Kampuchea would become a national minority. That is very clear.

In May 1976, we invited the Vietnamese to come and negotiate in Phnom Penh. At first, they did not want to come. When they arrived, they said that they were coming because we had insisted on inviting them to come. During the negotiations, Vietnam has rejected the borders that it has recognized in 1966 and 1967 and that it has committed itself to respect. Vietnam told us that in 1966 it agreed with Kampuchea for at that time it needed to fight against the US imperialists. Therefore, it was a dupery. Furthermore, Vietnam has proposed a new borderline cutting off a great part of our territorial waters. For us, that is expansionism and annexationism. That is no friendship. Because we are small, Vietnam has exerted pressure on us. But we have not accepted it and the negotiations had not then led to any result.

In the parallel direction with these negotiations, the Vietnamese continued to attack us along the border aiming at forcing us to comply with. But we have always refused. After having waged a hard struggle against the imperialists and their lackeys, we cannot accept to be slaves of Vietnam. Neither our people nor our Army can accept it.

Now, how to solve this problem? We will solve it in according to the concrete situation. If Vietnam really respects our independence and sovereignty, if Vietnam fosters a genuine friendship with us, there would be no difficulties in solving the problem. This problem could be solved at once. But if Vietnam stubbornly wants to take possession of Kampuchea, we must defend our independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. But we consider that our difficulties will evolve and could be solved progressively.

First of all, we have mobilized our forces to resolutely defend our independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. To this end, the entire people are united and have redoubled their endeavours to increase production improve their standard of living, increase exportations in order to accumulate more and more capital for national defence and edification.

At the same time, we think that the Democratic Kampuchea's friends in the world stand by our side and their number has been further increased. We are of the opinion that there are a lot of countries which cherish independence and some of them have a firm position of independence. Yugoslavia is an example. These independence - and - justice-loving countries progressively and clearly discern those who are right from those who are wrong, those who want peace and friendship from those who



are expansionists and aggressors.

We think the situation evolves in a direction more and more favorable for us. Thus, those who want to aggress and annex Kampuchea will be progressively aware of that they cannot do so. At that time, the problem would be solved. But we must continue to face this present situation.

Sixth question: *In the world, they write a lot with or without reason that your country is very closed. Would you have any intention to further open your country to the world? On what principles and in what direction?*

Answer: Since liberation, we have progressively received friends. After liberation, we had to solve many problems, we had to organize our country, solve the problem of the living conditions of our people, that is we had to arrange our country, our home. And our friends came one after another. We are convinced that in the future, more friends will come. In 1975, some of them came. In 1976, there were more. In 1977, there were more than in 1976. In 1978, many more friends will come to our country. In the future, they will be more and more. We open our country to our friends. We shall invite and welcome more and more friends to our home, to our country. And we shall further develop and strengthen our friendship with all friendly peoples and countries.

As for personages and organizations that have shown their friendship and their spirit of justice towards Kampuchea, we have invited them to pay a visit to our country and we shall invite more of them. We are convinced that more and more friends will come and pay a visit to our country. But we must also arrange and embellish our home to receive our guests. You have paid a visit to our country, you have seen with your own eyes the devastations caused by the war. Those who have not seen Phnom Penh during the war would think that it was safe. Phnom Penh was not like it is today. Immediately after liberation, Phnom Penh was very dirty and there were everywhere networks of strongholds and barbed wire. Now, we have removed and cleaned them out.

Seventh question: *The relations between Democratic Kampuchea and Socialist Yugoslavia appear in friendship and cooperation. What possibilities would you find to speed up this cooperation and to extend the collaboration between our two friendly countries?*

Answer: Democratic Kampuchea and Yugoslavia are friendly countries and this friendship is based on the policy of non-alignment and independence. On this basis, we have ties of solid friendship to develop and strengthen our relations in all fields in the future. The relations in various fields have been developed and strengthened according to the possibilities of our two countries. As far as Kampuchea is concerned, we are striving to build up our country, increase our production and develop our trade exchanges with Yugoslavia. At present, our agricultural production cannot yet meet with all the demands of the friendly Yugoslavia. For example, in case of rubber, we produce some quantity but the quality is not equal. We are striving to improve the quality of our production in order to increase our exchanges with

Yugoslavia. Concerning the other fields, we progressively set up co-operation relations in according to possibilities of our two countries. We think that the prospects of this cooperation are favorable for it does not lay only on the trade and economic relations, but also on an excellent political basis of friendship.

Eighth question: *Upon our return, we would like to present to our readers and tele-viewers the results, successes and preoccupations of Democratic Kampuchea and the leaders of this friendly and non-aligned country. That is why our last question is:*

*Who are you, comrade Pol Pot?*

*What is the past record of the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kampuchea?*

Answer: I am pleased to answer your question. But, first of all I would like to tell you that my role and that of other comrades leaders represents only a small part of the national movement of Kampuchea, of the revolutionary movement of the Kampuchea's people.

I am from a peasant family, during my childhood, I lived with my parents and helped them in their agricultural works. But after, according to the customs, I lived in a pagoda to learn how to read and write. I spent six years in pagoda and I had been a monk for two years.

You are the first people to know my biography.

When I grew up, I attended the primary school and after this school, I could not immediately attend the secondary school because I did not pass the examination. I went back to the agricultural works to my parents. Only after that, I passed the examination for entering the secondary school. I finished my secondary education and I attended the technical secondary school. The studies lasted more than one year. There were general technical studies, especially in electricity. After successfully passing the examination I received a scholarship to continue my studies abroad, in France.

In the first year, I studied with diligence. I was passably good student. Then I militated in the movement of the progressist students and I had not enough time to study. Two years after, as I neglected my studies, the authorities cut off my scholarship. I had then to come back home.

I joined the underground movement of struggle in Phnom Penh. After that, I joined the maquis to participate in the struggle against French colonialists.

After the Geneva Agreements in 1954, I came back to Phnom Penh and carried on my underground activities. In the current life, I was professor of history, geography and civics in a private school. I have contacted with various circles. I militated in the pupils, students and intellectuals' circles, in the workers' circles and also in the peasants' circles.

In 1963, I could not stay anymore in Phnom Penh. I had to join the maquis. I was not very well-known to the public. But the Lon Nol's police followed my activities. They knew me but they did not know exactly who I was. In Phnom Penh, I was the general responsible of the movement in the capital: I was also in charge of the liaisons with the countryside.

I joined the maquis in 1963 and I came back to Phnom Penh on April 24, 1975.

In 1960, the Congress of the Party elected me as member of the Central

Committee and member of the Standing Committee of the Central Committee of the Party.

In 1961, I was Deputy-Secretary of the Standing Committee.

In 1962, Our comrade Secretary of the Party was secretly assassinated by the enemy. I assumed then the function of acting Secretary.

In 1963, the Second Congress of the Party elected me as Secretary. And the following Congresses confirmed me successively in my charges.

In the countryside, I stayed mainly in the most remote areas. I travelled all over country. I know fairly well my people, the geographical and economic situation of my country. My backing base was in the region of the national minorities, that is in the North-East region. I know perfectly these national minorities. They were very miserable. They wore only a very small pagné. They had no salt to eat. Now, one cannot distinguish them from the other people. They wear the same dress and live like everyone. They have enough rice, salt, medicines and other products. Their conditions of living have been considerably improved.

I would like to tell you about a particular fact. In 1950 when I was a student abroad, I was in a brigade of workers in Zagreb for more than one month during my vacation. I had contacts with Yugoslav peoples and I attended the Yugoslav folkloric performances. So, from that time I had ties of friendship with the Yugoslav peoples.

# BUILD THE PARTY AT THE POINT OF PRODUCTION

Since the formation of the Bolshevik Party there has been sharp struggle over the question of factory cells and the organisational forms of Communist Parties. This question and its implementation was one aspect of the split between Bolshevism and Menshevism. It remains a clear line of demarcation between Bolshevism and opportunism - between revolutionary and social democratic methods of organisation.

The Mensheviks attempted to introduce an open-ended organisational structure in which virtually anyone who called himself a member would be considered one. Had this been allowed to develop it would have destroyed the Party as the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat and opened the doors wide to the gross opportunism and degeneration of the parties of the Second International. In *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, Lenin stated: "*The matter therefore reduces itself either to the consistent application of the principle of organisation, or the sanctification of disunity and anarchy.*"

Stated broadly the question is whether a Communist Party should be primarily organised on "territory" - the place of residence, or in factory cells - the place of work. The social democratic and revisionist parties are organised at the place of residence because this is the most suitable structure for fighting elections. It is the easiest way of organising people for this task. This organisational form based on territory, usually in electoral districts, reflects a revisionist line on the nature of the state. It places the struggle for parliamentary seats above the necessity of organising the class conscious workers in the vanguard party.

In sharp contrast the Bolshevik Party was based in factories. They fought elections from these bases and no special organisational forms, based on territory were developed for this purpose. The organisational structure of a Party is directly related to its goals and this is the link between political line and organisation.

## SOME HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE

With the formation of Communist Parties throughout the world after the Bolshevik revolution the question of organisational form was again on the agenda. The Comintern fought, unsuccessfully, to have the Bolshevik form of party structure, based in the factories, established in the newly formed parties. It is in the Western type of "legal" parties that this failure is most clearly revealed although it occurred throughout the world. The parties in the major imperialist countries never made a break with social democratic methods of organisation. This failure is an important aspect of the degeneration of these parties to revisionism.

Despite the hard struggles of Marxist-Leninists within the parties, they remained primarily based in the communities. Where they were involved in factory work they were, more often than not, linked to the labour aristocracy and the trade union bureaucracy.



The Comintern laid the blame for the failure of the revolution in Germany in 1923 "not only to the absence of a truly revolutionary leadership, but also to the absence of extensive and firm connections with the workers in the factories." The structure of the party meant that it did not and could not know what the workers were feeling or thinking. It was not organised in a consistent and all round way for a fight with the bourgeoisie. In short, it was incapable of leading the proletariat to victory! These lessons went unlearned and in 1931, the German Party had 6,196 street cells and only 1,983 factory cells. Many of the factory cells existed on paper only.

In France the so-called "factory cells" often had only 1 to 2 members working in a factory and 12 to 16 members outside it! The struggles in the factory must have been abstract and uninteresting to the majority of cell members.

Despite an intense struggle and campaign during the period 1925 to 1929, the CPUSA failed to base itself in the factories. The Central Committee revealed that in 1930 "less than 10% of the Party membership is organised into factory nuclei." While publicly taking the correct stand of the Comintern they were unable to change their organisational structure. The following lines from *The Communist Party - A Manual on Organisation* published in the USA in 1935 reveal more than was intended. "The Street Unit must not adopt a patronising attitude towards the Shop Unit. It cannot make any decisions for the Factory Unit. It must help from outside in a manner determined by the Shop Unit". By the late 1930's the openly revisionist line of Browder led to an attack on the "factory concentrations, and shop papers and trade union factories were liquidated". But Browder's influence spread far beyond the borders of the USA.

The history of the Communist Party of Great Britain reveals a similar pattern of development. As with many of the parties of the major imperialist powers, where it was involved in factory and trade union work it became tied to the labour aristocracy and trade union bureaucracy. At the 1935 Party conference out of 294 delegates 234 were trade unionists; 7 held national official positions, 27 in district positions; 82 branch positions, 9 were executive members of Trades Councils and 29 Trades Council delegates. In appearance it seems that the Party was widening its base and influence in the proletariat. In reality they became increasingly cut off from the masses. The leadership of the Party was in a constant environment of trade union politics which pull towards social democracy and away from Marxism-Leninism. They were cut off from the day to day, painstaking work of winning the workers to communism. The emphasis was on winning positions within the trade union structure rather than digging deep roots in the working class and preparing the workers for revolution. The CPGB was still a revolutionary party but the seeds of degeneration were being sown. The fruits were reaped in 1945 when the Executive Committee disbanded the Factory Branches for a period of time. McCreery pointed out in the early 1960's that only 1 member in 9, in the London District, was organised at his or her place of work. The continuance of social-democratic methods of work and organisation throughout the history of the CPGB have played an important role in bringing it to its present position. An utterly revisionist party and the most dangerous enemy within the working class movement!

The greatest emphasis politically, organisationally and numerically must lie with the creation of factory cells. However this does not mean that there is no important role for street cells. They can organise unemployed workers and housewives for support work for the factory cells and for work in the community. They can perform as the basis for self-defence against attacks from the fascists and the police, especially in areas where there are concentrations of national minorities. Street cells can lead struggles against the eviction of workers from their homes and organise rent strikes.

In the community they can aid the struggles for the preservation and improvement of hospitals, day-care centres and similar projects in working-class areas.

#### ON THE SHOP FLOOR

"But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons - the modern working class - the proletarians". (Manifesto of the Communist Party).

At the present stage the contradiction between capital and labour is primarily focused in the factories. Marx stated: "In this struggle - a veritable civil war - all the elements necessary for a coming battle unite and develop. Once it has reached this point, association takes on a political character". In order to develop and lead this "civil war", to raise the consciousness of the workers, to ensure that workers move away from bourgeois trade union politics and towards revolutionary socialist politics, communists must be organised and organising where the struggle takes place - on the shop floor.

It is here that the workers meet their enemy or his lackeys face to face and the contradiction is sharp and clear. Communists can provide the direct link between the economic struggle and the political struggle.

Cadres can win the respect and support of the workers as strong class fighters while increasingly raising their consciousness of the wider issues and tasks facing the proletariat. At the same time cadres can learn from the vast and rich experience of the masses and temper themselves in struggle. Through the course of these battles we will win leadership away from the opportunist misleaders and smash what hold revisionism has on the working class. In other words it is at the point of production we can best wage class struggle.

None of this will occur if our links with the masses are only "paper" ones. If our only contact with the workers is through the distribution of leaflets, posters or sales of *Class Struggle* we will not accomplish our goal. We must forge deep roots in the masses, a living revolutionary link that will become an unbreakable bond. This will ensure we know what the workers are feeling and thinking. We will be able, as workmates and friends to discuss the day to day and long term aspects of the struggles against the bosses. Through this process, combined with a fighting class stand and analysis we can win the advanced workers to communism and the League, giving it deep roots in the proletariat.

Throughout this process we will continually and increasingly come into conflict with the opportunist misleaders. They must be exposed nationally in our paper and directly by exposing and defeating them on the

shop floor. As the class struggle sharpens their fear of the masses and their struggles will become increasingly obvious as will their attempts to contain, direct, sell out and destroy the workers' fight against the bosses. Only if we are there to challenge them face to face, to make proposals and take actions that clearly reflect the interests of the workers will we be able to thoroughly smash their hold on the proletariat. Factory cells will ensure that step by step, we can turn the unions into fighting class organisations.

The existence of a revolutionary communist organisation is a declaration of war on the bourgeoisie and they will never regard it as "legal". The cell structure and in particular factory cells are the best method of organisation. They ensure that while the attacks of the bourgeoisie may damage a section of the organisation they can never destroy it! It is our duty to defend the interests of the masses and it is the masses that are our best defence.

Having cells organised in key areas of industry will be of obvious importance during economic and political struggles and especially in potentially revolutionary situations. This will bring the full strength of the proletariat to bear for the assault on the bourgeoisie. Factory cells are the organisational base for the proletariat's armed struggle against the capitalist class. All the above aspects of factory cells combine for this goal - the armed overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. As Lenin said: *"The main strength of our movement lies in the workers organisations in large factories, because in the large factories are concentrated that section of the working class which is not only predominant in numbers, but still more predominant in influence, development and fighting capacities. Every factory must be our stronghold."*

#### Sources

1. *The Bolshevization of the Communist Parties* (Communist International Publication 1934)
2. *By Eradicating the Social Democratic Traditions* O. Piatnisky
3. *Building the Factory Cell. Revolution* Vol.3, No.1
4. *The Way Forward* M. McCreery.
5. *The Communist Party - A Manual On Organisation* J. Peters.

Contributed.

# Messages to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

## Victory to the New Long March

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain we send warm fraternal greetings to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, headed by Comrade Hua Guofeng on the success of the third plenary session of the 11th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

We salute your victorious campaign to defend and uphold Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and to expose and criticise Lin Biao and the gang of four, and we hail the important Central Committee decision now to shift the emphasis of the Party's work to socialist modernisation. A socialist China that is modern and powerful is greatly in the interests of the international working class and the people of the whole world, and it will have a major effect in delaying and obstructing the aggressive war preparations of the two superpowers, especially Soviet social imperialism. The great campaign to build China as a powerful modern socialist country is also very much in the interests of the Chinese working class and Chinese people. It is a profound and extensive revolution not only economically but also politically and ideologically, which is indispensable for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China on the basis of widespread and healthy proletarian democracy and the practice of the mass line.

We also warmly welcome the recent successes of the People's Republic of China in implementing Mao Zedong's great strategic concept of the three worlds in international affairs. These victories hearten the international working class and the oppressed peoples and nations of the third world and they pin down and hamper the two main enemies of the people of the world today, the two superpowers, especially the more dangerous and aggressive of these two, the Soviet Union. They help provide the best international circumstances for social progress in accordance with the desires of the working class and working masses within each and every country of the world.

We are greatly inspired by all your victories, both nationally and internationally, which are victories for the glorious cause of the inter-



national working class guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

Long Live the Communist Party of China!

The Political Committee of RCLB  
30.12.78

Total Support for China's Counter-Attack

Dear Comrades,

On behalf of the Central Committee and the entire membership of the RCL we express our militant support for the firm stand of your Government and for the People's Liberation Army counter-attack against Vietnam. At the instigation of Soviet social-imperialism the revisionist and chauvinist Vietnamese authorities have consistently attacked China, killed and wounded many hundreds of Chinese civilians and soldiers, occupied Chinese territory and mercilessly persecuted the Chinese minority living in Vietnam. The situation had become absolutely intolerable. Time and again the Vietnamese authorities had refused to heed the Chinese Government's warnings or to respond to China's appeals. At the same time Vietnam has launched an all out invasion of Democratic Kampuchea.

We wish the counter-attack total and speedy success.

For our part we pledge to remain alert as to social-imperialism's intentions and to counter-attack, to the best of our ability, it's hysterical slander campaign against China. Furthermore, we will expose the British Government's appeasement of Soviet social-imperialism which is being passed off under the cover of "even handed criticism of both sides". This is our proletarian internationalist duty. It is also in the interest of the struggle to build the international united front against superpower hegemonism and war.

Central Committee of RCLB,  
20.2.79

# Messages to the Party and Government of Democratic Kampuchea

To Comrade Secretary Pol Pot and  
the Central Committee, Communist Party of Kampuchea

Dear and Respected Comrades,

We join the whole of progressive mankind in our bitter condemnation of Vietnamese aggression against your country. We wholeheartedly support the valiant struggle of the Kampuchean Army and people, united as one behind the leadership of their Party and Government, to defend their hard won sovereignty and independence. Your cause is just. Through protracted People's War the Kampuchean people will undoubtedly seize final victory.

The Vietnamese authorities have betrayed their people, sold out to Soviet social-imperialism and transformed Vietnam into a base for counter-revolution and aggression in south-east Asia. Exactly one month after the conclusion of the notorious Soviet-Vietnamese Pact the Vietnamese authorities set up a quisling Kampuchean "Front". A month later the Vietnamese authorities have despatched 100,000 troops to occupy Democratic Kampuchea and install the quisling "government". They will be defeated just as surely as US imperialism and its stooges were defeated by the Kampuchean people.

Down with Soviet-Vietnamese Aggression!  
Total support for Democratic Kampuchea!

Central Committee, RCLB  
April, 1979

Dear Comrades,

On this 17th April, the 4th Anniversary of the ignominious defeat of US imperialism and the glorious victory of the Kampuchean people, we extend to you our most militant greetings.

How was this historic victory won? It is no secret. It was won by the united and determined struggle of the Kampuchean people, the heroism of the peoples' army and the wise and correct Marxist-Leninist leadership given by the Kampuchean Communist Party headed by comrade Pol Pot. This same national unity, heroism and determination were then transformed to build up Democratic Kampuchea into a truly independent and socialist country. The victory of Democratic Kampuchea was a victory for the

international working class, the oppressed peoples and nations and the whole of progressive freedom loving mankind.

Today, the invader's jackboots have returned. The Vietnamese chauvinist authorities have committed all-out aggression against Kampuchea at the behest of Soviet social imperialism. Today the Kampuchean people and Liberation Army stand in the forefront of the struggle to defend national independence and peace in South East Asia and the world against the hegemonist designs of the new tsars. Already the heroic Kampuchean people have punctured the aggressor's arrogance, and along with China's successful counterattack against Vietnam, are proving that Soviet social imperialism, the most dangerous aggressor in the world today, and its puppet the Vietnamese expansionists, are not invincible. It is the peoples of the world and their just cause which is invincible. The total defeat of the aggressors and the total victory of Democratic Kampuchea are inevitable.

Long Live the 4th Anniversary of the Founding of Democratic Kampuchea!  
Total Support for the Kampuchean People against Soviet-Vietnamese Aggression!

## MANIFESTO

The Manifesto of the RCLB puts forward the stand of Marxism-Leninism on the major questions facing the working class, both internationally and nationally. It points out that our central task today is to rebuild the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class. The Manifesto is the founding document of the RCLB. The publication of the Manifesto marked an important step forward towards the drafting of the Party programme. The Manifesto is available from New Era Books. Price 37p (inc p&p)

The RCLB has London Grimsby Manchester  
members in: Birmingham Leeds Newcastle  
Bristol Liverpool Yeovil

To contact the RCLB, write to: The RCLB, c/o New Era Books.

## NEW ERA BOOKS

"WITHOUT REVOLUTIONARY THEORY THERE  
CAN BE NO REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT" (Lenin)

NEW ERA BOOKS stocks the works, of MARX, ENGELS, LENIN, STALIN and MAO TSETUNG, MARXIST-LENINIST publications and progressive literature from around the world.

### SUBSCRIPTIONS:

REVOLUTION 4 issues £1.65 (inland) £2.25 (abroad)  
CLASS STRUGGLE 13 issues £1.95 (inland) £2.70 (abroad)  
26 issues £3.90 (inland) £5.40 (abroad)  
NEW ERA BOOKS, 203 Seven Sisters Road, London N4.  
Telephone 01-272-5894. Nearest Tube - Finsbury Park  
Opening hours - 10am - 6pm, Monday to Saturday.  
Late night opening, Thursday till 7.30pm.

CLASS STRUGGLE PAMPHLET NUMBER TWO

## TURN THE UNIONS INTO FIGHTING CLASS ORGANISATIONS

Available from New Era Books, price 15p (plus 7p if by post) Bulk orders - details on request.

The pamphlet is based on a series of articles carried in "Class Struggle", the political paper of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain, between December 1977 and June 1978.

The pamphlet exposes through many concrete examples, how the opportunist trade union misleaders work in the interests of capitalism and makes the call to fight against trade union bureaucrats and struggle to turn the unions into fighting class organisations. It points out that any struggle must be unified and raises five slogans, which show how to orientate our struggle effectively.

1. No class collaboration with the bosses!
2. Fight for democratic unions!
3. We won't pay for the bosses' crisis!
4. Stop paying Labour to attack workers!
5. Oppose oppression and discrimination of black and women workers at the place of work!

The pamphlet exposes the Labour Party, the Communist Party of Great Britain, and other opportunist, who sabotage or oppose both the struggle for socialism and the day-to-day economic struggle.

Read the communist view on the trade union struggle. Sell it and discuss it with your workmates.



# CLASS STRUGGLE ★

POLITICAL PAPER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

## BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS

'CLASS STRUGGLE' is the political paper of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain. It is produced to help the working class build its own party - a revolutionary Communist Party.

'CLASS STRUGGLE' carries news and analysis of the class struggle in Britain, supporting the interests of the working class. It opposes the bourgeoisie, and all those opportunists who talk about socialism but whose actions are for the preservation of capitalism.

'CLASS STRUGGLE' carries many articles on the situation internationally. It supports the struggle against the two superpowers aims of world domination, and supports all forces in their opposition to the two superpowers. It supports the struggle against British imperialism.

'CLASS STRUGGLE' reports on the socialist countries, and the gains made in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in socialist construction



READ AND SELL 'CLASS STRUGGLE' - THE PAPER OF THE WORKING CLASS!

SUBSCRIPTION;  
13 ISSUES: £1.95  
26 ISSUES: £3.90  
FROM  
NEW ERA BOOKS