

# REVOLUTION

THEORETICAL JOURNAL OF THE REVOLUTIONARY LEAGUE OF BRITAIN.

**JANUARY 1980**

VOLUME 4, NO.2

PRICE 35p

## **CHINA'S NEW LONG MARCH —A CONTINUATION OF MAO'S REVOLUTIONARY LINE**

## **KAMPUCHEA: DEMOCRATIC PROGRAMME**



# EDITORIAL

## CONTENTS

<u>EDITORIAL</u> .....	P.1
MESSAGE FROM THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLES' REPUBLIC OF CHINA.....	P.1
<u>CHINA'S NEW LONG MARCH</u> - a continuation of Mao's revolutionary line.....	p.2
<u>KAMPUCHEA: DRAFT POLITICAL PROGRAMME</u> .....	p.20
<u>"THEY CONDEMNED ME TO PASSIVITY AND SILENCE"</u> (An interview with the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Poland).....	p.27
<u>STALIN CENTENARY: 1879-1979</u> .....	p.31
<u>AGAINST THE ACW'S HOPELESS DOGMATISM</u> .....	P.40

In October the People's Republic of China celebrated thirty years of building socialism. This event was marked by a rally held in London and attended by 150 people. Speakers from the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain and Communist Workers' Movement spoke from the platform on the significance of the occasion, and on socialist China's role in the world today. Speakers from the Bangladesh Workers' Association, the Anti-fascist and Anti-imperialist Student Front of Greece, and Youth Forces for National Liberation (Jamaica) also spoke, explaining the significance of China's struggles for socialism and against the superpowers, as applied to their own particular struggles.

The article "The New Long March" in this issue of *Revolution* takes up the main theme of the Thirtieth Anniversary celebrations. People's China has had great successes, and will continue to build a great modern socialist state. This is a fact of great importance for the international proletariat and the peoples of the world. Despite all the slanders of the bourgeois press, and the attacks of revisionists of both left and right we are confident that the Communist Party of China is continuing along the road charted by Comrade Mao Zedong.

In upholding this stand, the article encourages readers to study events in China. One lesson of the struggle against the "gang of four" is the need to combat dogmatism and to "emancipate the mind". This means looking at developments with an open mind, and in the light of concrete conditions, as opposed to comparing events with an abstract idea of "socialism" which has little to do with reality. If communists and friends of China in Britain are to understand the key questions and debates about the construction of socialism in China and the struggle for the four modernisations in particular, then we must grasp that this is a material question - not a question of wishful thinking.

We are also publishing in this issue an important statement from the Government of Democratic Kampuchea. This is the Programme of the Democratic Front which aims to unite all who can be united against the Vietnamese aggressors and the puppet regime of Heng Samrin. The publication of this programme is an important step forward in the struggle of the Kampuchean people for national liberation. Another document from the international communist movement in this issue is the damning evidence against the Party of Labour of Albania given by the veteran Communist leader Kazimir Mijal. This interview, given to the Workers' Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Norway is a living proof of the PLA's degeneration into revisionism. This party does not limit itself to attacks on the CPC, it also carries out provocations and bullying attacks on those with whom it has political differences.

December 21st is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Joseph Stalin. Joseph Stalin, made a great contribution to the Bolshevik revolution in 1917. He led the Party in its pioneering work of constructing socialism in the world's first socialist country. Stalin led the USSR into an alliance to resist the fascist axis. Under his leadership the USSR played the main part in defeating German fascism. *Revolution* is pleased to publish an article which has been contributed to commemorate the centenary of J. Stalin.

The last article in this issue is a reply to the dogmatism and centrism of the Association of Communist Workers. Readers will see that this article is signed. This means that, while the Editorial Committee considers the line of the article to be generally correct, it takes up questions on which the RCL as a whole does not have a line. This is a new development for the journal, and reflects changes in our policy which have been made as a result of the struggle against ultra-left idealism and the Anti-League Faction. Formerly the League had held a dogmatic and rigid view that articles in our publications had the force of a line of the Central Committee. This restricted the Editorial Committee to a narrow range of subjects, and made the journal too rigid. *Revolution* will now be publishing signed articles on questions which go beyond the formal lines of the League, and will be encouraging letters or articles from readers who wish to raise particular questions or to criticise *Revolution* articles. We aim in this way to reflect debates within the League and the ML movement in the pages of the journal. The main aim of *Revolution* will not change however. This will still be to propagate League views on the main theoretical and political questions facing the working class and the Marxist-Leninist movement.

Editorial Committee.

30th ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

To the Central Committee  
of the Communist Party of China,  
headed by Comrade Hua Guofeng.

27th September, 1979.

The Central Committee and all the members of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain send our warmest congratulations to you on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. This anniversary is an occasion for great satisfaction and great hope for the people of China and the people of the world.

The victory of the New Democratic Revolution was an event of world historic proportions. The tremendous achievements in socialist revolution and socialist construction which followed are undeniable. These achievements are a great testimony to the resourcefulness and determination of the Chinese people under the leadership of a very tempered Communist Party. Although inevitably going through some twists and turns these victories are unshakable proof of the great strength of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought when it is correctly integrated with concrete practice in a proper materialist way.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party of China the excellent prospect is now opening up of the Chinese people mobilising all positive factors vigorously in order to turn China into a modern powerful socialist country. A thriving situation is developing in which people contribute in a lively and creative manner to this great cause in all sorts of capacities and in all sorts of circumstances under the unifying leadership of the Communist Party of China. Your success will have a profound effect on building the essential international united front against hegemonism and war, and it will also promote social progress within all countries. Every victory you achieve is therefore a victory for the common cause.

In this spirit we celebrate the 30th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China with great warmth and great hope for the future of the Chinese people, and for the future of the international working class and all mankind!

Chris Burford, Chairman  
on behalf of the Central Committee  
of the RCLB.



# CHINA'S NEW LONG MARCH—

## A continuation of Mao's revolutionary line

The present developments in China are stirring events for communists throughout the world. They also impose some strict demands. The period of ascendancy of Lin Biao and the "gang of four" caused great havoc inside China, but this also had implications abroad. The campaign inside China to expose and criticise Lin Biao and the "gang of four" has therefore also had effects outside China, to the effect that it has shown the need to combat left opportunism.

One result of the ultra left line is that many in the Marxist-Leninist movement who were drawn into politics at the time of the Cultural Revolution came to understand socialism as being exclusively class struggle and never-ending political upheavals. So it has taken some time to adjust and begin to understand recent developments. This has meant going back to basic Marxist-Leninist principles, re-reading many of Mao's works and studying closely the documents coming from the Peoples' Republic of China (PRC). As a result, while the RCL does not claim to understand everything, we wholeheartedly support the present policies of the CPC, and particularly the policy to modernise socialist China by the year 2,000.

Like revolutionaries throughout the world, we are proud to re-affirm our confidence in the Communist Party of China and its leaders (some may be new to us, but they have a long history in the Chinese revolution). In this 30th anniversary year, we study with interest the exciting developments and achievements in socialist construction, and remember that China belongs to all oppressed peoples and workers throughout the world. Our interest is not academic, it is a class interest, the victory or defeat of socialism in China has tremendous significance for the world revolution. That is why, if we are serious about wanting to understand the recent developments in China we must avoid making rash judgements and really try and study the situation scientifically.

After the many recent political struggles inside China the present shift in emphasis quite naturally raises questions about what is right and what is wrong. However over the years Marxist-Leninists have been

tempered and matured, we have been educated to analyse things from a proletarian standpoint and reach our own informed conclusions. The fact that many people were taken in by the "gang of four", shouldn't make us cynical, it should make us want to understand questions more deeply, so we don't lose our bearings in the future. There are however many forces at play encouraging cynicism, that distort and attack China's leadership and policies and have confused many people. Firstly the bourgeoisie here, through their press, are for their own selfish reasons lauding China to the skies. This quite naturally makes us suspicious. We have dogmatically learnt to always oppose what the enemy supports, but we shouldn't be dogmatic. The fact that China has forced the West to tear down the "bamboo curtain" they erected around her and welcome her as a respected and influential member of the international community is a sign of China's strength. The bourgeoisie hate China's revolution as much as they ever did, but opportunistically they have found in China a strong support against threats of Soviet expansionism and an enormous new market which they greedily hope to capture! China will quite naturally exploit this situation to her own advantage, both for expanding her own trade and winning over second world countries in the united front to defend world peace. As long as there is not compromise on basic principles it is certainly to the advantage of the international proletariat and oppressed people that China is no longer isolated and has many friends.

Secondly, we have the professional "China-watchers" and the ultra-lefts here. They have now come off the fence and declared that with the ending of the Cultural Revolution went the ending of socialism in China. They say the current plan of building China into a powerful modern socialist state by the year 2,000 is in direct opposition to Mao's line and that the "re-introduction" of bonuses and the import of foreign technology and loans is evidence of revisionism. All this they say, echoing the "gang of four", proves that a right wing coup has taken place in China. (Incidentally, if things are now "bad", what the hell were all these "revolutionaries" doing when they were good. They only seemed to have realised the change in retrospect, as most of these fairweather friends have never done much to promote support and friendship with China!)

However, the criteria Marxist-Leninists apply to ascertain whether the present policies represent a capitalist restoration, is not whether it upsets us that China's socialist construction refuses to fit into our petty bourgeois idealist conception of socialism, but whether the dictatorship of the proletariat has been overthrown or not. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that this is so, on the contrary the dictatorship of the proletariat appears stronger than ever. Far from being weakened, the dictatorship of the proletariat is strengthened by a more stable and developed economic base. Our confidence in the recent consolidation of this dictatorship means that we support the socialist modernisation. We believe it is overwhelmingly positive, a continuation of all that is best in the long revolutionary traditions of the Chinese communist party. Of course there will be mistakes and retreats in the course of advancing, there will continue to be ideological struggle and we certainly won't always like or understand everything that is happening. But, China's new long march is travelling further

towards communism than has ever been reached before. That is a tremendous inspiration to revolutionaries everywhere.

This article can't hope to deal with all the many and varied developments in China, such as the welcome extension of democracy inside and outside the party, the new socialist legal system, the expansion of culture, all designed to release and protect the initiative and creativeness of the masses of people in China. We will concentrate on showing how the long march to socialist modernisation is a direct continuation of that charted by Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai and others. And how in fact, this is the first time for many years that these same economic policies for developing socialism can be fully implemented without sabotage.

#### SOCIALIST TRANSFORMATION

*"At the 11th national congress of the Chinese Communist Party and the first session of the Fifth National Peoples Congress, a general task for the new period was set, thus heralding a shift of emphasis in the work of the whole party and the whole nation to socialist modernisation. Now, thanks to the unity and concerted efforts of the entire people, the time for this historic change has come. Once the proletariat and the other working people have seized state power and established their political rule, economic construction must be given top priority. In the early years of the Peoples' Republic, and especially after the basic completion of the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out time and again that economic work and technical revolution should become our central task... In the present period and for a considerably long time to come systematic and planned socialist modernisation will be our main task. Whether we succeed or fail in our endeavour to modernise China by the end of the century will decide the future of our country and people". (Hua Guofeng, Report on the work of the Government 1979 June).*

To understand China's socialist modernisation programme, we should look at it in the context of the overall process of socialist construction since liberation. The experience of both the Soviet Union and China have shown us that the road to communism is not a smooth one. Although communist strategy is clear, it must apply flexible tactics and be prepared for set backs as well as successes. This has certainly been the experience of China's 30 years of socialism.

In 1949, the victory of the democratic revolution found China an extremely poor and backward country. It had been devastated by more than 20 years war, over the years the imperialists had sucked the country dry, leaving primitive unproductive agriculture and very little industry. It was a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country. The question then was, would it be possible to move from the stage of democratic revolution to socialism under such difficult conditions.

The success of the democratic revolution and the establishment of the Peoples' Democratic Dictatorship in 1949 were both carried out under the strong leadership of the proletariat and the communist party. This provided the key to making the future uninterrupted change over. Right from the start the democratic revolution had expropriated bureaucrat capital and established a basis for socialist transformation of ownership.

Even though more than 80% of the people were peasants, they were able to move from one stage of the revolution to the other only under the leadership of the working class. In all third world countries such as China, this will be the case. To ensure the success of the socialist revolution the relationship between the peasants and the workers must be handled correctly and the dictatorship of the proletariat must be based on the worker-peasant alliance.

*"The proletariat in China is small in number, some ten millions only, and it must rely on the several hundred million poor peasants, lower middle peasants, city poor, poor handicraftsmen and revolutionary intellectuals in order to exercise dictatorship - otherwise it cannot." Mao.*

In 1949 and before the Communist Party mobilised the masses to carry out the movement for land reform (distributing the land to the individual peasants). This was a continuation of the process already successfully carried out in the liberated base areas. In cases where land reform had already been completed, steps were taken to organise various forms of mutual aid and co-operation. These measures reflected both the subjective desires of the peasants (ie their level of political consciousness) and the objective conditions (the level of productive forces). The millions of peasants in China therefore enthusiastically supported the party and government. Right from the start the foreign and comprador-owned industry were confiscated and measures were taken to introduce state capitalist industry and commerce. The small national bourgeoisie that did exist were encouraged to put their expertise to the benefit of the new Peoples' Republic. This was in line with Mao's mobilising all the positive factors. In recognition of their contribution to the economy and in order not to alienate them, these capitalists were paid high wages as managers or allowed a proportion of the profits if they continued to invest in their firms.

The successes of this period proved that socialism cannot be built by decrees or out of text books. It must recognise and work within the objective laws of economic development. In order to develop smoothly the relations of production should reflect the development of the productive forces which in turn affect man's consciousness, "consciousness is determined by being". In China in 1949 the peasants' consciousness was "China for the Chinese" and "land for the tiller". This consciousness was correctly reflected in the movement for land reform. Shortly after millions of poor and lower middle peasants, having learned through their own experience the advantage of large scale farming, enthusiastically implemented the party's policies on collectivisation. In the fifties, at the time of socialist transformation the rightists put up fierce resistance saying China wasn't yet ready for socialism and needed to develop its productive forces first, ie develop capitalism. They aimed at undermining the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the other hand, the leftists using anything but the mass line and concrete investigation, went rushing ahead demagogically calling for the abolition of private plots as capitalists. In practice, private plots, alongside communes as the basic unit, accurately reflect the level of productive forces. They substantially add to the peasants income and are enthusiastically supported by the people. To either rush too far ahead, or to lag behind the objective and subjective conditions results in undermining the dictatorship of the proletariat and there-



fore leads to the danger of capitalist restoration.

The socialist transformation was in the main completed as early as 1956. This was only possible on the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat which succeeded in consolidating the worker-peasant alliance, pushing forward with state-owned industry, gradually making the socialist sector of industry predominant, and arousing the enthusiasm of the masses for collectivisation in agriculture. Summing up in 1958, Mao said:

*"...1955 was the year in which the basic victory was won as regards the aspect of ownership in the relations of production, while in other aspects of the relations of production as well as in some aspects of the superstructure, namely, on the ideological and political fronts, either a basic victory was not won or, if won, the victory was not complete, and further efforts were required".* (Mao, Selected Works Vol.5, p245).

Once socialist transformation was basically complete the scene was set for the all round expansion of production, mechanisation of agriculture and industrialisation.

*"We have entered a period, a new period in our history in which we have set ourselves to do, think about and dig into socialist industrialisation, socialist transformation and the modernisation of our national defence, and we are beginning to do the same thing with atomic energy. I hope that all secretaries of provincial, municipal and prefectural party committees and the comrades in charge of the central department will strive to become expert in political and economic work, for which the prerequisite is a higher level of Marxism-Leninism. We must do well both in political and ideological work and in economic construction. As for the latter we must really get to know how to do it."* Mao Zedong, 1955.

In the next few years tremendous advances were made in China. Only socialism could have solved the terrible poverty, starvation, illiteracy and decadence that existed at the time of liberation and still exists in many third world countries today. This is because once state power is in hands of the working class the productive forces can be continually expanded and adjusted in the direct service of the people. The contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production and between the economic base and the superstructure are not abolished, they continue to exist under socialism. But for the first time the conditions are created for resolving them, this is precisely the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

*"Socialist revolution aims at liberating the productive forces. The change over from the individual to socialist, collective ownership in agriculture and handicrafts and from capitalist to socialist ownership in private industry and commerce is bound to bring about a tremendous liberating of the productive forces. Thus the socialist conditions are being created for a tremendous expansion of industrial and agricultural production."* (Mao, Supreme State Conference, 1956).

In capitalist countries' high productivity and advanced technology mean inflation and unemployment. Development of the productive forces intensifies exploitation of the working class and the economic and political crisis of capitalism. As Marx said, "abundance brings scarcity". It is precisely the intensification of all these contra-

dictions under capitalism that make proletarian revolution a necessity. But revolution in the advanced industrial countries wouldn't mean going back to a more primitive economy, it would mean utilising these advances to improve the lives of the people. It is precisely such an increase in industrialisation and technology that China's modernisation programme seeks to establish, showing conclusively the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

*"You have such a big population, such a vast territory and such rich resources and what is more, it has been said that you are building socialism which is supposed to be superior, if after much ado for 50 or 60 years you are still unable to overtake the US, what a sorry figure you will cut. You should be read off the face of the earth. Therefore to overtake the US is not only possible, but absolutely necessary and obligatory. If we don't, we the Chinese nation will be letting the nations of the world down and we will not be making much of a contribution to mankind".* (Mao, Strengthen Party Unity and Carry Forward Party Traditions, 1956). Socialist transformation at the time was the central issue in resolving the contradiction between the socialist and the capitalist road.

In *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People* Mao analysed the political and economic situation and put forward the view that the two types of contradiction in society should be correctly handled:

*"The contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class is one between exploiter and exploited, and is by nature antagonistic, but in the concrete conditions of China, this antagonistic contradiction between the two classes, if properly handled, can be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and be resolved by peaceful methods. However the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie will change into a contradiction between ourselves and the enemy if we do not handle it properly and do not follow the policy of uniting with, criticizing and educating the national bourgeoisie, or if the national bourgeoisie does not accept this policy of ours"* (Selected Works, Vol.5 p386.

Summing up the situation in China at that time, Mao said:

*"Today, matters stand as follows. The large scale, turbulent class struggles of the masses characteristic of times of revolution have in the main come to an end, but class struggle is by no means entirely over".* (ibid p 395).

In the years immediately following this the general line was formulated of "going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism". This was a period of the peoples enthusiasm for socialism when new ways of carrying out socialist construction were explored, new ground was broken, including the movement in the countryside for the setting up of the peoples' communes.

#### AGRICULTURE AS THE FOUNDATION - INDUSTRY AS THE LEADING FACTOR

The decade or so from socialist transformation upto the outbreak of the Cultural Revolution were exciting but difficult years for the Chinese people. They coincided with the biggest ever betrayal of the international proletariat - the first socialist state, the Soviet Union of

Lenin and Stalin was overturned from a dictatorship of the proletariat into a fascist state. Mao and the Communist Party of China led the struggle to defend Marxism-Leninism from revisionism in the international communist movement. Their heroic struggle in face of many difficulties, served as an inspiration to the workers and oppressed peoples of the whole world and from that day to this China has stood as the beacon of the world revolution.

The fraternal aid previously given by the socialist Soviet Union was without warning, arrogantly withdrawn by the new tsars. This sabotage came at a time when China was isolated and suffering continuous provocation from the imperialists. Despite these difficulties the Chinese people, basing themselves on their long revolutionary traditions of self-reliance and hard work, overcame difficulties and applied themselves to the difficult job of building socialism. They learnt many lessons from the Soviet Union, both positive and negative, and after much trial and error formulated the revolutionary line in running a socialist enterprise. This was formulated in the famous Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel workers which had taken account of the errors of bureaucracy in leadership and management in the Soviet Union.

*"Keep politics firmly in command, strengthen party leadership, launch vigorous mass movements, institute the system of cadre participation in productive labour and worker participation in management, reform outdated and irrational rules and regulations, maintain close cooperation among workers, cadres and technicians, go full steam ahead with technical innovations and technical revolution".* Mao personally approved this charter and popularised it as a model for advanced units to be emulated. Later the Daqing oil workers were to use the charter as their guide. Both Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai recognised the significance of Daqing as far back as the Sixties. Daqing crystallised the most politically advanced experience to date in building socialism. In 1964 Mao issued the call to the whole country, *"In industry learn from Taching. While engaging in industrial activity, workers should also study military affairs and politics and raise their educational level. They too should carry out the socialist education movement and criticise and repudiate the bourgeoisie. Where conditions permit, they should also engage in agriculture and side occupations, just as people in the Taching oil field".* (Mao)(Taching = Daqing)

Alongside Daqing as the model for industry stood Dazhai the advanced model for agriculture. Both Daqing and Dazhai thrived in face of the massive opposition and sabotage by the "gang of four" which raised them even higher in the people's estimation. Dazhai shares many of the political and ideological qualities of Daqing; of putting politics in command, of hard work and sacrifice, of technical innovation and productivity. One other important quality they share is their pioneering work in beginning to break down the differences between agriculture and industry. By diversifying their production, they have overcome the complete reliance of one on the other. Taking agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor, means that although they support one another, agriculture provides the material base on which industry can develop. Obviously the stronger, the more productive a material base, the more surplus capital for investment. Not only that, the general standard of living in China is still low, it considers itself a developing third world country and lays great stress on catch-

ing up with the West, the living standards are even lower in the countryside than the cities, which is where the vast majority of China's millions live and work. Mao said, "the contradiction between the working class and peasantry is resolved by the method of collectivisation and mechanisation in agriculture". Collectivisation has now reached the stage of the Peoples' Communes, but China's agriculture has a long way to go before being substantially mechanised. Without such mechanisation, there can not be the necessary expansion of production to satisfy the peoples' needs. This is where the Government's policy on agriculture is concentrating, it is the main way to ensure the steady increase in the peasants' income. The Government has also recently increased the amount of investment it gives to agriculture raised the price it pays for grain, and by publicising the national family planning policy, contributed to raising the peasants' income more in line with the workers who themselves directly benefit from the resulting increase in the amount and variety of food.

Dazhai showed that not only does mechanisation add directly to the increase in funds, but indirectly as well by releasing the peasants for what are called side-line occupations, ie forestry, fishing, animal husbandry etc. They set up repair and light industrial work-shops to make them more self-reliant and to raise funds. Like Daqing, Dazhai put politics in command in a concrete way by revolutionising leadership. The communes leadership comes directly from the party committee, with cadres taking part in production and the poor and lower middle peasants firmly establishing their political dominance. It is through these methods that China aims to raise the present 3 level system of ownership of the peoples' communes (collective, brigade, team) to fully collective ownership by the peoples' communes and eventually ownership of the whole people. The "gang of four" pretended to support Dazhai. They "popularised" it in such a way as to make the lessons of Dazhai in-applicable. Firstly they dogmatically called on all communes, whatever their conditions, to copy Dazhai. This resulted in demoralisation because often, where conditions were poor, this process would take longer. Secondly the "gang of four" called for the basic accounting unit in communes to be the production brigade and not the production team when the basic form of ownership in communes is still the production team. This might sound very revolutionary to us, but if it does not reflect the concrete relations or forces of production, or the consciousness and needs of the masses, it is objectively counter-revolutionary.

Throughout the transitional period of socialism, the aim is to gradually abolish classes. One stage of this is to transform the peasantry into agricultural proletarians, this can only be accomplished by high productivity and industrialisation. Marxism teaches that "of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class". (*Communist Manifesto*). That is because all other classes are transitional. The trotskyists still stubbornly interpret this as meaning that as long as the third world are mainly peasants they will be incapable of carrying out a revolution without either firstly going through a process of capitalism to create workers, or to rely on the strength and support of their "white" brothers and sisters in the industrial west! All revolutions to date have shown this to be rubbish, that if the proletariat



(however small) and their party take the lead, the peasants can be mobilised to enthusiastically support the revolution and build a lasting alliance with the working class. Classes and class forces represent a particular historical stage, communists can't jump stages. Engels foresaw that "division of classes is invariably connected with a specific mode of production, it will be swept away by the full development of the modern productive forces".

## THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION

Mao's great theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat was developed after summing up the experience of both China and the Soviet Union, particularly the capitalist restoration inside the Soviet Union. The Cultural Revolution was the culmination of that theory that classes and class struggle continue to exist under socialism and that having seized power the masses of the people must be mobilised to consolidate their dictatorship. The Cultural Revolution started off as a struggle to defend and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat from the attacks of the right and ended with the final overthrow of the "left" "gang of four". Having prevented the restoration of capitalism and consolidated state power, in 1978 after twelve long years the Cultural Revolution was brought to a conclusion.

At the inception of the Cultural Revolution in 1966, Mao led the Central Committee in drawing up the "16 Points" which were to be the guidelines.

*"The aim of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is to revolutionise people's ideology and as a consequence to achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results in all fields of work. If the masses are fully aroused and proper arrangements are made, it is possible to carry out both the cultural revolution and production without hampering one another, while guaranteeing high quality in all our work. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a powerful motive force for the development of the productive forces in our country. Any idea of counterposing the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution against the development of production is incorrect".*

It is clear now in retrospect, that this line was not carried out and that increasingly production was counterposed to revolution and Lin Biao and the "gang of four" were able to cause an enormous amount of disruption to the economy as well as political confusion before they were finally exposed and defeated. How much the ultra left excesses outweigh the positive is still being assessed and a final summing up may take some time as the concrete manifestations of ultra leftism are still coming to light. At the time Mao's assessment was that it had been 70% positive and 30% negative, that assessment will obviously have to be looked at again with the benefit of hindsight. However the *Daily Telegraph* and others who would have us believe that the Chinese are just emerging from a period of total anarchy and fascism are going to be disappointed. The Cultural Revolution successfully prevented the restoration of capitalism, it mobilised the masses to defend socialism from the attacks of both the left and the right

and that should never be underestimated or forgotten! Obviously our past idealism that it was all marvellous, is increasingly being shown to be facile, but rash judgement of either all positive or all negative won't really do much to help anyone understand anything.

How is it that both the "left" and the right lines if followed would have resulted in capitalist restoration? Mao and the Communist Party of China have always emphasised waging ideological struggle on two fronts. "Our party has consolidated itself and grown strong through the struggle on two fronts". (The role of the CPC in the national war 1938). The bourgeois rightists' line said that with the elimination of the bourgeoisie, with the socialist transformation of the means of production, the question of whether socialism or capitalism would win out had already been decided in favour of socialism. Class struggle was therefore wasteful and redundant and all efforts should be concentrated on developing production. This became known as the "theory of productive forces". In practice it would have resulted in overturning the dictatorship of the proletariat. The socialist state is democracy for the people but dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. The revolution must be carried out on all fronts to assert the dominance of proletarian ideology over all aspects of society.

With the victory over the bourgeois line, Mao called for the ending of the Cultural Revolution and a return to order: "8 years have passed since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution started. It is preferable to have stability now. The whole party and the whole army should get united, its better to have stability and unity."

But the Cultural Revolution was in fact to last for a further five years. Mao's call for unity and stability went unheeded by Lin Biao and the "gang of four" who escalated their counter-revolutionary activities. They had emerged during the Cultural Revolution posing as the great defenders of Mao's revolutionary line against the rightists. They used this cover to exploit the peoples' revolutionary aspirations. They purposely distorted the theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, by turning the people into enemies and waging all out war against anyone who got in their way. In complete disregard for Mao's line of having faith in the masses, uniting the many against the few, and the correct handling of contradictions, they labelled veteran party members and outstanding workers as capitalist and stifled all opposition to their line. They portrayed the history of the CPC as nothing but a history of fierce two line struggle, forgetting the tremendous achievements and the high level of unity that had directly resulted from these struggles. Their plan was to foment anarchy in the name of revolution and then in the heat of the confusion step into the vacuum as saviours. By mixing up all sorts of contradictions, hitting out in all directions, they were able to spread a lot of political confusion and caused many to lose their bearings. They relied on the fact that the people had just emerged from an intense struggle against the rightists and would not easily see through their left demagoguery and identify them as counter-revolutionaries. To some extent this is what happened. The masses were not well prepared for a struggle against left opportunism. The initiative was temporarily taken out of their hands and the people's confidence was undermined. However in time the "gang of four" were exposed and defeated but not before a long and complex struggle to get to know them had occurred. The



extent of the damage both to the economy and to the class struggle is still not easy to assess. The Chinese have characterised them as carrying out a fascist type rule. Certainly they were directly responsible for many years of economic stagnation with their line of counterposing economics to politics leading to a big run down of production. It is precisely to redress the balance that there is the present shift of emphasis. There is a lot of time to be made up for, which is why there is a definite sense of urgency.

*"...It is necessary to make a scientific analysis - one which conforms to reality - of the internal class situation and class struggle after the establishment of the socialist system and adopt correct policies and measures accordingly. Class struggle still exists to a certain extent after the exploiters in our country no longer exist as classes. While rejecting the view that class struggle no longer exists, we must oppose the view that magnifies it, to say nothing of creating so-called class struggles out of the void. We must strictly distinguish between the two different types of contradictions and never mistake contradictions among the people for those with the enemy, still less conduct inner-Party struggle the way we fight the enemy. This is the only way to maintain a social and political situation characterised by stability and unity".* (Comrade Ye Jianying's Speech at the Meeting in Celebration of the 30th Anniversary of the Founding of the Peoples' Republic of China. *Beijing Review* 40, 1979 p 21).

## REVOLUTION AND PRODUCTION

There is a common belief that it is better to be left than to be right. Practice has shown, in the Soviet Union with Trotsky, in China with the "gang of four", and even in the RCLB with our pathetic little faction, that leftists can cause as much disruption, sabotage and confusion as the rightists. In fact left opportunism is generally more dangerous precisely because it hides behind revolutionary sounding phrase mongering. That is why in the struggle to expose the "gang of four" in China a lot of emphasis was placed on practice being the sole criterion of truth.

The essence of many of these ideological struggles against both left and right in China have centred on getting a correct balance in the dialectical relationship between economics and politics.

*"There is absolutely no doubt about the unity of politics and economics, the unity of politics and technique. This is true now and will always be true. Ideological work and political work are the guarantee for accomplishing economic work and technical work and they serve the economic base".* Mao then goes on to say, *"moreover, ideology and politics are the commander, the soul".* In other words of the two, politics and economics, politics is primary. This concept of the primacy of politics is again crystallised in the slogan formulated during the Cultural Revolution "Grasp revolution; promote production".

Why is it that generally speaking politics is primary? Revolutionary political power must first be established for economic production to be in the interests of the people, ie the fundamental economic contradictions in capitalist society are impossible to resolve without first defeating the political rule of the bourgeoisie.

Throughout the transitional period of socialism, there are different emphases and different levels of class struggle until the final abolition of classes. Hua Guofeng dealing with the precise relationship between production and class struggle, in China today stated;

*"... the fundamental aim has been to liberate the forces of production from the shackles of imperialism, feudalism, so as to turn and bring about a steady improvement in the material and cultural life of the whole nation... Almost 30 years have passed since the founding of the PRC, yet to this day the superiority of socialism has not been consistently and effectively brought into play and we have achieved far less than we should have... First we recognise both that class struggle has not yet come to an end and that at the same time there is no longer any need for large scale and turbulent class struggle waged by the masses... Both the view that class struggle has died out and the view that it should be magnified are at variance with objective reality at the present stage... class struggle is no longer the principal contradiction in our society; in waging it we must centre around and serve the central task of socialist modernisation".*

(Report on Work of Government, National Peoples' Congress, 1979).

At a certain stage, ie when the proletarian dictatorship has been firmly established the principal contradiction in society can and does change. Political power rests on economic strength. It will be impossible for communism to win final victory over capitalism without a large degree of industrialisation. It will be impossible to move from the socialist principle of "each according to his ability, to each according to his work" to the communist principle of "each according to ability, to each according to his need" without an enormous increase in production creating a society of plenty. Therefore at a certain stage it is correct that having resolved the principal political contradiction that the secondary economic contradiction becomes principal. Lenin said, "Productivity of labour is the most important, the principal thing for the victory of the new system". This can of course only be the case once political power is firmly established. That is why we have to keep coming back to the question of who holds state power? This is the one determining factor in assessing whether China's modernisation is socialist or not. *"Once the proletariat and the other working people have seized state power and established their political rule, economic construction must be given top priority".* (Hua Guofeng, Report on Work of the Government, 1979).

This relationship between revolution and production, politics and economics is a complex one, and it is at the root of much of the current confusion about China's modernisation. The slogan "Grasp revolution, promote production" has been under study and discussion recently in China. This may be because they feel it no longer reflects the emphasis needed now. Clearly the recent emphasis has been on redress-

ing the balance and stressing economics. Whether this is right or wrong depends on a scientific analysis of the actual situation in China to see which is the principal contradiction. *"The study on various states of unevenness in contradiction... of the principal aspect of a contradiction constitutes an essential method by which a revolutionary political party correctly determines its strategic and tactical policies..."* (Mao, On Contradiction).

Mao goes on to say how the principal aspect and the principal contradiction can change in different circumstances, usually with the resolution of one. Today the principal contradiction is that which is holding back the all-round development of socialism in China, clearly it is the relatively backward economy that is putting the brakes on the all round development of socialism in China now (certainly not for ever more). It is a big, rather than a gradual shift because of the urgency to repair the damaged economy and quickly catch up and then surpass the advanced technological levels of the capitalist world to demonstrate the superiority of socialism by substantially raising the living standards of the people. There is also the overall urgency of the world situation, the frantic war preparations of Soviet social imperialism demand that China modernises and strengthens national defence, not only in defence of socialism but as a strong support for the workers, oppressed peoples and countries of the world. Technology needs to be developed for this, that requires a raising of educational standards as well as the importing of foreign "know-how". Far from deviating from the policy of putting politics in command this is the correct implementation of that policy in the actual conditions.

*"On Chairman's Mao's instruction, it was suggested in the report of the work of the Government to the third National Peoples' Congress that we might envisage the development of our national economy in two stages beginning from the third five year plan. The first stage is to build an independent and relatively comprehensive industrial and economic system in fifteen years, that is before 1980, the second stage is to accomplish the comprehensive modernisation of agriculture, industry, national defence and science and technology before the end of the century, so that our national economy will be advancing in the front ranks of the world".* (Zhou Enlai, Report on the work of the Government, 1975, 4th National Peoples' Congress).

Only dogmatists, whose policies come out of the top of their heads rather than from an analysis of the conditions in the real world, can fail to recognise that an economically, technically and militarily strong China is essential to further consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent capitalist restoration.

Within this new emphasis is the danger that it will go too far. Constant struggle will be necessary to keep the balance right. There will be many things that we don't understand, but we have confidence that the Chinese people and party are as aware of these dangers as we are. They have been tempered over many years of bitter struggle and will not easily forget the result of relaxing their vigilance. There will of course be bourgeois elements who jump on the bandwagon for their own ends, but that must surely have already been anticipated. Even when implementing the correct line, mistakes

will be made, there will have to be adjustments and re-assessments. These are inevitable. Even with the greatest of leaders and the purest of line, setting out on a previously untrdden path will largely be a process of trial and error. Errors will be minimised by good preparation and careful analysis, but they can never be eliminated unless we refuse to move down the path altogether for fear of making mistakes.

#### SOME PROBLEMS OF SOCIALIST MODERNISATION

With all the blare of publicity that the socialist modernisation programme has got in the West we shouldn't forget that the emphasis has only basically shifted since 1978. Before that the overwhelming emphasis of the Party's work has been the political exposure of the gang. This meant concentrating on consolidating and revitalising the Party ideologically, politically and organisationally on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, uniting the working class and people around the Party, strengthening the united front, and unfolding genuine proletarian democracy in society as a whole. This was absolutely essential for consolidating the proletarian state power before launching the massive plan for modernisation. Only a correct revolutionary line which has been discussed and approved by the masses can be enthusiastically implemented by them. The masses of people, through the Party, the Congress, the reconstituted women's federation, Trade Unions, Youth League, etc. have held extensive discussions and passed resolutions in strong support. Only once there had been the most widespread debate was the plan launched. This is the surest guarantee that China's modernisation will be in the interests of the people and the revolution.

The stage of socialist construction in China is the most advanced ever. This modernisation plan is both ambitious and unique and the pace of progress rapid. It is natural with all these factors, people will get carried away with enthusiasm and have to be pulled back to a more realistic and correct approach. *"Generally speaking, whether in the practice of changing nature or of changing society men's original ideas, theories, plans or programmes are seldom realised without any alteration".* (Mao, On Practice).

The correct line is always achieved in the course of struggle. There will have to be continuous ideological and political struggle to get the plan right, then further struggle on the implementation. Only a democratic centralist party, practising criticism and self-criticism, is able to apply the mass line, sum up the situation, make adjustments and alterations to the line before much damage is done. In particular there will be a lot of adjustments to harmonise the relations of production and the productive forces, and the economic base and the superstructure.

Already the original plan has had to be readjusted. The next three years are being devoted to "readjusting, restructuring, consolidating and improving the national economy in order to lay the foundations for well proportioned and high speed development". Many of the adjustments are in line with points raised by Mao in 1956 in his article "On Ten Major Relationships". Summing up the experience both of China and Soviet Union this important document puts forward the basic policy for achieving the correct relationship between socialist revolution and socialist construction. Mao deals frankly with many of the contradic-



tions within socialist society and points to the way forward in resolving them step by step. Mao's method throughout this work is to isolate the principal contradiction and then set about to resolve it in the most effective way possible. For example a principal contradiction both in 1956 and in 1979 is the need to develop heavy industry. However Mao shows that *"If you really want heavy industries badly you should invest more in light industries..."* because *"light industries and agriculture can accumulate more capital and faster..."*

Recent adjustments to the national plan have meant an increased investment in agriculture and light industry and a cutting down in the number of capital construction projects, concentrating on those which produce items urgently needed by the state and that need less investment, yield quick returns and are profitable. These profits can then go to accumulate funds for the state to expand production and raise the general standard of living. The re-appraisal has called for much better and more economical use of already existing industry and a concentration on expanding transport and fuel production to service industry. Also the overall expansion of agriculture is essential to keep up with the need of the rapid industrial development. Their expansion must be mutually supportive and not put unnecessary strains on one section of the economy. Therefore the mechanisation and modernisation of agriculture is the key.

In "On Ten Major Relationships" Mao re-emphasises the party's line of *"while relying mainly on our own efforts, making external assistance subsidiary"*.

The question of "external assistance", foreign trade and loans is probably the most controversial of all China's current policies. Having spent the last few years boasting about how China owes nobody anything and based exclusively on self-reliance, it leaves a nasty taste in the mouth to hear of foreign investment and loans. But China's modernisation needs funds, it can't be built on our idealism. The important factor is how dependent is China on others, what is the basis of her growth. China's modernisation is primarily financed by domestic accumulation. By self-reliantly carrying out strict economies, increasing production, raising the quality and variety, by concentrating on raising the level of productivity, the people's income is raised and so is their consumption. The Chinese state cannot be dependent on foreign loans, however favourable and it has proved that it is not prepared to increase the burden of the people, by getting into enormous debt. This means that foreign loans are still a considerably small proportion of the overall funds. As long as the working class have state power firmly in their hands they can decide how best to use these funds.

Some problems are also raised by the question of use of foreign technology - especially the question of joint enterprises with foreign capitalists. The policy of the CPC is, and always has been, to learn from the strong points of all nations and countries. China does not copy indiscriminately. The study and introduction of advanced experience and advanced techniques of the West is now very much geared to increasing self-reliance. The emphasis after recent adjustments is that the modernisation of China cannot be bought or borrowed, it will be achieved by the hard work and concentrated efforts of the Chinese people. For example, the import of technology and equipment is being combined with improving the existing engineering skills and the standard-

isation and serialisation of products to improve efficiency.

It is a fact in the present world situation that the advanced capitalist economies possess the most advanced means of production in many fields. These advanced means are regarded as the private property of the capitalists themselves. If China is to obtain them, to put them in the service of socialist construction they must be bought. One way of doing this, and of obtaining capital to supplement China's needs, is to encourage joint enterprises just as Lenin and Stalin did in the 1920's and 1930's. Of course, this means that a portion of the Chinese market will be open to imperialism. But this is the price that must be paid. This compromise is necessary to obtain advanced technology, which is the foundation of China's modernisation policy.

China still relies mainly on her natural resources to develop production and the industry and wisdom of the Chinese people to carry out technical innovations. The policy is to combine creation with assimilation. China imports only the techniques and industrial equipment that will reinforce the country's potential of self-reliance and accelerate socialist construction. In foreign trade the policy is for a balance between imports and exports, by increasing exports in order to pay for importing advanced equipment and technology. The adjusted policy of reinforcing self-reliance has been graphically summed up as:

*"The former practice of buying eggs instead of chickens should be changed into buying chickens instead of eggs, of buying fewer eggs. The buying of chickens, if necessary, must not be duplicated"*.

The struggle over learning from the advanced experience of capitalist countries is not a new question for socialism, the same struggle took place in the early days of the Soviet Union. After the October Revolution Lenin pointed out the importance of obtaining as quickly as possible from the capitalist countries the means of production. Trotsky attacked this on the grounds that, *"the economy of the Soviet state would always be under the control of world economy"*. Stalin in reply to this type of pure isolationism said, *"to depict a socialist economy as something absolutely self-contained and absolutely independent of the surrounding national economies is to talk nonsense"*.

Our ultra-lefts of today are in good company! Along with Trotsky and the "gang of four" they want the socialist state to stand aloof from the rest of the world for fear of corruption. This fine idealism about the purity of socialism in practice means depriving the proletariat of the most advanced techniques and keeping the country economically backward.

In 1920 Lenin showed the emptiness of such idealism. *"Our main policy must be to develop the state economically... there must be less fine words for you cannot satisfy the people with fine words"*.

In 1956 Mao said, *"In technology I think at first we have to follow others in most cases, and it is better for us to do so, since at present we are lacking in technology and know little about it. However in those cases where we already have clear knowledge we must not follow others in every detail"*.

The recently adjusted policy puts a lot of emphasis on the self-reliant training of specialists as an important method of raising the scientific and technical level of the nation. Owing to the serious disruption of the educational system over the last few years, there is

now an enormous expansion in the educational opportunities to overcome the serious shortage of qualified young people. Post graduate studies have been restored, using not only Chinese expertise but inviting foreign specialists to lecture and increasing the number of Chinese students studying abroad. There has been an expansion of the July 21st workers' colleges run by factories. Open door schooling is being re-applied in a non-dogmatic way by combining theory and practice in more specific ways. This means students directly teaching a needed skill or learning a practical skill which enriches their education, just getting your hands dirty is no longer considered enough on its own. There has been a reintroduction of the examination system. Millions of young people have shown their enthusiasm to undertake these exams to contribute fully to socialist modernisation. The overspill is catered for by the TV Open University which is literally subscribed to by millions. Apart from this, spare time education is greatly increased with evening classes, day release etc. supplementing the schools which have now increased the system by one year to a unified ten year system. In this way the scientific, technical and cultural level of the whole country will be raised, and not just that of an elite.

The recent adjustments have been summed up as "taking one step backwards in order to take two steps forwards". However a big step forwards has been taken in raising the living standards of the people. Recently the lowest paid workers received a substantial pay rise. There has also been substantial increase in the income of the peasants. The Government has raised the price it pays for farm and side-line products, while reducing or exempting the communes from taxes. "...our agricultural tax has always been low... our purchase prices are gradually being raised... we follow a policy of larger sales at a small profit and of stabilising or appropriately reducing their prices... we must take greater care and handle the relationship between the state and peasants well". (Ten Major Relationships.)

In Hua Gofeng's Report on the work of the Government, he sums up what is meant by readjusting, restructuring and consolidating and improving the economy: "By readjusting we mean making conscientious efforts to rectify the serious disproportions in our economy caused by the long years of interference and sabotage by Lin Biao and the "gang of four", to bring about a relatively good co-ordination in the growth of agriculture and light and heavy industries and of the various industrial branches, and to maintain a proper ratio between accumulation and consumption... By restructuring we mean an overall reform of the structure of economic management carried out firmly and step by step. The trouble with the present structure is that in many areas and in varying degrees it violates objective laws... By consolidation we mean a resolute and effective shake up in the existing enterprises and especially those in which management is in confusion. To realise the 4 modernisations new enterprises must certainly be built. But we must rely mainly on tapping the potential of the large numbers of existing enterprises, renovating and transforming them and enabling them to reach or approach modern standards".

The whole report is a sober dialectical materialist approach to summing up questions. It proceeds from the reality of the situation in China listing the economic achievements over the last two years and setting the new targets. The policies of the Government which are

reflected in the Report are a most definite continuation of the policies outlined by Mao in "Ten Major Relationships" and other works. Throughout, the Report adopts Mao's Marxist method of having faith in the people and of giving play to their enthusiasm and initiative in building China into a powerful modern state.

China's enemies - the revisionists of right and left all try to represent these policies as a "return to capitalism". The imperialist bourgeoisies call the four modernisations a process of "de-Maoification". In fact as this article has shown the present policies are a direct continuation of those put forward by Mao and Zhou. This fact was made very clear by the recent major speech by Ye Jianying on the occasion of the 30th Anniversary Celebrations of the PRC. In particular Ye stressed that all the victories of the Chinese revolution were achieved under the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought. But following Mao Zedong Thought should not be done dogmatically, stressing the leading role of Mao should not become deification. The essence of Mao Zedong Thought is to oppose these things and to oppose idealism while upholding materialism.

*"We must proceed from China's realities, make a careful study of the laws of economics and the laws of nature, and open up a path to modernisation suited to China's specific conditions and features".* (Ye Jianying, *Beijing Review* 40, p23).

In following this path the CPC will win further victories, and will further develop Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.





## KAMPUCHEA: DRAFT POLITICAL PROGRAMME

*Democratic Kampuchea today stands in the front line of the struggle against superpower aggression and war - a focus of all the urgent issues of contemporary world politics in much the same way as Republican Spain in the 1930's.*

*The scale of the Vietnam-Russian genocidal war against the Kampuchean people plus the hysterical world-wide anti-Kampuchea propaganda campaign, are unprecedented in recent times. But Kampuchea fights on magnificently, to regain its own precious independence, to defend the independence of neighbouring small countries which are also now threatened, fully confident in final victory.*

*The Democratic Kampuchean Government has issued a call to expand the Patriotic United Front to include even those that for one reason or another previously opposed the Government, especially who opposed the socialist revolution. The Draft Programme is being discussed very widely indeed. It aims at nothing short of the total fighting unity of all patriotic Kampucheans, not only for the duration of the national liberation war but throughout the period of reconstruction as well so as to build up an independent, united, democratic, and non-aligned Kampuchea.*

STATEMENT OF THE  
PRESIDENT OF THE PRESIDUM OF THE STATE  
OF DEMOCRATIC KAMPUCHEA KHIEU SAMPHAN  
PRESENTING THE DRAFT OF THE POLITICAL PROGRAMME  
OF THE PATRIOTIC AND DEMOCRATIC FRONT OF  
GREAT NATIONAL UNION OF KAMPUCHEA  
Democratic Kampuchea, August 21st, 1979.

In the situation where the Vietnamese enemy aggresses and invades our Kampuchea in the most barbarous way to swallow her and exterminate our race, the great union of the whole nation and the whole people of Kampuchea has proved as a powerful force which pounces upon the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallows of territory and exterminators of race and their running dogs, driving them more and more deeply into the abyss of the people's war. At home, the great union of the 4 forces (\*) attacks the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallows of territory and exterminators of race and their running dogs in the military field as well as in the political, economic, diplomatic and other fields. Abroad, the Kampuchea nationals from everywhere stand by the side of our nation and our people to wage the struggle against the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallows of territory and exterminators of race and their running dogs.

Based on this great and powerful union of fighting against the Vietnamese aggressors and their running dogs our nation and our people will ineluctably win the final victory.

It is with this firm conviction and in view of achieving the large harmony of the whole nation and the whole people of Kampuchea around the political programme so as to develop and reinforce this force of great national union against the Vietnamese aggressors and their running dogs in a large and strong patriotic and democratic Front that, on behalf of the Presidium of the State of Democratic Kampuchea and the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, I would like to present the draft of the political programme of the "Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea" to all our respected and dear compatriots and friends.

This draft of the political programme has been drawn up after taking the opinions of various political and social circles on several occasions. But it is necessary to exchange opinions with other parties in order to further improve and make more effective this political programme of the Front whose main purpose is to achieve the great union of the whole nation and the whole people of Kampuchea to fight the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallows of territory,

(\*) The 4 categories of forces are:

- The regular guerrillas - the guerrillas of the base - the revolutionary violence of the whole people - the forces constituted by the self-defence guards, the Khmer soldiers and the administrative committees set up and forcibly enlisted by the Vietnamese aggressors.

exterminators of race and their running dogs, and to totally wipe them out of the Kampuchean territory.

DRAFT OF THE POLITICAL PROGRAMME OF THE

PATRIOTIC AND DEMOCRATIC FRONT OF

GREAT NATIONAL UNION OF KAMPUCHEA

Democratic Kampuchea, August 21, 1979.

PREAMBLE

At this new stage of our history when the Le Duan clique carries out invasion and aggression against Kampuchea in the most bloody and doulourous way in order to swallow her and to exterminate our race, the main task of the whole nation and the whole people of Kampuchea is to fight against the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallows of territory and exterminators of race to totally wipe them out from the beloved Democratic Kampuchea territory. So, the whole nation and the whole people of Kampuchea, regardless of the political tendencies and disagreements, uphold the banner of the great national patriotic and democratic union of Kampuchea and unite together in a large front named:

"PATRIOTIC AND DEMOCRATIC FRONT OF GREAT NATIONAL UNION OF KAMPUCHEA"

The one and only condition of this great union of the whole nation and the whole people of Kampuchea is to unite together to wage all forms of struggles against the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallows of territory, exterminators of race.

I

PURPOSE

To unite in a large national front all the patriotic and democratic forces, at home as well as abroad, in order to:

1. resolutely fight the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallows of territory, exterminators of race, so as to totally wipe them out from the Kampuchea territory and overthrow the puppet Heng Samrin, running dog of the Vietnamese aggressors;
2. build up an independent, united, democratic, peaceful, neutral, and non-aligned Kampuchea.

II

POLITICAL PROGRAMME IN ALL FIELDS

A. DOMESTIC POLICY

1. in the political field

- To unite in a large national front the people of Kampuchea of all nationalities, all the Kampuchea nationals living abroad and all the foreign nationals in Kampuchea who are determined to fight, under all forms, the Vietnamese aggressors in order to totally wipe them out from the Kampuchea territory;
- To build up a society where every citizen enjoys the democratic freedoms in his occupation as well as in his daily life;

- To guarantee the democratic freedoms in the political life, in the spiritual life and in the material life;
- To guarantee the freedom of forming political parties, various associations and mass organisations;
- To guarantee the liberty of opinion, the liberty of speech, the liberty of press, the liberty of meeting, the liberty to correspond, the liberty to circulate, the liberty of residency;
- To guarantee a parliamentary regime with a national assembly elected through a secret, direct, free and universal vote (the General Secretary of the United Nations Organisation or his representative will be invited to supervise the first legislative election in order to ensure its free and democratic proceeding).
- To enlarge the government of Democratic Kampuchea and the administrative system at all levels. The representatives of the various political organisations, social strata and the patriotic independent personages who struggle against the Vietnamese aggressors and their running dogs on the basis of the political programme of the Front, are welcomed in the Government of Democratic Kampuchea and the administrative system at all levels in accordance with their capability and with their assentment.

The Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea greets and supports the activities of every Kampuchea citizen, even he has not yet adhered to the Front for various reasons or whatever his past, provided he wages the struggle against the Vietnamese aggressors and their running dogs.

- Any member of the self-defence forces, any soldier and servant of the puppet administrative system who leave the Vietnamese aggressors and their running dogs to join the people and come on the side of the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea are warmly welcomed by the latter. We make a clean sweep of the past stories: we hold out our hands and consider them as patriots of the same blood and same flesh as us.
- Towards the Vietnamese aggressor soldiers of all ranks and all categories and their puppets who consent to lay down the arms, the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea ensures their lives and implements a correct policy of clemency and solicitude.
- The same policy of clemency and solicitude is implemented towards the prisoners of war.

2. in the military field

- To form a national army strong in all fields, whose present task is to fight the Vietnamese aggressors and to liberate the nation, and the future task will be to ensure the defence of the Kampuchean nation and people;
- On the basis of the condition of the political programme of the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea, the various patriotic armed forces who fight the Vietnamese aggressors and their running dog Heng Samrin have to adopt a defined programme for common actions with the purpose of fighting the Vietnamese aggressors and their puppets in order to win the victory.



### 3. in the economic field

- To build up a national independent economy; to establish economic and trade relations with all countries on the basis of reciprocal benefits;
- To ensure the right to production and the liberty in exercising one's occupation in all fields: agriculture, handicraft, industry, trade;
- All activities of every citizen in the agriculture, handicraft, industry, and trade fields are encouraged, supported and defended. The fruits of all these activities are fully guaranteed;
- Every citizen enjoys the liberty of working and of carrying out an individual or family productive activity. The liberty of carrying out any form of production according with one's preference is guaranteed;
- To guarantee and protect the private property of every Kampuchea citizen and of every foreign national in Kampuchea;
- At home, the trade exchanges are carried out by using national currency.

### 4. in the social field

- To ensure the material life, particularly in regard of food, clothes, housing medicines, to every citizen;
- To protect and develop the health, especially of the children, the women, the old-aged people and the disabled;
- To fully grant all kinds of help and support to all the victims of the devastation war of the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallowers of territory, exterminators of race;
- Every citizen enjoys the liberty for marrying and leading a family life;
- To guarantee equality between man and woman in all fields.

### 5. in the fields of culture, science, technology, religion

- To protect and develop the people's national culture and traditions;
- To totally eradicate the illiteracy all over Kampuchea;
- To ensure the development of culture, teaching, education, arts, science and various technologies and ensure the right for attending primary, secondary as well as university studies;
- To train the utmost number of technicians in the fields of culture, literature, teaching, education, science and national technology;
- To use the advanced science and technology of the foreign countries for serving the development of the nation and people of Kampuchea;
- To guarantee the liberty of belief and religion.

### B. FOREIGN POLICY

The Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea:

- unshakenly abides by the foreign policy of independence, peace, neutrality and non-alignment;
- establishes relations with all countries the world over on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence;
- opposes the settlement of any foreign base in Kampuchea and does not seek at all to settle bases in other countries;
- strictly respects the United Nations Charter and the principles of non-alignment;
- abides by the policy of solving the differences in the world through

- peaceful way;
- resolutely oppose the use of force for solving these differences.

## DRAFT OF THE POLITICAL PROGRAMME OF THE PATRIOTIC AND DEMOCRATIC FRONT OF GREAT NATIONAL UNION OF KAMPUCHEA SUMMARY FORM

Democratic Kampuchea, August 21, 1979

- 1- To unite all the patriotic forces at home as well as abroad to fight the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallowers of territory, exterminators of race and their running dog Heng Samrin, so as to totally wipe them out of Kampuchean territory;
- 2- Every citizen enjoys the democratic freedoms in his occupation as well as in his daily life;
- 3- To guarantee the freedom of forming political parties, various associations and mass organisations, the liberty of opinion, the liberty of speech, the liberty of press, the liberty of meeting, the liberty to correspond, the liberty to circulate, the liberty of residency;
- 4- To guarantee a parliamentary regime with a national assembly elected through a secret, direct, free and universal vote (the General Secretary of the UNO or his representative will be invited to supervise the first legislative election in order to ensure its free and democratic proceeding);
- 5- Any member of the self-defence forces, any soldier and servant of the puppet administrative system who leave the Vietnamese aggressors and their running dogs to join the people and come on the side of the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea are warmly welcomed by the latter.
- 6- A correct policy of clemency and solicitude is implemented towards the Vietnamese aggressor soldiers of all ranks who consent to lay down the arms and towards the prisoners of war;
- 7- To form a national army strong in all fields, whose present task is to fight the Vietnamese aggressors and their running dogs and to liberate the nation, and the future task will be to ensure the defence of the Kampuchean nation and people;
- 8- To build up a national independent economy; to establish economic and trade relations with all countries on the basis of reciprocal benefits;
- 9- All activities of every citizen in the agriculture, handicraft, industry and trade fields are encouraged, supported and defended. The fruits of all these activities are fully guaranteed;
- 10- Every citizen enjoys the liberty of working and of carrying out an individual or family productive activity. The liberty of carrying out

- any form of production according with one's preference is guaranteed;
- 11- To guarantee and protect the private property of every Kampuchea citizen and of every foreign national in Kampuchea;
  - 12- At home, the trade exchanges are carried out by using national currency;
  - 13- To ensure the material life, particularly in regard of food, clothes, housings, medicines, to every citizen. To fully grant all kinds of help and support to all the children, women, old-aged people disabled and to all the victims of the devastation war of the Vietnamese aggressors, expansionists, swallows of territory, exterminators of race;
  - 14- Every citizen enjoys the liberty for marrying and leading a family life. To guarantee equality between man and woman in all fields;
  - 15- To protect and develop the people's national culture and traditions; to totally eradicate the illiteracy all over Kampuchea;
  - 16- To ensure the development of culture, teaching, education, arts, science and various technologies and ensure the right for attending primary, secondary as well as university studies; to ensure the training of national scientists and technicians in all fields;
  - 17- To guarantee the liberty of belief and religion;
  - 18- To unshakenly abide by a foreign policy of independence, peace, neutrality and non-alignment; to establish relations with all the countries in the world on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence; to strictly respect the United Nations Charter and the principles of non-alignment.

## THEY CONDEMNED ME TO PASSIVITY AND SILENCE

*What follows is an interview with Kazimierz Mijal, Chairman of the Polish Communist Party, which took place in Beijing, in October 1978. The interview was done by comrades of the Norwegian Workers' Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) and this translation is made from their published text.*

*Comrade Mijal is General Secretary of the Polish Communist Party. He was born on the 15th September 1910 of peasant stock. Before the war he worked in a bank and was active in the bank workers union. During the war he was in "Proletariat", a Communist Group, and was a founder member of the Polish Labour Party in 1942. He held several leading posts in the party and also in the National Peoples' Committee (the underground parliament). During the Nazi occupation he was part of the opposition to Gomułka's right deviationist tendency in the Polish Labour Party, (PLP).*

*From 1945 comrade Mijal was a member of the Central Committee of the PLP and later of the United PLP. After the war he held further leading government posts, including that of Secretary of State for Public Services. In 1954 he carried out a fight against modern revisionism in the ranks of the UPLP. As a result he was kept out of the Central Committee and the government. In 1963 he organised a secret communist group of which he was leader. More than 10,000 copies of the pamphlet "Victory through Struggle - Passivity and Silence Lead to Defeat" which attacked the revisionist Gomułka clique, were distributed throughout the country. Many Marxist-Leninists were arrested as a result and Mijal was sacked from his posts. In December 1965 the secret Communist Party of Poland was founded, with Mijal as General Secretary.*

*As a result of social-fascist repression against the Communist Party of Poland Mijal was forced to flee the country in 1966. From then until 1978 he lived in exile in Albania. During the last few years, the Norwegian comrades were told, the Albanian leaders prevented Mijal from meeting representatives of other parties who visited Albania. He told the Norwegian comrades:*

*"It's not enough that I wasn't allowed to meet Norwegian comrades - I wasn't allowed to meet comrades from other parties either. In particular, after the 7th Party Congress (of the Party of Labour of Albania) in 1976, the Albanian leadership denied me any help in maintaining contact with the leadership of the PCP (Communist Party of Poland) in Poland. In that way they weakened the revolutionary activity of the illegal PCP. Objectively they condemned me to passivity and silence - something I couldn't accept. In that situation I saw no other way out than to fight even harder".*

*I lived in Albania for more than 12 years. I have great sympathy with the Albanian peoples' struggle, which is now being carried out under great difficulties. At the same time I see great damage that the Albanian people are suffering as a result of the foolhardy policies the leadership are following.*



Ever since the PCP was founded in 1965, our Party has had differences with the leadership of the PLA over the question of the role the Communist Party of China (CPC) should play in the international communist movement. Up to now these differences were not made public as we hoped they would become steadily less and that eventually we would overcome them altogether. However, instead of getting better, the relationship between us and the PLA has become steadily worse. The relationship suddenly and seriously deteriorated after the Albanian leadership openly attacked the theory of the three worlds at the 7th Congress of the PLA in 1976. I personally didn't take part in that Congress - we only sent a letter with our greetings.

#### HOW DID YOU CARRY ON THE FIGHT AFTER THE 7th PARTY CONGRESS?

Even after the 7th Party Congress, I didn't give up hope that they would change the mistaken course they were following. I informed the PLA leadership verbally and in writing that I disagreed with their position, especially their criticism of the theory of three worlds. However, I began to first doubt whether they could correct their errors when they began a vociferous campaign - entirely without principle and full of abuse, insults and slander - against the three worlds theory. This happened after a number of Latin American Parties had published a statement. In July 1977 they published in their central organ an editorial entitled "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution", in which both the style and contents were in sharp contradiction with the title, and which showed how the leadership of the PLA stood, stamping their feet in the mire of leftist revisionism. Without any argument or discussion they demanded that readers should blindly believe in what they wrote. However, we know that the less this mumbo-jumbo and high-flying ideological smoke has to do with revolutionary theory and practice, the further out to the left it is. In this situation I wrote a comprehensive article, "Long live Mao Zedong Thought". I had planned to publish it in *Red Banner*, the organ of the Central Committee of the PCP, to commemorate the first anniversary of Mao Zedong's death. The article lay a whole month at the publishers, and it wasn't until the end of September that I was told it couldn't be published. I was told that I couldn't seek help anywhere. In that way they closed down the organ of the Central Committee of PCP, *Red Banner*, overnight. I didn't give up the struggle, but typed out a number of copies myself and sent one to the Central Committee of the PLA. The other four copies I planned to send to German, Italian, Spanish and Brazilian Parties, but the leadership of the PLA refused my request for assistance in sending these letters.

#### HOW DID YOU REACT TO THIS REFUSAL?

I sent a letter to the leadership of the PLA to protest at the decision. I sharply criticised their extension of censorship to include the organ of Central Committee of the PCP and correspondence between the Central Committee of the PCP and other parties. A self-contradictory situation arose. In their radio programmes in Polish, Tirana attacked the theory of three worlds while I was prevented from printing articles in the organ of the Central Committee of the PCP supporting that theory. The leadership of the PLA also refused to receive my letter, which they

called "Hostile" and "provocative". In January 1978 I wrote a new article in defence of the three world theory against the attack of the adventurist leftist line. I sent a copy of the article to the leadership of the PLA but they refused to receive it, informing me that "relations between our parties are broken". In this situation I wrote another article in February 1978 where I took up the problem of a struggle to ensure that left-wing revisionism should be exposed and eventually smashed.

#### DESPITE THE FACT THAT THE LEADERSHIP OF THE PLA ACTED IN THIS WAY YOU STILL STAYED IN TIRANA?

As I've already said, I remained in Tirana despite the fact that the relations between us were no longer normal. In fact, I still had some hope that the leadership of the PLA would change in its incorrect course which was causing so much damage to the international communist movement, but first and foremost was a great tragedy for the Albanian people. However the Albanian leadership moved from incorrect theory to counter-revolutionary practice. After the PLA leadership had broken my postal communication with the leadership of the PCP they showed me in secret that they were carrying out attempts to split the PCP in Warsaw and build a new revisionist leadership in the PCP. In Warsaw, representatives of the PLA leadership contacted a leading member of our Party and informed him that I (Mijal) was an "enemy" of the revolution and of socialism, a "traitor" to Marxism-Leninism, that I had contacts with agents for the Polish revisionists Home Office and other similar "exposures". Eventually he delivered a directive from his own leadership stating, "you must condemn openly Mijal as an "enemy" and "traitor"." The conversation ended up with the representative of the PLA being thrown out. All the same he did not give up his counter-revolutionary activities in Warsaw. In other conversations with other PCP members held behind my back the Albanians arranged a meeting abroad between myself and PCP representatives. This happened without me having any idea of what lay behind it all. It was only after a long conversation with a comrade from Poland that I found out about the PLA's intrigues and deceitful splitting activities against the PCP in Warsaw. After this meeting abroad I realised that it was impossible for me to stay in Albania. I applied for political asylum to faithful friends of the working class and Polish people, and at the end of May received a favourable reply. I then wrote a letter to the leadership of the PLA in which I exposed the splitting activities of their representatives in Warsaw. At the same time I applied to them for permission to leave Albania as soon as possible. However it wasn't until the end of June that I was given a passport and an emigration visa - a half hour before the plane was due to depart from Tirana. In this way I was illegally and completely groundlessly detained in Tirana almost a whole month. During June the leadership of the PLA directed various forms of terrorism and blackmail against me. They increased the guard on my flat, cut off the telephone and warned me, "You must follow Albanian law; you can go the Chinese Embassy but you may not take with you any PCP documents from your flat. If you do attempt to do this then we warn you that the security service has been informed that it shall not be permitted." This meant that they were threatening me with a trial, sentence and

imprisonment. Eventually I was forced to leave the archives of the PCP in Tirana. On top of this they asked me quite shamelessly to sign a statement that I had left the archives of the PCP in Albania of my own free will. So, I wrote a statement describing the conditions under which I left the PCP archives in Tirana, and quoted from Lenin's "Left-wing Communism - an Infantile Disorder", where he says that if armed bandits attack an unarmed man in the forest at night, and point a pistol at his chest demanding money, then a compromise in that situation is both justified and correct. This statement was of course rejected by the PLA leadership.

I said to the representatives of the leadership of the PLA, "You have the power, the police and the army while I have only my bare hands I must therefore accept a compromise". It was under these circumstances that I left Albania. It was in this way that the leadership of the PLA confiscated the archives of the PCP. These are the kind of political gangster methods the Albanian splittists use. They had neither Albanian nor international law behind them when they behaved like that towards me. They ignored every principle of proletarian internationalism between parties. Such is the practice of "left-wing" revisionism. The attack of the PLA leadership on the theory of the three worlds is for them just a pretext - a kind of fig leaf. In reality they are attacking Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. They attack the Communist Party of China - the vanguard of the international proletariat - the bastion of world revolution and socialism. The PLA leadership suffers from infallibility in revolutionary theory and practice, and socialist construction. They look upon Tirana as the "Rome" of Marxism-Leninism and as the centre of world revolution and socialism. Enver Hoxha says; "The party is never wrong". The Pope is also infallible - but only in things which don't belong to this world.

Kazimierz Mijal

## STALIN CENTENARY 1879-1979

"This Wonderful Georgian". Lenin, letter to M.Gorki, 1905.

Joseph Stalin's real name was Joseph Djugashvili. He was born on December 21st, 1879, in the small Georgian town of Gori. His father, Vissarion, was a cobbler by trade and later a worker at the local shoe factory. His mother Ekaterina came from a family of former peasant serfs. She had to work as a washerwoman to make ends meet. Despite their poverty his parents managed to send Joseph to the church school in Gori. He passed with top marks and in 1894 entered the Theological Seminary at Tiflis, the capital of Transcaucasia.

This was the period in which capitalism and the working class movement were growing rapidly. Peasants were flocking into the towns to escape the destitution of the feudal countryside. Here they found appalling living and working conditions. The large industrial enterprises were mainly foreign owned. A fourteen hour working day was the norm - wages, a pittance. Caucasia was a cockpit of national oppression and struggle. Georgians, Armenians, Jews, Persians and scores of others all suffered alike under the jackboot of the Tsarist Empire. But they were kept divided - literally at daggers drawn. All sorts of political currents existed among the people: Romantic feudal nationalism, anarchism. Liberal reformism was strong among the middle class. But Marxism was developing rapidly among the advanced workers.

At the seminary Stalin and some other students secretly studied the works of Marx and Darwin. Stalin also read Shakespeare and Hugo, and wrote poetry that was published in the capitals literary magazines. He was severely punished whenever these "subversive" activities were discovered. Stalin made contact with the Marxist workers' movement and helped in the Tiflis railway strike. That same year Stalin was put in charge of a study circle of railway workers and read an article by someone called Lenin in far off St. Petersburg.

In 1899 Stalin was finally expelled from the seminary as "politically unreliable". From then on he devoted his life completely to revolutionary work. He organised the first ever local May Day celebration. In 1900 about 500 people attended. But a year later the May Day demonstration of 2,000 was brutally attacked by the police. Stalin who had been earning a living at the Geophysical Observatory was now compelled to go into hiding. He was elected a committee member of the Tiflis Social Democratic Organisation and sent to Baku to organise the oil workers. Police surveillance was so strict that most old hands believed it was impossible to organise on a mass scale. Stalin disagreed. Influenced by Lenin's paper *Iskra* which had appeared in 1901, Stalin urged the need for an illegal revolutionary newspaper and mass agitation. Through his remarkable ability and leadership, by 1902 the majority of Baku industrial workers were in fact organised. Strikes against the unendurable conditions followed. In 1903 Stalin was arrested and a printing press discovered in his bedroom. He was exiled to Siberia but escaped and returned to Baku a year later.



The story of Stalin's arrests and escapes make for an extraordinary catalogue:

1. 1903. Exiled in November for three years and escaped in January 1904.
2. 1906. Arrested in Baku in March, imprisoned and then exiled for two years in September; escaped in June, 1909.
3. 1910. Arrested in Baku in March, exiled, and escaped in July, 1911.
4. 1911. Arrested in St Petersburg in September and escaped in February 1912.
5. 1912. Arrested in St Petersburg in April, exiled for four years but escaped that summer.
6. 1913. Arrested in St Petersburg in April and exiled close to the Arctic Circle in 1916. Returned February 1917. Stalin was one of the thousands released by the Revolution.

Of sixteen years revolutionary underground activity Stalin spent over nine years in prison and exile. Police violence did not cease at the cell doors. Several of Stalin's colleagues were assassinated and others crippled. But contact with the outside world and Marxist study classes never ceased. It was while in exile in 1903, Stalin first exchanged letters with Lenin.

And in all this, Stalin managed to go abroad. In 1905, as a delegate to the Fourth Bolshevik Conference held in Finland. In 1906 to the Fourth Congress in Stockholm. In 1907 to Berlin and on to the Fifth Congress in London. And in 1912, twice to Cracow in Poland to confer with Lenin.

In the first Russian Revolution of 1905 Stalin from the very outset resolutely advocated and practiced Lenin's strategy and tactics. Above all the Bolsheviks insisted on the working class leading the revolution and on the transition from the bourgeois democratic revolution to a socialist revolution. The Caucasian Federal Committee, headed by Stalin summoned the workers and peasants to armed insurrection and denounced the Mensheviks as treacherous opponents; *"It is our bold and outspoken voice, and not the cowardly voice of the liberals, that must resound through Russia. It is we, not the liberals, who must give the tone to the revolutionary movement. We must demand a democratic republic with universal suffrage. We must fight both the autocracy and the bourgeoisie"*.

Though the December uprising was defeated it provided the invaluable experience which would guarantee victory twelve years later. But for now the revolutionary tide began to ebb and the conflict between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks flared up. For Lenin and Stalin these were years of relentless struggle for the preservation and consolidation of the Party and for the education and organisation of the working masses.

The Mensheviks were expelled from the Party. This was a historic event not only for the Russian working class but for the international working class as well. The first ever truly revolutionary party, the Bolshevik Party, was established, based on Marxism and the new principles worked out by Lenin. While still in exile, Stalin was elected to the Central Committee in 1912 and placed at the head of the important Russian Bureau.

The Party arranged Stalin's escape from exile to organise the production of *Pravda*, the new daily Bolshevik paper. *Pravda*, an indispensable and mighty political weapon was founded according to Lenin's instructions.

It was on one of his visits abroad that Stalin wrote *Marxism and the National Question*, a major contribution to the science of Marxism-Leninism. It formulates the Marxist theory of nations, outlines the Bolshevik solution to the national question in the imperialist era and lays down the basic principles of proletarian internationalism.

In the summer of 1914, the first imperialist war broke out. The parties of the Second International shamefully betrayed the working class and joined the camp of their "particular" ruling class. Only the Bolsheviks stood by principle and called for a resolute struggle against the imperialist war.

Tsarism crumbled with the revolutionary uprising of February 1917. The gates of prison were opened. Within a fortnight Stalin was in Petrograd. The Bolshevik Party was just emerging from underground. Many of its prominent members were still on their way back from remote prisons and exile. Lenin himself was still abroad, and the bourgeois Provisional Government was obstructing his return. At this critical juncture it was Stalin who rallied the Central Committee and the Petrograd Committee and directed their work. In the very first article he wrote on his return from exile he pointed out that the main task was to consolidate the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets, and transform them into the organ of revolutionary power. He showed that the character of the imperialist war had not changed with the assumption of power by the Provisional Government. Stalin and Molotov, supported by the overwhelming majority of Party members advocated a clear policy of "no confidence" in the Government. They opposed both the defencism of the Mensheviks and the semi-Menshevik position of conditional support for the bourgeois government advocated by Kamenev and other opportunists in the Party.

In April Lenin returned from abroad. Lenin was welcomed at Petrograd by a massive and powerful revolutionary demonstration. The very next day Lenin announced his famous April Theses, the plan for the socialist revolution. In July the Provisional Government clamped down on the Bolsheviks and Lenin had to go into hiding once again. That autumn with the working class rallying to the Party, the Bolsheviks began to prepare for insurrection. Stalin was appointed to direct the uprising. Kamenev and Zinoviev publically betrayed the date of the insurrection. Government troops were sent to occupy the Party press and headquarters, on October 24th. The troops were dispersed by Red Guards and revolutionary soldiers acting under Stalin's command. At mid-day the Party paper came out carrying a lead article by Stalin entitled *What Do We Need?* It called on the masses to overthrow the bourgeois government and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Revolutionary detachments were dispatched to capture all strategic centres and arrest the Government. The insurrection began and ended victoriously in one day. The Second Congress of Soviets, which opened on the evening of October 25th, jubilantly took over all power. It elected the Council of Peoples' Commissars, headed by Lenin, with Stalin Commissar of Nationality Affairs. The previously oppressed nations were given complete freedom,

either to secede or to join the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as equals.

In January 1918 Stalin was instructed to arrange a conference of representatives of revolutionary organisations from abroad. This was an important step towards the formation of the Third Communist International.

In the critical Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations with German imperialism, when the fate of the revolution was in the balance, at first very few of his colleagues supported Lenin's position. Lenin insisted that it was essential to accept unfavourable peace terms in order to win time and build up the country and the army, "Either respite or downfall". Stalin supported Lenin from the start and opposed Trotsky's treacherous position of a fight to the finish.

The overthrown capitalist-landlord classes and the foreign imperialists could not reconcile themselves to the existence of the Soviet State. They would stop at nothing to crush the Bolshevik revolution which was already beginning to "infect" the workers of Britain, Germany and other countries.

In 1918 a bloody counter-revolution was unleashed. A year later the armies of Britain, America, Japan, of fourteen capitalist countries in all attacked. The Land of Soviets was in mortal danger.

The Bolsheviks rallied the workers and peasants to defend the Revolution and called on the workers of all countries for support. At this time Stalin was sent to restore the railway link with the south and obtain grain for the starving cities. He arrived at Tsaritsyn with a detachment of workers in June 1918, only to find a disastrous situation. The White forces had surrounded and infiltrated the town. The Red forces were in disarray. If Tsaritsyn fell then the Republic would be cut off from its last sources of grain and oil. Stalin moved decisively. He went over the head of a furious Trotsky, took personal command of the local Party and Army and led the successful defence of Tsaritsyn. A few years later the citizens elected to rename their town Stalingrad.

By the end of the year the eastern front was on the verge of collapse. Again this was due mainly to Trotsky's incompetence. He resigned and Stalin was sent to sort things out. Soon Kolchack's Whiteguards were in full retreat before the Red Army. In fact Stalin was the principal organiser of the victory at Petrograd, at Smolensk, and of the crushing defeats of Denikin and Wrangel in the south.

"At the moment of grave danger, when surrounded on all sides by a solid ring of enemies... J.V. Stalin, appointed by the Presidium to a fighting post, succeeded by his energy and tireless work in rallying the Red Army troops who had wavered. Himself present in the front line and under fire, Stalin by his personal example inspired the ranks of those fighting for the Socialist Revolution". So read the first Order of the Red Banner awarded to Stalin.

Lenin had been badly wounded by an assassination attempt in 1918 and never fully recovered. Increasingly the burden of guiding Party and State affairs fell on Stalin. He was appointed General Secretary of the Central Committee and played the prime part in drafting the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which was founded in 1922.

On January 21, 1924 the great Lenin passed away. The gigantic task of overcoming the devastation of war and civil war had barely begun. The anti-Leninist opposition which had been sniping at the Party's correct lines from as far back as 1917, now came right out into the open. It was Stalin who led the fight to defend and implement Leninism. For example, he wrote a book called *The Foundations of Leninism*, based on a series of lectures he gave to thousands of young people. The opposition fluctuated from "left" to "right" and grouped itself around Trotsky - who had always opposed Lenin and had only joined the Party after the revolution. The opposition was made up of all sorts, but it had one motivating factor - lack of confidence in the revolution and the people.

Whereas Stalin agreed with Lenin that it was possible to build socialism in the Soviet Union, the opposition insisted that unless there was a world revolution immediately imperialism would destroy the USSR. Stalin held that it was possible to industrialise rapidly, mobilise the peasants to collectivise and modernise agriculture and build a powerful socialist country. Not only was it possible, it was their foremost internationalist duty to the developing world revolution. Forward to socialism or pave the way for the restoration of capitalism - this was the issue.

Of course Stalin's proposals and general line were overwhelmingly endorsed by the Party and the Communist International. This defeat of Trotskyism laid the basis for what became known as "the Russian Miracle". By 1933 socialist production was dominant. Great new industrial complexes existed everywhere. Russia's peasant millions worked in thriving collective farms with the beginnings of prosperity. Culture, education and the most advanced medical system anywhere replaced poverty, ignorance and helplessness. The exploitation of man by man had been eliminated.

The titanic achievements of the Soviet workers were an inspiration to the exploited everywhere, not least to the class conscious workers of Britain. Just as the First International is inseparably associated with the names of Marx and Engels, so the history of the Third, Communist International and the victories of the Russian revolution are linked with the names of Lenin and Stalin. It was Stalin who defended the Communist International against all the enemies of Leninism.

The Soviet Party and State gave unstinting aid and support to the heroic struggle of the Spanish Republic against fascism, to the Chinese revolution and to the cause of national liberation and socialism everywhere.

The rise of fascism out of capitalist decay threatened world peace and the independence of all countries. Again and again, Stalin pointed to the only path that could avert disaster - unity of all peace-loving peoples and countries and a firm stand against fascism. But the pro-fascist rulers of Britain and France had a different idea. Appeasement and collaboration in the Nazi rape of central Europe, was intended to turn fascist aggression against Russia. But as Stalin warned, this dangerous policy would end in disaster for the "men of Munich". History has pronounced its judgement. When the World War Two engulfed the whole of Europe it was not the USSR that was embroiled in war with



# STALIN: FROM APPRENTICE TO

REPLY TO THE GREETINGS OF THE WORKERS OF THE  
CHIEF RAILWAY WORKSHOPS IN TIFLIS. J.V. STALIN.

June 8, 1926 CW 8 p182-184.

Comrades, permit me first of all to tender my comradely thanks for the greetings conveyed to me here by the representatives of the workers.

I must say in all conscience, comrades that I do not deserve a good half of the flattering things that have been said here about me. I am, it appears, a hero of the October Revolution, the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the leader of the Communist International, a legendary warrior-knight and all the rest of it. It is absurd, comrades, and quite unnecessary exaggeration. It is the sort of thing that is usually said at the graveside of a departed revolutionary. But I have no intention of dying yet.

I must therefore give a true picture of what I was formerly, and to whom I owe my present position in our Party.

Comrade Arakel said here that in the old days he regarded himself as one of my teachers, and myself as his pupil. That is perfectly true, comrades. I really was, and still am, one of the pupils of the advanced workers of the Tiflis railway workshops.

Let me turn back to the past.

I recall the year 1898, when I was first put in charge of a study circle of workers from the railway workshops. That was some twenty-eight years ago. I recall the days when in the home of Comrade Sturua, and in the presence of Djibladze (he was also one of my teachers at that time), Chodrishvili, Chkheidze, Bochorishvili, Ninua and other advanced workers of Tiflis, I received my first lessons in practical work. Compared with these comrades, I was then quite a young man. I may have been a littler better-read than many of them were, but as a practical worker I was unquestionably a novice in those days. It was here, among these comrades, that I received my first baptism in the revolutionary struggle. It was here, among these comrades, that I became an apprentice in the art of revolution. As you can see, my first teachers were Tiflis workers.

Permit me to tender them my sincere comradely thanks.

I recall, further, the years 1907-09, when, by the will of the Party, I was transferred to work in Baku. Three years of revolutionary activity among the workers in the oil industry steeled me as a practical fighter and as one of the local practical leaders. Association with such advanced workers in Baku as Vatssek, Saratovets, Fioletov and others, on the one hand, and the storm of acute conflicts between the workers and the oil owners, on the other, first taught me what it means to lead large masses of workers. It was there, in Baku, that I thus received my second baptism in the revolutionary struggle. There I became a journeyman in the art of revolution.

Permit me to tender my sincere comradely thanks to my Baku teachers.

# MASTER WORKMAN

*Lenin and Stalin in Gorky, 1922.*



Lastly, I recall the year 1917, when, by the will of the Party, after my wanderings from one prison and place of exile to another, I was transferred to Leningrad. There, in the society of Russian workers, and in direct contact with Comrade Lenin, the great teacher of the proletarians of all countries, in the storm of mighty clashes between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, in the conditions of the imperialist war, I first learnt what it means to be one of the leaders of the great Party of the working class. There, in the society of Russian workers - the liberators of oppressed peoples and the pioneers of the proletarian struggle of all countries and all peoples - I received my third baptism in the revolutionary struggle. There, in Russia, under Lenin's guidance, I became a master workman in the art of revolution.

Permit me to tender my sincere comradely thanks to my Russian teachers and to bow my head in homage to the memory of my great teacher - Lenin.

From the rank of apprentice (Tiflis), to the rank of journeyman (Baku), and then to the rank of a master workman of our revolution (Leningrad) - such, comrades, was the school in which I passed my revolutionary apprenticeship.

Such, comrades, is the true picture of what I was and what I have become, if one is to speak without exaggeration and in all conscience.

the fascist powers, but Britain and the western powers. Having met little effective resistance anywhere the nazis finally turned on the USSR.

On June 22, 1941, 240 fascist divisions, well over three million troops were hurled at the Soviet Union. The Red Army beat an orderly retreat leaving behind scorched earth and guerrilla bands, constantly overstretching and harassing the fascist supply lines. Stalin's strategy was that of people's war. Finally the Soviet troops held a line which stretched from Leningrad in the north, through Moscow, Stalingrad and on to the Crimea in the south. In December Stalin ordered the first counter-attack of the Second World War from his frontline headquarters in Moscow. By May 1942, eighty per cent of all German land forces were fighting in Russia.

The great Battle of Stalingrad lasted from August 1942 until February 1943 and ended in the complete rout of the nearly half a million German troops. This was the turning point of the War. The Red Army moved onto a vast offensive which did not stop until they reached Berlin. As Churchill said, it was none other than Stalin's troops that "tore the guts out" of the German military.

This tremendous victory saved the world from fascism. It is a testament to the unity, strength and heroism of Soviet people, the superiority of socialism and to unity of the solidarity between the USSR and the peoples of the world.



*Mao and Stalin in Moscow in 1949.*

Alone of all the countries attacked by fascism, the USSR stood like a rock, without traitors and fifth-columnists within. The Trotskyites who had degenerated from an opposition with no mass support into a band of plotters and fascist spies had been crushed in good time. Nevertheless as early as 1939 Stalin admitted, "it cannot be said that the purge was not accompanied by grave mistakes"

These mistakes were to have serious consequences and lay the basis for the restoration of capitalism in Russia after Stalin's death. Stalin's error was to believe that with the victory of socialism, classes and class struggle had been eliminated in the USSR. He was unable to clearly differentiate between enemies and people that made mistakes. This led to the growth of a bureaucratic method of handling Party and State affairs, instead of always relying on the working class and people.

Comrade Mao Zedong once said that he assessed Stalin's contribution as seventy per cent good and thirty per cent bad. No genuine communist will dwell on Stalin's mistakes. The point is to learn from them.

When Stalin died in 1953, the Soviet Union under his leadership had grown to be a great industrial and scientific country. On an international level, Mao and the Communist Party of China had led a quarter of humanity to independence and socialism, the whole of eastern Europe had overthrown the fascist dictatorships and was establishing Peoples' Democratic Governments. The national liberation movements of the Third World were stronger than ever before.

Despite the restoration of capitalism in the USSR no one can deny that under Stalin the Soviet people had taken socialism a long way forward. Far enough to pass on the baton to a fresh runner, the workers and peasants of China and the new generation of revolutionaries throughout the world.

STALIN'S CONTRIBUTION IS IMMORTAL!



# AGAINST THE ACW'S HOPELESS DOGMATISM

(A Reply to the Association of Communist Workers' Pamphlet:  
*On the Social-Chauvinism of the RCLB*).

Imperialism generates war and revolution. Today, Soviet social imperialism is striving to replace the US as the chief imperialist world power. It is hell bent on becoming the one and only superpower. This is dragging the world towards a new world war. Like all other countries, Britain is included and caught up in superpower designs and war preparations. It should be self-evident that the development of the class struggle in Britain is inseparably linked to the class struggle internationally. We need to take account of the effects of superpower contention on the world in general and on Britain in particular and to constantly assess its implications for the development of the socialist revolutionary movement. Along with other communist organisations in Britain, the RCL is striving to formulate the revolutionary programme around which to reconstitute the genuine Communist Party. Everything depends on integrating the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought with the concrete practice of the revolution in Britain and the actual realities of the world today. This is a continuous and difficult process, involving a whole series of theoretical and practical mass work tasks. But whatever the problems one thing is certain - a beginning has been made. A new sense of clarity and unity towards building the party is emerging in the Marxist-Leninist movement. There is a new sense of conscientiousness and urgency as well. After all, without its own political party, strategy and tactics, the working class cannot possibly advance its struggle for power or fulfil any of its pressing internationalist duties.

Inevitably the RCL's basically correct approach to the question of war and revolution has come under fire from both the "left" and right. This is a good thing. The correct line can only develop and mature in the course of struggle against opportunist lines of all hues. From the right, the Marxist-Leninist Coordinating Committee accuses the RCL of a "gross distortion of Mao's Three Worlds Theory." Very ironic indeed. The RCL states unequivocally that the principle contradiction in British society today is the contradiction between the proletariat and the imperialist ruling class - that the strategic task confronting the working class is the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To argue as the MLCC does that the Russian, not the British ruling class, is the main enemy is clearly ridiculous. We cannot accept the MLCC's opportunist thesis that anti-hegemonism, not socialism, constitutes the strategic stage of the revolution. In our view the struggle to defend and extend national independence against the superpowers is an essential but subordinate aspect of revolutionary strategy.

And now the Association of Communist Workers has re-emerged from hibernation to attack us from the "left". Their line is particularly interesting - of much greater importance than the organisation itself.

The ACW is attempting to take a centrist position between Marxism and "left" revisionism. Invariably the ACW finds itself echoing the Bainsites and the Birchites, covering up its support for Soviet social imperialism with leftist demogogy. The ACW accuses the RCL of "social chauvinism, monstrous distortion and crude falsification of Marxism-Leninism, and a complete departure from it." (ACW Pamphlet, page 1). As we shall see the RCL's only real crime is to have completely departed from Hoxha's crude falsification of Marxism-Leninism and to have refuted the ACW's own time-worn trotskyite clap-trap.

But what exactly has provoked the ACW's tirade? It is this.

We cannot agree with the ACW's categorical prediction about the nature of the next world war: "It would be a war, we repeat, between the two imperialist coalitions." (Page 3). Along with other communists in Britain, the RCL holds that the third world war will either be an inter-imperialist superpower war, or a revolutionary anti-superpower war. We maintain that the working class must be prepared for either eventuality so that it can fulfil its revolutionary tasks accordingly.

Further, "The RCLB are actually not fighting against the hegemonism of the superpowers. They are actually...fighting for the interests of one imperialist coalition, namely, the one which is part of the NATO alliance under the USA, against the other coalition which is a part of the Warsaw Pact, under the leadership of the USSR." (page 37). Why? Because as far as international class struggle is concerned, we differentiate between British imperialism, a second world power, and the superpowers. And then, horror of horrors, we proceed to differentiate between the superpowers by identifying Soviet social imperialism as the most aggressive and dangerous of the two.

Unlike the ACW we hold that the working class is not disinterested in the question of national independence. The RCL does not accept that national independence is a taboo subject for revolutionaries in Britain. On the contrary, it is already an important factor in British politics and will become increasingly more important in the future. The struggle against British imperialism's appeasement of Soviet social imperialism especially, is a vital revolutionary task. It is a component of socialist revolutionary strategy. Dogmatists are incapable of understanding that the fight to defend and extend national independence is above all the task of the working class and working people. Similarly, in the related struggles to force Britain to strengthen its ties with other West European states; to make concessions to the Third World and thus support the main force of the growing united front against superpower domination and war; and, to force Britain to ally itself with socialist China and overcome its subservience to the superpowers - in all this, the working class is the decisive factor. The struggle can only expose, divide and weaken our class enemies and strengthen the revolutionary forces. And just as important, it complements the struggles of the international working class and of the oppressed peoples and nations.

Consequently, unlike the ACW, we maintain that under certain conditions it will be both correct in principle and essential in practice to concede an alliance with that section of the ruling class which is prepared to oppose the superpowers and fight appeasement. The Communist Party will strive might and main precisely to bring about

those national and international political conditions. This is the crux of the matter.

In short, unlike the ACW dogmatists the RCL upholds comrade Mao Zedong's strategic three worlds theory. We are attempting to grasp the relationship between the class struggle in Britain and the class struggle on an international scale, between the strategy for revolution in Britain and the strategy for building the broadest possible world united front against superpower aggression and war.

The ACW opposes the differentiation of the world into three categories and refuses even to attempt an elementary analysis of world politics. It is content to repeat ad-nauseam, and thus render meaningless, the maxim that war is a continuation of politics by other means. And it has created its very own ACW catchphrase, "an inter-imperialist war is probable between the two imperialist coalitions - each coalition being under the leadership of a superpower." This recurs countless times like a ritual incantation throughout the pamphlet and is not substantiated once. But war is the continuation of politics! Evidently, as far as the ACW is concerned, the politics of the People's Republic of China and the international working class is of no consequence. The politics of the national liberation movements, from Kampuchea to Eritrea, from Azania or Zimbabwe to Nicaragua, are irrelevant. The politics of the Third World Countries, be they the struggle of the Iranian peoples to defend their dearly-won independence, or the struggle waged by the ASEAN countries on the economic and political front, none of these matter. And what about the contradictions and struggles within the ACW's precious coalitions? Non-existent. In fact everything is hunky-dory for the "two imperialist coalitions". All they have to contend with is each other. Contemporary world politics, according to the ACW, is the monopoly of the two monolithic superpower coalitions. The people's of the world are mere onlookers, passive spectators.

Incredible, but true. This is what the ACW's approach amounts to, this is the essence of the ACW's analysis. Only the most hopeless type of petit-bourgeois intellectual, with nothing but an academic interest in politics, can have produced such a purile "analysis" and be satisfied with such sterile "conclusions".

The RCL's stand and basic approach to world politics is well documented and quite well known. We have fought against both right and left deviations and will continue to do so. In our view, the distinguishing features of the present period are: firstly, the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, the disintegration of the socialist camp and Russia's degeneration into social imperialism and its emergence as the most aggressive and dangerous superpower; secondly, the decline of US imperialism and the steady disintegration of the Western camp it heads. Last but not least, the rise of the Third World. These are the conditions, the real politics that are giving rise to the next world war and on which the international working class bases its global strategy.

We think it very useful to quote some of comrade Mao's comments on the subject. As far back as 1974, Mao said in conversation with an African head of state,

*"In my view, the United States and the Soviet Union form the first world. Japan, Europe and Canada, the middle section, belong*

*to the second world. We are the third world...Imperialism does exist in this world. In our opinion, Russia may be called a social imperialist country, and this system engenders war. Not that you or we or the third world want a world war. Nor do the people in the rich countries want a world war. This sort of thing happens irrespectively of man's will." 1*

At the beginning of 1976, Mao pointed out,

*"The United States wants to protect its interests in the world and the Soviet Union wants to expand; this can in no way be changed. In the era in which classes exist, war is an interval between one peace and another. War is a continuation of politics, that is to say, a continuation of peace. Peace itself is politics." 2*

And as early as October 1970, talking about the contradictions between the superpowers and the second world, Mao added,

*"We should win over these countries, such as Britain, France and West Germany." 3*

Strategy is the determination of the proletariat's main blow at a given stage of the revolution, the elaboration of a corresponding plan for the disposition of revolutionary forces (the main and secondary reserves), the fight to carry out this plan. Strategy, wrote Stalin, is not something constant, fixed once and for all, it alters in accordance with the turns in history. Every new historical period requires a new disposition of forces, a new strategic plan for uniting the maximum forces against the principle obstacle and enemy of the revolution. Leninist strategy and tactics constitute the science of leadership of the proletariat's struggle. These principles are applicable to the revolution in each particular country, but equally to the international class struggle for the elaboration of the general line of the international communist movement at each historical juncture.

Lenin stated that, *"World political developments are of necessity concentrated on a single focus."* In his day, the single focus was, *"the struggle of the world bourgeoisie against the Soviet Republic, around which are inevitably grouped...the Soviet movement of the advanced workers in all countries and...all the national liberation movements in the colonies..." 4.* During the 1930s and 40s the united front focused on the struggle against war and fascism and culminated in the great Anti-fascist War. In the 1950s and 60s comrade Mao Zedong and the CPC advocated the general line of building a *"broad united front opposed to US imperialism."*

It should be noted that these correct strategic lines had a number of common features. Above all, the united revolutionary front of proletarian socialist movement with the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples.

We shall see how Stalin and the Soviet Union pursued a consistent and principled foreign policy based on proletarian internationalism, the differentiation of the imperialist powers, and the struggle against war and fascism.

The differentiation of the imperialist powers had enormous consequences. They were not permitted to collude against the Soviet Union and the people of the world. Instead, the Soviet Union exploited the contradictions among the imperialist powers: in order to win as many direct and indirect allies as possible and isolate the main



fascist enemy. To this end the Soviet Union joined the League of Nations and adopted a series of moves with the object of concluding bilateral and multilateral treaties with imperialist and capitalist states to undermine imperialism's war intrigues and contain the aggressive Axis powers. In May 1934, the Soviet Union signed mutual assistance pacts with France and Czechoslovakia. When Japan launched an all-out invasion of China, when Germany and Italy invaded Republican Spain, and Germany annexed Austria and threatened Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Government called on the non-fascist states to take a firm and united stand to halt aggression, to defend the independence of nations and world peace. The defeat of the fascist powers in the Second World War, the victory of the Chinese revolution and the establishment of the People's Democracies in Europe, these were the fruits of the creative application of Leninism by the Comintern, by Stalin and Mao Zedong.

But not a single word about any of this in the ACW's wordy "exposition" on Marxism and war. In the name of upholding the "principles of Leninism" the ACW attempts to body swerve all the facts of our immediate past and side-step all the urgent issues of today.

In our view the only correct strategic, general line for the international communist movement today is embodied in Mao Zedong's differentiation of the three worlds. Mao, with characteristic genius, made an up-to-date analysis of all the fundamental contradictions at work in the contemporary world, the changes and development of these contradictions, the division and realignment of political and economic forces. Mao has provided the international working class with a clear strategic theory. It identifies the third world peoples and countries as the main revolutionary force in international class struggle. It differentiates between the imperialist powers and identifies the two superpowers, above all Soviet social imperialism, as the main enemy of the world's peoples. It identifies the middle forces, the second world, which can be won over to the united front against Russian aggression and superpower war.

The ACW sees fit to neither explicitly oppose nor support this indispensable theory. In fact with a nonchalant indifference, or brazen opportunism, the ACW doesn't even bother to mention the theory of the three worlds, let alone attempt to study, consider and apply it. Their deafening silence on this vital question speaks volumes. Furthermore, every explicit point the ACW does make, plus everything implied, proves conclusively that the ACW rejects the strategic theory.

Of course, for us to merely proclaim support for Mao's theory would be little or no consequence. Communists in Britain are duty bound to study it in connection with the unfolding class struggle nationally and internationally, to formulate correct policies and implement them among the working masses and so on. Inevitably, there is the constant struggle against errors, against deviations of the left and right, to make the line more correct, more all-sided, more effective in rallying the vanguard and mobilising the masses. But the RCL, the CWM and others have definitely taken a basically correct stand and begun this work in practice. We are entitled to draw a clear line of demarcation between ourselves on the one hand, and sham Marxist-Leninists of the ACW ilk on the other. Support or opposition to the strategic theory of the three worlds is indeed a clear line of demarcation between genuine communists

and charlatans. The ACW has chosen to do battle against Mao Zedong Thought. That is their problem.

#### SOME POINTS ON THE QUESTION OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

The ACW quotes Lenin eclectically, in opposition to the Leninist method of concrete analysis. The ACW quotes Lenin to counter the living essence of Leninism - to turn it into a lifeless dogma - to pitch Lenin against Stalin and Mao Zedong.

Take the "defence of the fatherland" slogan as an example. Yes, Lenin did mercilessly expose the social-chauvinist traitors who raised that slogan in the imperialist war. But what the ACW have done is to convert Lenin's tactical line into a "universal principle", to be applied irrespective of concrete conditions. According to the ACW the working class of Britain, or any other imperialist country, must never fight to defend national independence - because Lenin said so in 1914. Did he? In fact, refuting just such dogmatism Lenin ticked-off Zinoviev in the following terms:

*"We are not at all against 'defence of the fatherland' in general. You will never find such nonsense in a single resolution or any of my articles. We are against defence of the fatherland and a defensive position in the imperialist war of 1914... But in the imperialist epoch there may be also 'just', 'defensive' revolutionary wars namely 1. national, 2. civil, 3. socialist and such like." 5*

Writing to Inessa Armand, Lenin emphasises the same point categorically:

*"In the imperialist war of 1914-1917, between the two imperialist coalitions we must be against 'defence of the fatherland', since 1. imperialism is the eve of socialism, 2. imperialist war is a war of thieves over their booty, 3. in both coalitions there is an advanced proletariat, 4. in both the socialist revolution is ripe. Only for these reasons are we against 'defence of the fatherland', only for these reasons." 6*

"In the 'West European' countries the national movement is a thing of the irrevocable past." (p.34) So runs the title of a section devoted to quoting and amplifying Lenin's correct theses that in Britain, Germany and France etc, "the process of forming national states has been consummated." Here we have a prize example of an aunt-Sally. The ACW concocts a ludicrous argument and falsely attributes it to the RCL so that it can then cut it to shreds. But the RCL does not fantasise about Roundheads or tilt lances at feudalism. We have raised the question of defending and extending national independence in the context of the fight for socialism. Not of consummating, forming the nation state.

In fact, many problems of national independence exist at the present time. For a start the problem of British imperialism's reliance on the US and the danger of US entrenchment. But this is not the main danger. Though still the dominant superpower in Britain, the US is on the decline. Then there is the Soviet social imperialist offensive, overwhelmingly political and economic at present, and not as pronounced as in other parts of Europe. Nevertheless the new tsars have made considerable inroads already. This can be measured by the growing appease-

ment policy towards Russian expansionism practised by sections of British monopoly capitalism, especially those represented by the Labour Party. We ignore these facts and growing trends at our peril.

After overlooking these points the ACW finally comes to the real point at issue. Is the RCLB attempting to drag a national programme into a non-national war? The RCL is "even more opportunist than Rosa Luxemburg; ...The central theme of their views... is the suggestion that an imperialist war should be opposed with a national programme". (p.42). In our view, in order to advance in the direction of the socialist revolution the British working class must wage an all-sided and an internationalist struggle. Among other things it must oppose Soviet social imperialist aggression and US entrenchment; it must fight British imperialism's appeasement towards the new tsars and its subservience to uncle Sam. And just in case it has escaped the ACW's notice we must point out that this too is fighting British imperialism, exposing its "unsuitability" to rule in the name of the "nation". These then are the politics we advocate as far as national independence is concerned. And because we understand how war is a continuation of politics (though still only an elementary understanding) we are prepared to consider the very real possibility of a united front, including sections of the imperialist ruling class, against a Soviet war of aggression.

The ACW quote sections of Lenin's *The Junius Pamphlet* to support its argument. These are the quotes that deal exclusively with combating Luxemburg's erroneous attempts to "drag a national programme into the imperialist war". Lenin's points are as relevant today as ever and should be studied by all comrades struggling against right deviations. But once again the ACW has systematically "edited-out" of Lenin what it doesn't like. This is not merely another typical example of their eclectic style. The ACW has censored the main point of Lenin's pamphlet - the very point that contradicts their negation of "national factors". We quote a relatively long passage from *Junius Pamphlet* confident that it fits well into all the arguments we've presented here, and attempts to fool no one. There is one other proviso. We urge all comrades who are concerned to fight the ACW type left revisionists as they are to fight right revisionists, who have no vested interest in covering one deviation with another, to study the whole of Lenin's remarkably all-sided and relevant pamphlet for themselves and take it to heart.

*"The chief defect in Junius's pamphlet... is its silence regarding the connection between social-chauvinism... and opportunism.*

*"The first of Junius's erroneous propositions is embodied in the fifth thesis of the International group. 'National wars are no longer possible in the epoch of this unbridled imperialism. National interests serve only as an instrument of deception in order to place the working masses at the service of their mortal enemy, imperialism.' The beginning of the fifth thesis, which concludes with the above statement, discusses the nature of the present war as an imperialist war. It may be that this negation of national wars generally is either an oversight, or an accidental overstatement in emphasising the perfectly correct idea that the present war is an imperialist war, not a national war...*

*"Junius is perfectly right in emphasising the decisive influence of the 'imperialist atmosphere' of the present war, in maintaining*

*that behind Serbia stands Russia, 'behind Serbian nationalism stands imperialist Russia', and that the participation of, say, Holland in the war would likewise be imperialist, for, first, Holland would be defending her colonies and, second, would be allied with one of the imperialist coalitions. That is irrefutable in respect to the present war...*

*"The only mistake, however, would be to exaggerate this truth, to depart from the Marxist requirement of concreteness, to apply the appraisal of this war to all wars possible under imperialism, to ignore the national movements against imperialism. The sole argument in defence of this thesis, 'national wars are no longer possible', is that the world has been divided up among a small group of 'great' imperialist powers and for that reason any war, even if it starts as a national war, is transformed into an imperialist war involving the interest of one of the imperialist powers or coalitions."*

*"The fallacy of this argument is obvious. That all dividing lines, both in nature and society, are conventional and dynamic, and every phenomenon might, under certain conditions, be transformed into its opposite, is, of course, a basic proposition of Marxist dialectics. A national war might be transformed into an imperialist war and vice versa...*

*"Transformation of the present imperialist war of 1914-16 into a national war is highly improbable, for the class that represents progressive development is the proletariat which is objectively striving to transform it into a civil war against the bourgeoisie. Also this; there is no considerable difference between the forces of the two coalitions, and international finance capital has created a reactionary bourgeoisie everywhere. But such a transformation should not be proclaimed impossible: if the European proletariat remains impotent, say, for twenty years; if the present war ends in victories like Napoleon's and in the subjugation of a number of viable national states; if the transition to socialism of non-European imperialism (primarily Japanese and American) is also held up for twenty years by a war between these two countries, for example, then a great national war in Europe would be possible...*

*"Further, national wars waged by colonies and semi-colonies in the imperialist era are not only probable but inevitable..." 7*

The last extract from Lenin's pamphlet we would like to high-light, contains a difficult idea of immense importance; "...here is a national liberation war in which imperialist rivalry is an auxiliary element, one that has no serious importance. This is the very opposite to what we see in the war of 1914-16 (the national element in the Austro-Serbian War is of no serious importance compared with the all determining element of imperialist rivalry). It would be absurd therefore, to apply the concept imperialism indiscriminately and conclude that national wars are 'impossible'."



## MARXISM-LENINISM AND TWO WORLD WARS

The ACW labours under the illusion that the third world war will be in all fundamentals an action replay of the First World War. They quote Lenin at considerable length on the politics that gave rise to and characterised the first imperialist war. Nearly half the pamphlet is devoted to just that. Lenin's position amounted to this: the war is an inter-imperialist war for the redivision of the world between two evenly matched imperialist coalitions - the working class has no stake in the war, on the contrary the workers of every belligerent state are duty bound to fight for defeat of their own ruling class and transform the war into revolutionary civil war. Fine. But the ACW insists that the working class today must re-enact exactly the particular strategy and tactics developed by Lenin in 1914-1917. The ACW have carefully edited out of the quotes Lenin's repeated reminders that he was dealing with a particular war, not every war involving imperialist powers in general. There is a remarkable and uncharacteristically candid sentence tucked away in the pamphlet which sums up the ACW's lousy position exactly: "...All that we can say is that the Soviet Union has come to occupy the position today which was occupied by German imperialism at the time of the First World War." (p.18) This is the essence of the contemporary left-revisionist line on the international class struggle. Under the guise of handing out even-handed "criticism" of all imperialist powers, it covers up for Soviet social-imperialism, and objectively serves it. Not surprisingly the ACW has precious little to say about the Second World War. And even that is wholly inaccurate and misleading. The section entitled "The War of 1941-1945" is noticeably short. Less than a page in a long very long pamphlet of seventy pages. All that concerns the ACW is that we should regard the war in 1939 as identical to 1914; "...an inter-imperialist war, for both Germany and Britain were fighting for robbing colonies and oppressing other countries and not for national independence, etc... It was not until after the then Socialist Soviet Union was attacked by the Hitlerite fascists that the class character of the war changed." (p.39) There is an element of truth even in this crude oversimplification. Of course there were certain similarities between the first war and the second. More important still however are the differences.

Contrast the ACW's bland assertion with Stalin's dialectical summing up of the differences between the two world wars and the effect of the Soviet Union's entry into the war in 1941. Stalin said:

"...In reality the war broke out as an inevitable result of the development of world economic and political forces on the basis of modern monopoly capitalism... The reason is that the un-evenness of the development of capitalist countries usually results, as time passes, in an abrupt disruption of the equilibrium within the world system of capitalism, and that a group of capitalist countries which believes itself to be less supplied with the raw materials and markets usually attempts to alter the situation and redivide the 'spheres of influence' in its own favour by means of force...

Thus the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy resulted in the First World War, and the second crisis in the Second World War.

This does not mean of course that the Second World War was an exact replica of the first. On the contrary, the Second World War substantially differs in its nature from the First.

One should bear in mind that the principle fascist states - Germany, Japan and Italy - before attacking the Allied countries, had destroyed the last remnants of bourgeois democratic liberties at home, established a brutal terroristic regime within their countries, trampled underfoot the principle of the sovereignty and free development of small states, proclaimed that their policy was one of seizure of foreign lands, and declared for all to hear, that their aim was world domination and the extension of the fascist regime to the whole world: while by the seizure of Czechoslovakia and the central provinces of China, the axis states demonstrated that they were ready to carry out their threat concerning the enslavement of freedom-loving nations.

In view of this, as distinct from the First World War, the Second World War against the axis states from the very outset assumed the nature of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one of the tasks of which was to reestablish democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the axis states could only strengthen - and actually did strengthen the anti-fascist and liberating character of the Second World War." 8

But, again, there is deafening silence from the ACW when it comes to identifying the particular politics and characteristics of the Second World War. And this allows the ACW to imply that the strategy and tactics employed by the Comintern in the 1930's were identical to the Bolshevik strategy and tactics of 1914. This is where the ACW's illusion turns into the ACW lie.

The truth is very different and very instructive. Stalin and the Comintern adhered to the Leninist principles worked out in 1914-1917. but not to the strategy and tactics of 1914. The Second War developed under entirely different conditions. It posed new problems that had to be solved by the creative application of Leninism, by new strategy and tactics. Stalin started from the world as it actually was in 1935, with the fascist powers hell-bent on world domination, not as it was in 1914. There is a saying that goes, generals who think in terms of the last war are liable to loose the next. How true. It follows that communists today, armed with Mao's teachings, start from the world as it is today. Victory cannot be won by departing from the revolutionary principles of Leninism but the new situation demands the elaboration of a new strategy to deal with the superpowers, in particular to contain and defeat the Russian offensive.

## WORLD WAR I

The basic proletarian approach to analysing and responding to wars involving imperialist powers was clearly advanced by Lenin and subsequently developed by Stalin and Mao Zedong. Of course Marxism had established long before how politics is in fact the concentrated expression of economics and that war is determined by the relationship between classes. Lenin defended and developed Marxism and completely de-mystified the question of war in the imperialist epoch.

Lenin defined imperialism as moribund capitalism, the highest and last stage of capitalism. With imperialism all the fundamental contradictions of capitalism are intensified to their extreme limit, to breaking point. Imperialism is the eve of the proletarian socialist revolution. It sharpens the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie; it brings the oppressed nations into open revolt against colonial oppression; it intensifies the uneven development of the capitalist powers and leads to wars for the redivision of the world. In opposition to the social chauvinists of the Second International Lenin quoted the bourgeois military expert Von Clausewitz, "war is nothing but the continuation of political relations, with the intervention of other means".

World War One was an inter-imperialist war for the redivision of the world between two more or less evenly matched imperialist coalitions. "*The real essence of the present war,*" wrote Lenin, "*is the struggle between England, France and Germany for the redivision of the colonies and for the plunder of the competing countries.*"<sup>9</sup> British imperialism's objective was to extend its supremacy by smashing its most dangerous rival - Germany, seize Germany's African colonies, seize Mesopotamia and Palestine from Turkey and strengthen its foothold in Egypt. Britain found its natural allies in the other "possessing" powers, France and Russia. French imperialism wanted to "win back" the Saar Basin and Alsace-Lorraine, the two iron and coal rich regions lost to Germany in 1871. Tsarist Russia strove for the dismemberment of Turkey so that it could take Constantinople and the Black Sea straits and realise its dream of access to the Mediterranean. Russia also wanted Galicia, a part of Austro-Hungary. Italy was brought into the Triple Entente with the promise of the Tyrol and Trieste.

German imperialism's objective was to knock out Britain and replace her as the dominant European and colonial power. Germany also wanted France's colonies and the Ukraine, Poland and the Baltic provinces from Russia. Paradoxically, Germany found its Triple Alliance partners in the decrepit Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires. And in the background stood the greatest of all capitalist powers, the USA, playing off both sides, selling arms to both sides, and then cynically joining the Entente all to advance its objective of world hegemony, no more, no less. These were the politics which proceeded and characterised the war. The working class could have no stake in such a war. "*This war is in a treble sense a war between slave owners to fortify slavery,*" wrote Lenin. "*This is a war firstly, to fortify the enslavement of the colonies by means of a 'fairer' distribution and subsequent more 'concerted' exploitation of them; secondly, to fortify the oppression of other nations within the great powers; for both Austria & Russia (Russia more and much worse than Austria) maintain their rule only such oppression, intensifying it by*

*means of war; and thirdly, to fortify and prolong wage slavery, for the proletariat is split up & suppressed, while the capitalists gain, making fortunes out of the war, aggravating national prejudices and intensifying reaction.*" With the outbreak of war virtually every European Social Democratic party rallied to the "defence" of its respective "fatherland" The Second International collapsed. The imperialist war had strengthened opportunism, furthermore, it turned opportunism into fully fledged social-chauvinism and the opportunists' alliance with their bourgeoisie into the open. In direct opposition to this treachery Lenin stressed: "*... the duty of the class conscious proletariat to defend its class solidarity, its internationalism, its socialist convictions against the orgy of chauvinism raised by the 'patriotic' bourgeois cliques of all countries.*" Lenin added, "*Transform the present imperialist war into civil-war - is the only correct proletarian slogan; it was indicated by the Paris Commune, ... and logically follows from the conditions of an imperialist war among highly developed capitalist countries.*"<sup>10</sup> Lenin adds, "*The national element in the Austro-Serbian war occupies an entirely subordinate place & does not alter the general imperialist nature of the war.*"<sup>11</sup>

The blood letting of 1914-1918 solved nothing in imperialist relations. Victory had fallen to the superior resources of the "possessing" powers, and not the rising imperialist forces. Britain and France endeavoured in the post war treaties to subjugate the losers economically and politically. At the same time Britain tried to retain the "balance of power in Europe", by not allowing Germany to become too weak or France too strong. The victorious states redistributed colonies and mandates, adding them to their already extensive possessions. European frontiers were fixed and attempts were made to regulate their contention for the conquest and plunder of China. Consequently the disproportion between the victor states and the rising imperialist states, especially Germany, was enormously increased. The treaties of spoliation which followed the war, in a word, only succeeded in sowing the seeds of future war.

## WORLD WAR 2

The Second World War arose under the particular conditions of the general crisis of capitalism.

Capitalism had developed further down the road of decay. It had developed new forms which found their typical expression in fascism - the open, terrorist dictatorship over the working class of the reactionary and chauvinist sections of the imperialist ruling class.

The victory of working class power over one-sixth of the globe was an all important new factor in world politics. Ever since the establishment of the socialist state, a revolutionary headquarters with growing strength and influence, world politics has been in essence action and reaction around this event. Imperialism could never be reconciled to the existence of the socialist Soviet Union. Nevertheless, every British attempt to draw the imperialist powers into a united crusade against the Soviet Union collapsed against the contradiction of rival interests, ably aided and abetted by Soviet diplomacy.

The Soviet Union's foreign policy was based first and foremost on proletarian internationalism. Secondly, while the tendency towards fas-



cism existed in every imperialist state, Stalin differentiated between the fascist and non-fascist states. The emergence of the fully fascist axis powers threatened not only the Soviet Union, the working class and oppressed nations. Communists clearly understood, it threatened the established supremacy of the non-fascist powers as well. The Soviet Union, was able to utilise this contradiction and at the same time build a powerful united front movement which finally culminated in the great Anti-fascist War.

The struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations for liberation was gathering strength and exercising a decisive influence on world politics. It should not be forgotten that Lenin had resurrected and developed the revolutionary principles of Marxism on the national and colonial question. The 1905 Russian Revolution bore all the characteristics of anti-imperialist struggle. It had an enormous impact on the rapidly awakening national movements of the near and far east, particularly on the national democratic movements' revolutions of Persia in 1906, Turkey in 1908, and China in 1911.

The October Revolution completed this development. By destroying the tsarist empire - the prison house of nations - it "created a new front of revolutions against world imperialism, extending from the proletarians of the west through the Russian revolution, to the oppressed peoples of the east." 12 The national element which Lenin said had occupied an entirely subordinate place in the First World War, was to exert a decisive influence on the Second.

Imperialist relations between the wars make for a complex picture. The fact that the ACW has not one word to say about them is a devastating self-exposure.

As we have already stated, British imperialism endeavoured to retain supremacy in Europe by preventing Germany from becoming too weak or France too strong. US imperialism had emerged as the real victor of World War 1 - it had changed from being a debtor state into the richest and most powerful state. It would now do its utmost to gain a foothold in Europe and the far-East while consolidating its domination over Latin America and the Pacific. Britain for all its might was now heavily in debt to the US and lagged far behind it economically and industrially. The rivalry between the US and Britain became the principal inter-imperialist contradiction. France had emerged from the war severely weakened. It strove to ruin Germany and play off Britain and the US to establish its own hegemony in Europe. Japan had enlarged its spheres of influence in the far-east and the Pacific during the war, and was now coming increasingly into contradiction with the US.

Owing to the uneven development of capitalism and the massive support of Britain and the US, Germany had recovered its economic might by the 1930's and was outstripping Britain and France in all major areas of production. German imperialism needed to regain its lost territories and colonies, cast off the gigantic burdens and restrictions imposed on it at Versailles, in order to seize hegemony first in Europe and then the world. US and British imperialism had lavished aid on Germany partly to stave off another revolutionary crisis there but also in preparation for war to crush the Soviet Union. When the British government had first attempted to enroll Germany as the spearhead of an anti-Soviet crusade in 1928, the overture broke down against German demands

for the return of her colonies and freedom to rearm without restrictions. Britain opposed the first demand, and France rejected the second. But there was a third factor - the German working class. Though both the 1918 and 1924 revolutions had been mercilessly crushed, the German working class had not been broken and no German government dare risk a war with Soviet Russia. Post war Germany became a focal point of international class struggle. The outcome of the class struggle in Germany would have an enormous influence on the development of world politics.

It took international imperialism and the German bourgeoisie a full fifteen years to break the resistance of the German workers and establish the Nazi dictatorship in 1933. This was accomplished above all, from within the workers movement by German social-democracy.

With indecent haste Britain, France and fascist Italy rushed to sign the Act of Accord and Co-operation with Nazi Germany. A year earlier Japan had refused Britain and France's "offer" for her to attack the USSR, but now Japan had an ideal partner in Germany. The imperialist dream of a two-pronged assault on Russia seemed on the point of realisation. Henceforth the dominant section of British imperialism would pursue a strategy of egging on Germany and Japan against the Soviet Union - diverting the fascist offensive away from Britain's spheres of influence - with the delightful prospect of seeing both sides embroiled in war, Britain drawing on the profits of war, and then moving in to pick up the pieces. This was the essence of Chamberlain's "non-intervention" and appeasement policies. Not naive pacifism, but the calculated and cynical policy of an aristocratic warmonger. Similarly the fascist elements of French imperialism headed by Laval wanted to give Hitler a free-hand in the east in return for a guarantee for its frontier and interests.

Initially, Nazi strategy was based on allying with Britain and neutralising France to establish hegemony in Europe and isolate the Soviet Union. It would then crush the Soviet Union, which it considered the "weaker enemy", strike down France and then press all its colonial demands against Britain. In time Hitler came to realise that the Western powers, not Russia were the weaker enemy and would change his strategy accordingly. At all costs Hitler intended to avoid war on two fronts in order to pick off his enemies one at a time.

And so what appeared to trotskyites as an invincible monolithic anti-Soviet coalition, was in reality a mass of irreconcilable contradictions. Added to this there were of course the contradictions within each imperialist ruling class. Churchill was a rabid anti-communist but opposed appeasing Hitler and favoured an "understanding" with Stalin. Churchill represented the more far sighted section of the ruling class which realised Hitler posed the immediate danger to British interests. Russia could be "used" and then "dealt with" later.

The formidable anti-Soviet alliance would break down time and again in the face of these irreconcilable imperialist contradictions and interests. The scene was not set for a united anti-Soviet crusade but for imperialist back-stabbing, for the proverbial cross and double-cross. All aided and abetted by the principled peace policy of the Soviet Union in consent with the struggles of the international working class and the oppressed peoples and nations.

Early in 1933 Japan seized Manchuria and left the League of Nations. Germany soon followed suit and categorically rejected the Soviet Union's proposals for a non-aggression pact. Russia was now clearly threatened in the east and west.

Alarmed, the newly formed United Front government in France invited Russia to join the League, which she did in 1934. In May 1935 both France and Czechoslovakia agreed to mutual assistance pacts with the Soviet Union. Ominously Britain and Poland refused to be co-signatories to the agreements.

The pacts stipulated that if either party was attacked by a European power, the other would immediately come to its aid. Stalin declared his "complete understanding and approval of the policy of national defence pursued by France for maintaining its armed forces at the level corresponding to the needs of its security". Without such a standpoint the anti-fascist alliance would have been meaningless. All this was fully consistent with Soviet foreign policy which differentiated between the aggressive and non-aggressive imperialist powers with a view of isolating and attacking the more dangerous enemy. This did not prevent the French communists from struggling against its ruling class, voting against military budgets and two year military conscription while putting pressure on the government to strengthen its alliance with the Soviet Union and exposing any deviation away from such a policy.

Of course the Trotskyites slandered the policy of both the Soviet Union and the French party, especially the alleged contradiction between the two. The fact is however that while the overall strategic objective of the Soviet and French communists were identical, their concrete role was entirely different. Hence the difference in tactics. The Soviet - French mutual assistance pact assisted the United Front government, further isolated Laval's fascists, enhanced the prestige of the Soviet Union and communism among the French working class and enabled France to become a bulwark of peace in Europe. The positive peace policy of the French working class assisted the Soviet Union. Far from being contradictory, the different tactics of the Soviet state and the French party complemented each other.

In 1935 events moved with even greater momentum. Germany tore-up the Versailles and Locarno treaties and begun to build a huge conscript army. With the blessing of a new Anglo-German Naval Treaty which ostensibly limited the size of her navy, Germany started the construction of her U-boat fleet. In March fascist Italy invaded Abyssinia (Ethiopia), the last major independent country on the African continent. The League of Nations invoked sanctions against Italy which only the Soviet Union applied in practice. Japan proceeded to invade the whole of northern China. Imperialism was rushing headlong into war.

#### The Seventh Congress of the Communist International, 1935.

It was at this crucial juncture that the Communist International convened its 7th Congress, from July 25th-August 20th, 1935. The development of the fascist war offensive had drastically altered the world situation. With true Leninist flexibility the Comintern changed its

strategy and tactics accordingly. The new strategic orientation of the Comintern had vast implications. On an international scale it projected nothing short of a great anti-fascist peace alliance with the Soviet Union and the international working class at its core. The Congress devoted much attention to the development of the people's front movement in the respective capitalist countries, as the foundation of the whole struggle against fascism and war. Especially, the Congress noted the progress made by the parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. In particular the Communist Party of China was forging a broad anti-imperialist united front and leading the war of resistance against Japan. In Indo-China, Philippines, Indonesia, Korea, Malaya, Egypt and Syria the parties were winning the leadership of the national liberation movement.

The main Congress Report was made by George Dimitrov. In view of the widespread confusion as to what fascism actually was, Dimitrov paid considerable attention to analysing and defining its class character. He reiterated the famous analysis made by the Executive Committee of the Comintern (ECCE) in 1933: "fascism is the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital". Furthermore, "the accession to power of fascism is not an ordinary succession of one bourgeois government by another, but a substitution of one state form of class domination by the bourgeoisie - bourgeois democracy - by another form - open terrorist dictatorship. It would be a mistake to ignore this distinction". Fascism "is unbridled aggression in relation to other nations". In particular "German fascism is acting as the spearhead of international counter-revolution, as the chief instigator of imperialist war, as the initiator of a crusade against the Soviet Union, the great fatherland of the working people of the whole world". 13

The Resolution on the War Danger was based upon the famous Lenin-Luxemburg thesis on the tasks of the working class parties adopted by the Stuttgart Congress of the 2nd International in 1907. The Resolution stated: "The Communists, while fighting also against the illusion that war can be eliminated while the capitalist system still exists, exert and will exert every effort to prevent war. Should a new imperialist world war break out, despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the Communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organised in the struggle for peace, to the struggle for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war against the fascist instigators of war against the bourgeoisie, for the overthrow of capitalism". While pointing out that, "The main contradiction in the camp of the imperialists is the Anglo-American antagonism", the war danger emanated mainly from German fascism. "Being the chief instigators of war, the German fascists, who strive for the hegemony of German imperialism in Europe, raise the question of changing the boundaries of Europe at the expense of their neighbours by means of war". Nazi Germany was "organising a war of revenge against France, dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, annexation of Austria, destruction of the independence of the Baltic States, which they are striving to convert into a base for attack on the Soviet Union".

Having stated that "a new partition of the world has actually already begun," the resolution points out, "there is a tendency, among a number



of other countries to maintain the status quo. At the present time this tendency is represented on a world scale by the US; in Europe, primarily France; the efforts of these two leading imperialist powers to maintain the status quo are supported by several smaller countries (the little and Balkan Entente and some of the Baltic states where independence is threatened by a new imperialist war!").

Here, the cynical warmongering role of British imperialism is clearly identified; "Dominant circles of the British bourgeoisie support German armaments in order to weaken the hegemony of France on the European continent, to turn the spearhead of German armaments from the west to the east and to direct Germany's aggressiveness against the Soviet Union. By this policy Great Britain is striving to set up a counterbalance to the US on a world wide scale, and simultaneously, to strengthen the anti-Soviet tendencies not only in Germany but also of Japan and Poland. This policy of British imperialism is one of the factors accelerating the outbreak of a world imperialist war." 14

#### The Road to Munich

In February 1936 the Popular Front came to power in Spain and set up the Republic. The carefully planned fascist counter attack began in July. Germany and Italy heaped lavish military aid on France and then proceeded to invade Spain. The British and French governments repeatedly rejected the Spanish government's efforts to buy arms. The "Berlin Rome Axis" was formalised in October 1936. Japan joined a month later; the notorious Anti-Comintern Pact was born. While the Soviet Union shipped enormous supplies of weapons and food and the International Brigade fought heroically with the Republic, Chamberlain, under the guise of "non-intervention" and "strict impartiality" was aiding and abetting the fascists. By March 1937, German, Italian, British and French warships were jointly policing the Spanish Coast. Furthermore Britain was making thinly disguised efforts to set up an anti-soviet bloc to take "non-intervention" to its logical conclusion and prepare the way for an attack on the Soviet Union.

In March 1938 Hitler annexed Austria after having given his word that "Germany neither intends or wishes to interfere in the internal affairs of Austria, or to annex Austria". The Soviet Union called on all the powers to take a "firm and unambiguous stand in regard to the problem of the collective salvation of peace", to unite and collectively defend the independence of a country threatened by aggression. Britain rejected the proposal as "inopportune".

Having occupied Austria, Germany turned its attention on Czechoslovakia. The nazi propaganda machine began a "war of nerves" against the Czechs, bombarding them with threats and false accusations. At the Anglo-French-Soviet talks in April 1938 the Soviet Union offered to fight alongside the Czechs if either Britain or France would do the same, or even if only the Czechs were willing to resist nazi aggression. Kalinin stated that the USSR would carry out its treaty obligations to France and Czechoslovakia to the letter, he added, "a firm stand against the aggressor is the fundamental solution of the present international tension".

In September Hitler demanded that Czechoslovakia relinquish Sudetenland to the Reich. The Czechs responded by manning its western defences

and called on France to honour its treaty obligation with armed support. But France, encouraged by Britain and the US was more interested in appeasing Hitler and forming an anti-Soviet bloc.

On his fourth hectic flight to Germany, Chamberlain met with Hitler, Mussolini and Daladier at the Munich thieves' kitchen. The notorious Munich agreement of September 1938 handed the Sudetenland with its 3 million inhabitants, the Pilsen armaments factory and all the Czech frontier defences, lock, stock and barrel over to Germany. In return Hitler and Mussolini gave an assurance, guaranteed by Britain and France, not to occupy the defenceless remnants of Czechoslovakia. Neither the Czech government nor the Russians were consulted. On no account did Britain and France want the Soviet Union to go to war before nazi Germany was strong enough - this would only have increased Russia's power and prestige, severely weakened Germany, and set-back their plans for all out aggression against the USSR.

#### The Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) 1939

In his report to the 18th Congress of the CPSU(B) (Communist Party of Soviet Union (Bolshevik) ) in March 1939 Stalin stated,

"A new imperialist war is already in its second year, a war waged over a huge territory stretching from Shanghai to Gibraltar and involving over 500 million people. The map of Europe, Africa and Asia is being forcibly re-drawn. Here is a list of the most important events during the period under review which marked the beginning of the new imperialist war. In 1935 Italy attacked and seized Abyssinia. In the summer of 1936 Germany and Italy organised military intervention in Spain, Germany entrenching herself in the north of Spain and in Spanish Morocco, and Italy in the south of Spain and in the Balearic islands. Having seized Manchuria, Japan in 1937 invaded North and Central China, occupied Peking, Tientsin and Shanghai and began to oust her foreign competitors from the occupied zone. In the beginning of 1938 Germany seized Austria, and in the autumn of 1938 the Sudetan region of Czechoslovakia. At the end of 1938 Japan seized Canton; at the beginning of 1939 the island of Hainan..."

Stalin added "... Three aggressive states, and the new imperialist war launched by them have upset the entire system of the post-war peace regime. ... All this in defiance of the interests of the non-aggressive states. 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, wherein every way infringe upon the interests of the non-aggressive states, primarily England, France and 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 amount of connivance, on the part of the latter".

Stalin does not attribute this to weakness. On the contrary, "combined, the non-aggressive, democratic states are unquestionably stronger than the fascist states, both economically and in the mili-

tary sense."

He attributes their policy firstly to "fear that a revolution may break out if war assumes world wide proportions. Learning from victory of the socialist revolution in Russia during World War I, they are afraid that the second imperialist war may also lead to the victory of the revolution in one or several countries."

The "chief reason for rejection of collective security and collective resistance to the aggressors, of non-intervention, neutrality" is far more sinister. "The policy of non-intervention means conniving at aggression, giving free rein to war, and, consequently, transforming the war into world war... not to hinder Germany, say, from ermeshing herself in European affairs, from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union, to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war and encourage them surreptitiously in this: to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another, and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear, of course, 'in the interests of peace' and to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents... It must be remarked, however, that the big and dangerous political game started by the supporters of the policy of non-intervention may end in a serious fiasco for them". 15

In the Spring of 1939 the nazi propaganda machine turned its attention to Poland. In March, in violation of all the "promises" made at Munich, Germany occupied the remainder of Czechoslovakia, capturing 3,000 artillery pieces, 2,000 tanks, 2,000 air craft as well as the Skoda and Brno works. The Hungarian fascists seized Carpatho, in the Ukraine. The Chamberlain Government hastened to give Poland a military guarantee, without so much as informing the USSR. Hitler responded by contemptuously renouncing the German-Polish non-aggression pact and Anglo-German Naval Treaty. On April 17th Italy invaded Albania. Britain gave worthless guarantees to Greece and Romania, again without consulting Russia. A week later Chamberlain proposed that the Soviet Union unilaterally guarantee Poland and Romania. This amounted to undertaking to defend a country about to be attacked.

Soviet reaction to Hitler's coup was swift. On April 17th Stalin proposed convening a conference with Britain, France, Poland, Romania and Turkey to consider joint action against aggression, and a mutual assistance pact between the USSR, Britain, France and Poland. The terms of the proposal were as follows: immediate assistance including military aid, to any east European country adjoining the Soviet Union between the Baltic and Black seas should they fall victim to aggression. Chamberlain rejected the full proposal as "premature" and pressurised Poland to do the same. The British and French Governments insisted that the Soviet Union guarantee their security but refused to guarantee the security of the USSR and its neighbours. Furthermore Britain was still holding secret negotiations with Germany with the aim of diverting nazi aggression eastwards.

On May 11th the Japanese army occupying Manchuria invaded the USSR. The stage seemed set for a two pronged onslaught on the Soviet Union. Stalin had warned Britain and France that unless they came to terms with the Soviet Union she would come to terms with Germany. Finally, a full ten weeks after the fall of Prague and the Soviet Union's triple

alliance proposals, negotiations opened in Moscow. Failure was planned from the start. Britain and France refused even to consider giving a military guarantee to the USSR. It has since become known that while Britain was sabotaging the long-delayed negotiations with Russia, Hudson and Wilson held secret talks with Wohlat in London. They agreed to renounce the guarantee just given to Poland if Germany and Britain could work out a division of spheres of influence. At this critical juncture the Soviet Union pulled off its great diplomatic victory - the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact of August 1939. It destroyed the Anglo-French-US strategem of embroiling the Soviet Union and Germany in a war after which they could move in and pick up the pieces. Its immediate effect was to crack the fascist block down the middle. With its western borders secure the Soviet Union was able to concentrate its forces on defeating Japan in the east, which it accomplished in three months. Stalin had succeeded in getting Hitler to double-cross Japan and his secret collaborators Chamberlain and Daladier. Nevertheless the Soviet leaders knew full well that sooner rather than later the Axis powers would fall on the Soviet Union. The pact gave the USSR nearly two years to prepare for war.

Mao Zedong summed up the significance of the pact as follows:

"...The Soviet-German non-aggression treaty is the result of the growing socialist strength of the Soviet Union and the policy of peace... the treaty has shattered the intrigues by which the reactionary international bourgeoisie represented by Chamberlain and Daladier sought to instigate a Soviet-German war, has broken the encirclement of the Soviet Union by the German, Italian, Japanese anti-communist bloc, strengthened peace between the Soviet Union and Germany, and safeguarded the progress of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. In the East it deals a blow to Japan and helps China; it strengthens the position of China's forces of resistance to Japan and deals a blow to the capitulators. All this provides a basis for helping the peoples throughout the world to win freedom and liberation". 16

Hitler was banking on British and French appeasement. He was convinced that having been double-crossed they would be even more frantic to appease. Nazi strategy was clearly, as Stalin predicted, first the destruction of the flabby western powers, and then the mobilisation of their industries and manpower for the assault on the USSR. On September 1st German troops poured into Poland and took Warsaw, two days later Britain and France declared war on Germany. Mao wrote:

"The outbreak of the imperialist world war is the result of the attempt of the imperialist countries to extricate themselves from a new economic and political crisis. Whether on the German side or on the Anglo-French, the war is unjust, predatory and imperialist in character. The Communist Parties throughout the world must firmly oppose the war and also the criminal actions of the social-democratic parties in betraying the proletariat by supporting it. The socialist Soviet Union is persevering as before in its policy of peace, is maintaining strict neutrality towards both belligerents." 17

The expectation had been that if and when it came to war the USSR would be allied to the western democracies. This would have given the war an entirely anti-fascist democratic content. This had been the



objective of Communist policy for several years. But the treachery of the "men of Munich" had made this course utterly impossible. Therefore a policy of non-support had to be adopted - a major expression of this was the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact itself.

In mid-September the Red Army liberated eastern Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and parts of White Russia and the Ukraine, all of which had been severed from Russia by the imperialists in 1920. The Soviet Union regained its lost territory, rescued millions of people from imminent conquest and established a strong defence to block the Nazi advance. Churchill, then head of the Admiralty, had the courage to state amidst a howl of abuse, *"That the Russian armies should stand on this line was clearly necessary for the safety of Russia against the Nazi menace... Nazi designs upon the Baltic states and upon the Ukraine must come to a dead stop"*.

But the dominant section of the British ruling class presented Soviet Union's action as a blow against Britain, although Britain was technically at war with Germany, not with Russia! The anti-Soviet campaign in the press reached hysterical proportions. In October 1939 the Communist International issued a manifesto on the Anglo-German war. It declared, *"the war is the continuation of the many years of imperialist strife in the camp of capitalism... Such is the real meaning of this war, which is an unjust reactionary, imperialist war. In this war the blame falls on all the capitalist governments, and primarily the ruling classes of the belligerent states. The working class can not support such a war... no support for the policy of the ruling classes aimed at continuing and spreading the imperialist slaughter. Demand the immediate cessation of war!"*

This was the "phoney war" period, as an American correspondent aptly described it. The men of Munich were still in power and still hoped to "switch" the war against the Soviet Union and no decisive action was taken against Germany. Chamberlain stated his intentions quite explicitly when he told the House of Commons in November, *"None of us knows how long the war will last; none of us knows in what direction it will develop; none of us knows when it is ended who will stand by our side and who will be against us"*.

Anglo-French intrigues to "switch" the war went into full gear over Finland. Finland was governed by the fascist regime headed by Mannerheim, an ex-Tsarist general. Leningrad, the Soviet Union's principal arms producing centre was in shelling distance from the Finnish border, and the Soviet Baltic ports could be completely bottled up by hostile submarines in Finnish waters. The Soviet Union could not but be extremely anxious about an attack from Finland. In 1936 the British and Germans had helped build the "impregnable Mannerheim defences", and all along had been supplying Finland with munitions and aircraft to establish a potential northern front against the USSR. The Soviet government asked the Finnish government to negotiate frontier changes around Leningrad. Britain and France persuaded the Finns to refuse, hoping to bring about a war with all its many possibilities of intervention by themselves, the Nazis or both. Confronted with this intolerable situation the Soviet Union acted decisively. On November 30th the Red Army crossed the frontier. Britain and France offered to send 100,000 troops. In March the Red Army destroyed the whole plan

by arriving through the "impregnable" Mannerheim line in a few days. Britain and France repeated their offer, adding that they would brook no resistance from Norway or Sweden to the passage of troops. Mannerheim could see the game was up and sued for peace. Britain and France could still not take "no" for an answer and again repeated the offer, but Finland signed the peace treaty on 12th March.

The "phoney" war ended abruptly when German imperialism had exploited Anglo-French appeasement to the maximum. In April the Nazis invaded Denmark and Norway to secure the supply of Scandinavian iron ore. Chamberlain was finally booted out of office and Churchill brought in to head a coalition government. On that same day, May 10th 1940, Germany struck at France through neutral Belgium, and overran Holland to secure its right flank. Nazi troops cut through the French lines and reached the Channel coast by May 21st. The humiliating defeats suffered by the British armies culminated in the Dunkirk fiasco. By the end of June, Paris fell and Marshall Petain sued for peace; Germany would occupy northern France and the Atlantic coast, leaving the centre and south "free" with a capital at Vichy. Italy declared war on Britain.

A peace offer from Hitler, confirming his new acquisitions, was rejected by Churchill. The Nazis now prepared for an invasion of Britain; the "Battle of Britain", the "Night Blitz" the U-boat war, and the war in North Africa.

With its army destroyed Britain was about to fall when the Soviet Union made a sudden move which saved it. The Red Army occupied the former Russian territory of Bessarabia, then in the hands of Romania. This dramatic act forced Hitler to relax his mounting pressure against Britain. Mortally afraid of a two front war, the fuhrer was compelled to consolidate Germany's position in the Balkans and to strengthen the forces on the Russian border.

In October 1940 Germany occupied Romania to safeguard its main sources of oil; then Italy launched its disastrous invasion of Greece. The Yugoslavian people overthrew the government which was prepared to collaborate with Hitler. In April 1941 the Germans moved into Yugoslavia and on into Greece. Meanwhile after initial setbacks, the Axis powers were recovering in North Africa and the Middle East. The Nazi occupation of Yugoslavia, Greece, Romania and Bulgaria, cleared Hitler's right flank for his next, and ultimately fatal venture. With France knocked out and with Britain without a foothold on the Continent, the Axis powers decided it was time to crush the Soviet Union. The German General Staff reckoned it could all be done in 8 weeks. The decision had been taken in December 1940; and after months of quiet preparation the blow was launched in June 1941.

On June 22nd 1941, Nazi Germany and Finland invaded the Soviet Union.

## ON THE STAGES AND CHARACTER OF WORLD WAR II

With a smug contempt for facts the ACW asserts:

"It is most probably known even to the RCLB comrades that the Second World War started not in 1941, but in 1939" (p.39)

We confess. We know no such thing. The RCLB labours under the common misconception that Second World War actually began in 1937, not 1939. In March 1939, six months before Britain's declaration of war on Germany, Stalin summed up the international situation in the following way:

*"A new imperialist war is already in its second year, a war waged over a huge territory stretching from Shanghai to Gibraltar and involving over five hundred million people. The map of Europe, Africa and Asia, is being forcibly redrawn."*

By September 1939 (after the Munich sell-out, the complete annexation of Czechoslovakia and after the collapse of the Anglo-French-Soviet talks) Mao stated categorically:

*"From now on the situation will inevitably develop into one of direct conflict between the two big imperialist blocs... The second imperialist war has entered a new stage!" 18.*

By slight of hand the ACW has rewritten history. It has written out of history the anti-fascist, national liberation wars and struggles being waged by the Abyssinian, Spanish, Chinese, Austrian, Czech and then the Polish peoples, prior to the Anglo-German war. The ACW has written out of history two years of anti-imperialist struggle because they do not correspond to the assertion that the Second World War was initially a purely inter-imperialist war.

According to the ACW, World War Two, developed through two distinct stages 1939-1949 and 1941-1945. This omits the first stage 1937-1939. To quote from their pamphlet again:

*"...The CPGB correctly regarded the war in 1939 as an inter-imperialist war, for both Germany and Britain were fighting for robbing colonies and oppressing other countries and not for national liberation... It was not until after the then socialist Soviet Union was attacked by the Hitlerite fascists that the class character of the war changed."*

According to the ACW therefore a purely inter-imperialist war is transformed into a wholly anti-fascist war. This is metaphysics not Marxism-Leninism. Dialectical and historical materialism teaches that things in nature and society are indeed transformed into their opposites, that the secondary aspect of a contradiction can become the principle aspect, and so on. But a stone can never become a chicken. A purely inter-imperialist war cannot become a purely anti-fascist war. An egg certainly can become a chicken in the right conditions. A mainly anti-fascist war can become a mainly anti-imperialist war, and then mainly an anti-fascist war again. This is the case with the Second World War.

The war developed through three inter-related stages, not two distinct stages. Britain's war with Germany between 1939-1941 was inter-imperialist. The ACW gets no marks for acknowledging the fact. But even this must be seen in the context of the anti-fascist struggles being waged before 1939. To these we must add the struggles of the Danish, Norwegian, Belgian, Dutch, French, Romanian, Yugoslavian, Greek and

Bulgarian people against fascism and German occupation between 1939-1941; that is, before the Soviet Union entered the war. Clearly it is a complete nonsense to describe the overall character of the war up until 1941 as essentially identical to the war in 1914.

German conquest of the European imperialist states changed the tasks and targets of the revolution in each particular country. For all intents and purposes the "national" bourgeois state was smashed, defeated. Those parts of the state machine that were preserved were assimilated into the Nazi occupation regime. The tendency of the imperialist ruling class to split into three was completed - one group united with the Germans; another group allied itself with the Anglo-American imperialists; and the third group vacillated between the two. The principle contradiction changed from being the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, now the Germans and their collaborators became the principle target. The working class was faced with the task not of launching a civil war for socialism, as in 1914, but of uniting the whole people in the struggle to recapture national independence. The people included the anti-fascist, patriotic sections of the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie. The communists of imperialist France and Belgium raised the banner of national resistance, as did the communists of oppressed Greece and Bulgaria, before the Soviet Union came into the World War. According to the ACW's petit-bourgeois logic they and the Dutch, Norwegian and Danish communists should be criticised for social-chauvinism. We obviously disagree. If anything it may emerge after deeper study that certain parties hesitated, were initially somewhat indecisive, in launching the resistance movements against Nazi occupation. It is possible that the Comintern's fundamentally correct position was not clear enough, that it tended to accommodate rather than criticise the rigidity displayed by some western parties.

The only definite conclusion we are able to arrive at here is this. The imperialist Anglo-German war ran parallel to the anti-fascist wars and struggles of the oppressed nations under the fascist boot.

### THE CPGB IN THE FIGHT AGAINST WAR AND FASCISM

A comprehensive study of the Communist Party of Great Britain's (CPGB) policies preceding and during World War 2 is both essential and long overdue. The RCL cannot accomplish such a task at present and is certainly not going to attempt it here. The absence of a systematic summing-up of the positive and negative lessons of our immediate history is a big problem. But this does not excuse the ACW's brazen falsification of history.

The definite implication in the ACW pamphlet is that the CPGB's strategy up until June 1941 was to strive for the defeat of the ruling class and the conversion of the imperialist war into civil war. This is not spelt out - in fact nothing about the CPGB's strategy and tactics is spelt out. But given that the ACW "approves" of the CPGB's line, and the whole thrust of their argument throughout the pamphlet is that Lenin's strategy and tactics in 1914 hold good in all wars between imperialist powers - the only possible deduction is that, according to the ACW, the CPGB advocated and implemented the strategy of revolutionary defeatism. This is simply not true.



The CPGB, for all its weaknesses, and they were serious, was the political party of the working class. It alone stood in the vanguard of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist, anti-fascist struggles of the British working class. From 1935 onwards, and more clearly and consciously from 1937, the CPGB's strategy was for building a broad united front in Britain and on a world scale, against fascism and war, against appeasement and collusion with the nazis, for the defence of world peace, for the advance of the national liberation struggles in the colonies, for the defence of the Soviet Union and the victory of socialism.

Let us look at some outstanding examples of the CPGB's line at important junctures of World War Two.

When in 1935, Mussolini's armies invaded Abyssinia the Party consistently exposed the National Government's pro-fascist policies. *"The workers hate and distrust the National Government, that is why they are fearful about supporting any policy that seems in the slightest way to indicate support for the National Government".* But, *"... every person who desires to maintain peace, retard the advance of fascism and defend the Soviet Union must be prepared to use every means and take full advantage of all existing institutions... and imperialist contradictions, that can place stumbling blocks in the path of the war mongers. To preserve peace, we must bring into play the full force of working class action and 'sanctions' carried out in terms of the League of Nations covenant."* To this end the Party put forward an eleven point programme which skillfully combined the call to action with demands on the Government to honour its treaty obligations. On the one hand, the Party fought to free the working class of any illusions in the National Government. On the other it made a clear differentiation between British imperialism and the fascist powers and the tasks of the working class in Britain and in Italy. *"At the same time as we carry out this policy in Britain, the Italian socialist and Communist parties are striving might and main to turn what to them is an imperialist war into a civil war. They are organising strikes and demonstrations; they call on the Italian soldiers to refuse to embark for Abyssinia, they urge the soldiers already in Abyssinia to desert their own ranks and join the Abyssinian army".* 19

The 11 points were as follows:-

1. Stoppage of all war materials to Italy and refusing to load or unload any Italian ships at present in British ports.
2. No loans to Italy.
3. Removal of the ban on export of arms to the Abyssinian people in order that they can adequately defend themselves against imperialist aggression.
4. Closing the Suez canal to all Italian transport.
5. Raising funds to assist the anti-fascists in Italy itself.
6. Demand for the surrender of all British mandates and British imperialist interests in Abyssinia.
7. The British Council of Labour to convene an emergency international conference of all working class organisations to mobilise world wide

support to derend the independence of Abyssinia.

8. Immediate organisation of a nation-wide campaign of meetings, demonstrations, mass deputations to the Italian Embassy and Consulates throughout Britain, demanding the withdrawal of all Italian forces from Abyssinian territory.
9. Mass distributions of leaflets, especially among the workers in the war and transport industries and among the armed forces, calling for solidarity with the Abyssinian people.
10. Election of a Workers' Control Commission in the war industries to supervise all war material contracts.
11. Support the policy of sanctions as a means of preventing Italian fascism going to war against the Abyssinian people, and redoubled efforts to organise the defeat of the National Government on the basis of united struggle for the preservation of world peace, the defence of democracy, and the improvement of the conditions of the workers.

Apart from these concrete demands in relation to Abyssinia the Party also called for struggle to force the National Government to:-

1. Renounce the German Naval Agreement.
2. Abandon all forms of support for Hitler.
3. Give full support for the Franco-Soviet Pact.
4. Sign a peace pact with the Soviet Union.
5. Renounce its own imperialist conquests, concessions and mandates. 20

It should be noted that the cornerstone of the CP's line was support for the Soviet Union and its peace policy. Speaking at the important enlarged Central Committee in January 1936, Pollitt stated, *"...the time is ripe for a great mass campaign for ending the National Government's policy of friendship with German fascism, and instead to compel it to seek a peace alliance with Soviet socialism. We think that millions of people in Britain would warmly welcome such a peace alliance".* 21

With the fascist onslaught on the Spanish Republic the Party popularised the slogan "MADRID TODAY - LONDON TOMORROW". Throughout the late 30s the Party consistently exposed the "appeasement gang", the "men of Munich", while targetting the fascist powers as the main instigators of war on Britain and the whole world. Clearly the ACW would have had no place inside the CPGB. As a matter of "principle" they would have to attack the "class collaborationist" and "chauvinist" line. But that does not mean that the ACW would have found itself completely in the wilderness. They would have found a place in the trotskyite Independent Labour Party (ILP) and could have voted enthusiastically for the resolution "To Resist War" in 1937.

*"In the event of war between two capitalist countries, or two groups of capitalist countries, it will be the duty of the British working class to concentrate on the task of overthrowing the British capitalist government and to co-operate with the workers of other countries in overthrowing the capitalist governments. If and when workers power has been achieved, it will be the socialist duty to*

*judge the objective situation from a class point of view to decide whether action in support of one side is desirable in order to make working class forces a dominating factor".*

The ILP in 1937 - the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist), Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) and ACW in 1979. The same trotskyite pill for the world headache. No doubt the ACW and its members would have voted with equal enthusiasm for the "Resolution on Soviet Russia":

*"The foreign policy of Soviet Russia, with its reliance on the League of Nations and Pacts with capitalist governments, rather than an alliance with the working class forces of the world, has had a depressing effect on the revolutionary movement of other countries".*

For many years the Comintern's strategy was aimed at winning the western democracies to an alliance with Russia, the international working class and the oppressed peoples and countries against the fascist powers. But the treacherous warmongering policies of the Munichites, their determination to turn Hitler eastward had made this course impossible! Therefore a policy of neutrality, non-support, had to be adopted - the highest expression of this policy was of course the Soviet-Nazi Non-Aggression Pact.

In the events immediately preceding the outbreak of the British-German imperialist war and during the "phoney war" period, the revisionist tendencies of the CPGB leadership broke out into the open. On the day the nazis invaded Poland the Central Committee announced that: *"we are in support of all necessary measures to secure victory over fascism"*. Two days later when Britain and France declared war on Germany the *Daily Worker* announced: *"The war is here, it is a war that can and must be won!"* Harry Pollitt hastily drafted the pamphlet entitled "How To Win The War" with the chauvinist theme that the war being waged by British imperialism was *"a just war against fascism"*. It was published a few days after the French Party was declared illegal.

A fierce struggle ensued in the Central Committee and to a lesser extent in the party as a whole. Dutt and Rust led the fight to characterise the war as an inter-imperialist war which the working class must oppose, and to implement the line and decisions of the Communist International. Six months later Dutt reported: *"The debate on the C.C. on this vital issue lasted over a period of nine days (with interruptions). It was the sharpest and most intense debate in the history of the Party; the viewpoint which was finally adopted in the October Manifesto was at first put forward by only a small minority and became a majority in the course of the debate... The same debate was conducted in every group and organisation of the party with a democratic completeness never before equalled in the history of any party in Britain."* 22 The resolution finally adopted by the Central Committee declared: *"the struggle of the British people against the Chamberlains and Churchills is the best help to the struggle of the German people against Hitler"*. Gallacher replaced Pollitt as General Secretary. Rust replaced Campbell as editor of the *Daily Worker*. On 12th October the *Daily Worker* criticised its earlier position as incorrect because the British, French and Polish governments "shared responsibility" with German fascism for the present war, and that consequently the war was

"unjust and imperialist". Britain's declaration of war was intended to pressurise Hitler into dumping the Non-Aggression Pact with the Soviet Union. The "phoney war" period which lasted 6 months was an extension of the same policy to "switch" the war against Russia. British imperialism was indeed out to defend its vast Empire which stretched from India to the Caribbean.

Nevertheless the CPGB did not call for transforming the British - German imperialist war into civil war. Why? Because outside of the immediate arena of the British-German war, the war was not inter-imperialist, because revolution was far from being an immediate possibility in Britain. And because there was still a possibility of winning Britain to an anti-fascist alliance with the Soviet Union.

This was a great testing time for the Party. The Party had reversed a fundamentally opportunist line at a critical juncture, but as was to become clear later, it had only halted the rise of revisionism, but had not rooted it out at the core. Many fellow travellers left the Party in this period. Its meetings were broken up; speakers and paper sellers often assaulted and arrested. Members continued to agitate among the armed forces and the working class against the war, before and after the fall of the Chamberlain Government and the entry of the Labour Party into Churchill's coalition "War Government".

All the really awkward jobs in the Coalition Government were given to Labour Ministers. Morrison became Home Secretary and Minister of Home Security. In opposition he had been one of the sharpest critics of the Chamberlain Government for its failure to provide air-raid protection; now as minister he went so far as to accuse the communists and all others who demanded deep bomb-proof shelters as "fifth columnists". Bevin who had a history of opposition to industrial conscription was made the minister to enforce just that. No attempts were made to check profiteering. The cost of living was rising. Trade union rights were being undermined; food distribution was chaotic and air raid shelters grossly inadequate.

The climax of the CP's anti-war campaign came with the People's Convention. The first delegates meeting was called by the Hammersmith Borough Trade Council and Labour Party in July 1940. The second meeting in London in January 1941 was attended by 2,234 delegates representing well over a million people, the overwhelming majority from trade union branches and trade councils. Messages of support were read out from Mao Zedong and Paul Robeson. The message from the underground movement in Germany, concluded; *"Those who do not want periodical outbreaks of terrible wars must fight for the conclusion of a real peoples' peace between the representatives of the working people of Britain and Germany, in closest contact with the people of the great socialist Soviet Union, must fight for a peace without annexations and indemnities, for a peace leading to the happiness of the people"*.

The Convention decided on the Eight-Point Charter and on a plan of action to win the masses to it.

1. To raise the living standards of the people, including wages, pay of armed and civil defence forces, dependants' allowances, all pensions, compensation, insurance and unemployment allowances, and the restoration and extension of educational facilities.
2. Adequate ARP bombproof shelters, and prompt and effective provision



for all the needs of air raid victims, including rehousing and full and immediate compensation.

3. Restoration, safeguarding and extension of all trade union rights and democratic rights and civil liberties. Effective democratic rights for members of the armed forces.
4. Emergency powers to be used to take over the banks, land, transport, armaments and other large industries, in order to organise our economic life in the interests of the people.
5. National independence for India; the right of all colonial peoples to determine their own destiny; and the ending of the enforced partition of Ireland.
6. Friendship with the USSR.
7. A Peoples' Government truly representative of the working peoples, and able to command the confidence of working people throughout the world.
8. A Peoples' Peace, won by the working people of all countries, and based on the right of all peoples to determine their own destiny. 23

The Government and press accused the convention of peddling "defeatism" and "peace at any price". Atlee concluded that the communists were Hitler's allies and the Labour Party expelled all the branches and any of its members who had taken a prominent part in the Convention. On July 21st the Government invoked the Defence Regulations and banned the *Daily Worker*. The Party had anticipated this and more. Under Rust's direction a secret chain of printing presses had been established throughout the country which now produced the daily *Industrial and General Information*.

One indication of the Party's growing influence was *Labour Monthly* sales; they rose from 7,500 in August 1939 to 20,000 in December 1940. Increasingly the Conventions Campaign for a Peoples' Government and Peoples' Peace and friendship with the USSR, the agitation around democratic rights, food, defence etc. won popular support. The rising discontent which found expression mainly through the Convention reached such proportions that the Government took the unprecedented step of seeking a vote of confidence in war time.

With the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union the CPGB was faced with a totally new situation and new tasks. For Britain too the war was now an anti-fascist war. Every blow against Hitler was a blow for socialism and a peoples' peace.

On June 22, 1941, the nazis hurled thousands of planes and tanks, hundreds of cracktroop divisions, across the Soviet frontiers. Later that day Churchill came to the microphone to declare that for all his bitter opposition to communism he recognised that Britain and the Soviet Union now had "one aim, one single purpose - to destroy Hitler and every vestige of the nazi regime". He added Britain would give the Russians all the aid it could. Stalin immediately greeted this "historic utterance" and said that "aid would be on a reciprocal basis". On June 24, Britain and the USSR agreed on the exchange of Missions and full co-operation. On July 12, they signed the Pact of Mutual Aid, pledging no separate peace.

The Central Committee of the CPGB responded swiftly to the vital change in the war. "For the first time we now have a real fight against fascism. Now it is a people's war in which the people of Britain and

the Soviet Union are working and fighting side by side". 24

The Peoples' Convention also adapted its line. The National Emergency Assembly, attended by 2,500 people on July 5, called for a further strengthening of friendship with the USSR and for an all-out war effort to defeat fascism. This was in fact the beginning of the mass movement demanding that Britain open the second front. The famous leaflet "We must Act Now" stated, "... Now after all the waverings and defeats of the past 21 months, the real anti-fascist struggle has begun and victory is within grasp, a victory that will bring a peoples' peace to all countries, including Germany and Italy... The full mobilisation of all our military and industrial resources for a great united front with the Soviet people against German fascism is the vital issue before us today."

The Party and its front organisations were besieged by demands for speakers and literature. Retired generals and Labour dignitaries appeared on platforms for friendship with the USSR. This was of course all to the good. The problem was whether or not the Party was strong enough to withstand its newly found respectability.

Membership had dropped to around 12,000 by June 1941. Now it recovered all lost ground. By the end of 1941 the total stood at the record figure of 22,700. In the first three months of 1942 over 25,000 recruits were reported. In September 1942 the party claimed a membership of 65,000. The new membership of the Party was overwhelmingly proletarian, mostly from the large munition works in the Midlands and West London.

The *Daily Worker* was allowed to resume publication in January 1941. It was now publishing all the encouraging war news, boosting the production drive in the factories, and urging the immediate opening of a "second front". According to William Rust, the editor, over a million copies of the first issue were ordered. But owing to the rationing of newsprint the total edition was limited to 75,000.

However, Pollitt was opportunistically reinstated as General Secretary. The implication being that he had been right about the war all along. This was a major concession to revisionism and social-chauvinism in the Party. In the context of the united front with the ruling class this was to prove fatal.

This period of Party history, no less than the preceding period, calls for a deep study and assesment. While the Party's platform was basically correct it seems far too many concessions were made to the bourgeoisie politically and in industry. There was all unity and no class struggle in the united front. The CPGB even began to advocate the continuation of a National Government after the war.

The rapid expansion of membership had taken place without any systematic political education and consolidation, Party factory cells were being disbanded and replaced by residential branches and factory "groups". Determined to maintain their "mass party" the leadership abandoned the idea that "every member must be a working member". The first essential now was numbers, quantity. Great importance began to be attached to the role of the dues-collector, whose job it was to go round the inactive members to collect their subscriptions. The social-democratic, revisionist tendencies of the party surfaced with a vengeance. Nevertheless, try as they may the leadership could not halt

the decline in membership which began in the summer of 1943. The dissolution of the Comintern in June 1943 only accelerated the political degeneration of its British section. The CPGB was well down the road to the "British Road to Socialism". This is how revisionism betrayed the working class and squandered the excellent national and international conditions won in the fight against fascism. Communists today must study and take to heart the positive and negative lessons of our recent history.

#### SOME CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSITIONS

In the face of social-imperialist aggression we propagate the necessity of a war of national defence under the leadership of the working class. This is the clear stand of the RCL Manifesto adopted unanimously at the Founding Congress. It is the line we have worked consistently to develop and deepen ever since.

The Manifesto states: *"In the event of an inter-imperialist war between the superpowers on West European territory the working class and people of Europe must fight for independence from both superpowers and must not support either of them. We would be for the defeat of our own bourgeoisie if it took us into such an inter-imperialist war."*

On the other hand, in the event of a just war of defence against Russian invasion and occupation, *"... a successful peoples' war can be led only by the working class and its Communist Party. The working class will constantly have to struggle with the bourgeoisie to win leadership of any war of national resistance against a soviet social-imperialist invasion"*.

In short the working class needs to be fully prepared for either eventuality.

Given our present level of development we can at best only touch on some of the vital issues posed here. It is a measure of the relative immaturity of the communist movement in Britain that we still have only an inadequate grasp of the facts, the trends, and the theoretical principles involved. But it is not just a matter that we are acutely aware of our limitations and inexperience. We are equally determined to overcome them, to transform them through conscientious investigation combined with struggle on the theoretical and practical fronts. Nor do we profess to have access to the ACW's amazing crystal ball which enables the ACW to predict the exact turn of future events, no matter how unconvincingly.

The threat of war is developing under quite complex conditions and there really can be no substitute for constant, all-sided concrete analysis of the changing situation. There is no way of predicting the exact correlation of class forces at this or that juncture in the development of the war - at what point and in what way Britain will go to war - and consequently impossible to predict whether the situation will demand the working class to transform the war into civil war or lead a united struggle against Russian aggression. But we emphasise the fact

that in either eventuality the working class will wage a revolutionary war of national liberation against the superpowers, with or without an alliance with a section of the British bourgeoisie, and that this will lead on to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat

We can also say with certainty that at present the trends are positive, favourable - there is indeed a growing international united front against superpower domination and war. It begins first and foremost with the Peoples Republic of China. It encompasses the national liberation movements and the countries of the third world. Yes, of course, when you analyse the particularity of various third world forces, there is uneven development, an uneven contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle, and so on. But only the most hopeless doctrinaire can fail to recognise that taken as a whole the third world is the main force in international class struggle, the main force in the united front. The united front includes the second world, The inter-imperialist contradictions between the superpowers on the one hand, especially social-imperialism, and the lesser imperialist powers, is of immense strategic importance. Not least because Europe is the focus of superpower contention, and knows it. The anti-appeasement trend is gaining strength, particularly in Britain, France, Belgium and Japan. And even if this has not yet become the dominant trend in general, should the working class adopt a passive, defeatist policy, in effect encouraging appeasement. Or should the working class launch a political offensive against appeasement, in defence of independence and world peace, with the object of securing a powerful ally, an important reserve in the international fight against the superpowers. If the second world must be considered a direct reserve, the contradiction between US imperialism and social-imperialism should be seen as an indirect reserve of our struggle. In a certain sense the US superpower has already become an indirect ally in the united front, while remaining a target of the united front. This too is a measure of US imperialism's desperate weakness and accelerating decline.

Should the British working class seize on these positive factors or not? Should we encourage and exploit these positive factors and harness them to our own revolutionary and internationalist strategy. We must answer in the affirmative.

What do we mean by saying preparations should begin now?

Communists must patiently expose appeasement as a dangerous imperialist policy and expose superpower "detente" as a cover for war preparations and aggression. We must educate the workers to understand the vital issues and facts of the turbulent international situation and propagate solidarity with the Peoples' struggles for independence and freedom. Our emphasis is on the class struggle, the socialist revolution and proletarian internationalism, on the necessity for the working class to lead the struggle against social-imperialist aggression. At the same time we need to explain that even under the imperialist ruling class there is an alternative to the present policy of capitulation in the face of the Russian offensive and concurrent alliance with US imperialism. There is the possibility of a European alliance against the superpowers. Britain's relations with the third world are imperialist relations, nevertheless the results of the Lome Convention for example, or Britain's support for Democratic Kampuchea



at the United Nations, show that Britain is being forced to recognise the growing strength of the third world and make significant concessions to it. While we propagate unconditional support for the third world's struggles for political and economic sovereignty and oppose British imperialism, we demand it make further concessions and we support everything that strengthens the common front against the superpowers. Rather than continued servility towards the superpowers there is the alternative of friendship and co-operation with socialist China, the most consistent exponent of world peace and the independence of nations.

Though clearly on the defensive, the US is still the dominant superpower in Britain and Western Europe, economically, politically and militarily. NATO is under the domination of US imperialism. This is all detrimental to the advance of the class struggle and to the world united front, and must be fought against. At the same time there must be a vigorous and effective struggle against Soviet social imperialism, otherwise anything that weakens US imperialism's grip on Britain will improve social imperialism's chances. Just as in the struggle against the superpowers we aim our main blow at Soviet social imperialism, at home we must aim our main blow at the revisionists and "left" social democrats. They are in all respects the main enemy within the working class movement, not least because they are the most eager exponents of "collaboration" with social imperialism.

Increasingly, we must put up concrete and realistic demands for civil defence. While educating the workers on the nature of the state military forces and its counter-revolutionary role at home, in Ireland and elsewhere, communists must not advocate defeatism in the present situation. Above all, we must propagate the necessity of a just war of national liberation under the leadership of the working class and strive to develop all the conditions that will make that possible.

Speaking in Paris in October 1932, comrade Thaelman, the leader of the German communists explained:

*"Our struggle against the Versailles system has nothing in common with the imperialist demands and nationalist propaganda of the German bourgeoisie and the National Socialists... We want to destroy both the national oppression established by the Versailles treaty and the social oppression of the toilers caused by the system of capitalist profits... Our fight against the Versailles treaty is a fight for wages and bread, a fight for liberty, a fight for socialism."* 24

While there is no direct parallel in our opinion between the national oppression of Germany described by Thaelman in the 1930s and Britain's relations with the superpowers, the Third World, and other second world countries today, his dialectical approach to tactics is extremely relevant and instructive.

Here we have tried to touch on some of the urgent questions of history and of today, all of which will be taken up systematically in subsequent issues. For now we think that we have demonstrated the ACW's futile attempt to rewrite history and falsify Marxism-Leninism in the service of social-imperialism. They have chosen to part company with the Marxist-Leninist movement. We are well rid of them.

(Contributed, LS)

## NOTES

- 1 Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism. FLP, pp 4,56
- 2 Hua Guo-feng. Report to 11th Congress of the CPC, August 1977. Documents, p56.
- 3 Chairman Mao's Theory...p54.
- 4 Lenin, "Draft Thesis on the National and Colonial Question". Collected Works, Vol 31, p146.
- 5 Lenin. Letter to Zinoviev. Collected Works, Vol 35, p229.
- 6 Lenin. Letter to I.Armand. Collected Works, Vol 35, p274.
- 7 Lenin. "The Junius Pamphlet." Collected Works Vol 22, p305
- 8 Stalin. "Speech to the Moscow Electors" February 9th, 1946, Soviet News Publications, pp. 3,5
- 9 Lenin. "Conference of the RSDLP Sections Abroad" Selected Works, Vol 5 p132.
- 10 Lenin. "The War and Russian Social Democracy" Selected Works, Vol 5 p123.
- 11 Lenin. "Conference of the RSDLP Sections Abroad" Selected Works Vol 5 p132.
- 12 Stalin. "Marxism and the National and Colonial Question" p67.
- 13 Dimitrov. "Report to the Communist International Seventh Congress". Red Star Press, p40-42.
- 14 Seventh Congress of Communist International Documents, Section 14 p20-28.
- 15 Stalin. Report to the Eighteenth Congress CPSU(B), "Problems of Leninism" p596-604.
- 16 Mao Zedong. "Interview On the International Situation", Selected Works, Vol 2 p263.
- 17 Mao Zedong. "Current Situation and Party Tasks", Selected Works Vol 2, p297.
- 18 Mao Zedong. Selected Works, Vol 2, p264-265.
- 19 Harry Pollitt, "The War Danger in Abyssinia", Selected Articles, Vol 1 p163-167.
- 20 *ibid* p168.
- 21 Harry Pollitt, "Report to Enlarged Central Committee Meeting", Selected Articles Vol 1 p180.
- 22 *Daily Worker*, 8th May 1940.
- 23 Quoted in D.N.Pritt Autobiography, Part 1, p249.
- 24 Quoted by M.Ercoli (Togliatti), Speech to the 7th Congress of the Communist International, p 10.

Printed and published by the RCLB,  
c/o New Era Books, 203 Seven Sisters Rd., London N4.



# 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:  
26 ISSUES:  
FROM  
NEW ERA BOOKS