

to build up a sphere of economic and political domination which they can exploit more fully at a later date. Like any other nation which is developing an economy based on private profit, the Soviet Union needs areas to exploit.

Soviet "involvement" is designed to undermine the unity of the Chinese and Vietnamese. "Involvement" is being used to stop the revolutionary process in Vietnam and isolate the revolutionary forces. This is the real meaning of the statements:

The scientific and technical revolution of the second half of the 20th century and its subsequent revolution in military science have fundamentally changed the nature of war, aggravated its aftermath and engendered the possibility of turning what at first glance would seem to be an inconsequential conflict breaking out in some remote corner of the world, into the detonator of a universal rocket-nuclear war. In present conditions a threat to peace, wherever it appears—in Africa, Asia, Latin America or Central Europe—is equally dangerous for the peoples of all countries and imperils their national and social gains. (23 CPSU Congress: *Results and Prospects*, p. 59.)

This is the real meaning of the Soviet policy of "peaceful co-existence" applied to the focal point of revolution in the world today.

Soviet "Aid" Is a Trojan Horse Used by Imperialism

Now the Soviet Union is giving "aid" to the Vietnamese. The reason for this "aid"—its essence—is to undermine the revolutionary struggle in Vietnam, and to weaken the political struggle around the world in support of the Vietnamese.

Coupled with the "aid" is a call by the Soviet Union to all "socialist" countries for "unity of action." On the face of it, these two steps seem fine. However, Marxist-Leninists cannot simply view the superficial aspects of things but must delve deeper.

Certainly Marxist-Leninists stand for and welcome all genuine expressions of proletarian internationalism. Aid and unity of action designed to help the revolution are to be lauded. But aid and unity of action designed to betray should be rejected.

How can one unite with revisionism? The real unity in this situation is between revisionism and imperialism. No one understands this better than the imperialists. As the *Christian Science Monitor* noted:

What might have been considered another "silly" proposition in the Chinese text—the one referring to a presumed collaboration between Washington and Moscow in sabotaging "the revolutionary struggle of the people of various countries"—is widely accepted by some diplomats here as an obvious truth.

The imperialists welcome Soviet "aid" to Vietnam, for they understand its purpose. They know the Soviets are trying to drag the Vietnamese to the bargaining table to fritter away the revolution in south Vietnam and socialism in the north. U.S. imperialism, which has a clear class outlook, sees all this without trouble. As Drew Pearson wrote:

For the first time in years in which the State Department has chased down every peace feeler coming out of Hanoi, Moscow, Paris, Algeria or the U.N., it looks like something solid is in the works. Reason for optimism is two-fold. The Russians are really putting the heat on North Vietnam for peace. Since they supply MIG fighter planes, anti-aircraft guns and even train North Vietnamese pilots, their influence can be decisive. . . .

In private talks with Secretary Rusk and Goldberg, Gromyko has appeared highly interested and quite conciliatory. This is why the President took the unusual step of inviting the Soviet Foreign Minister to dinner. . . .

And in the October 24, 1966 column by Marquis Childs appears the following:

President Johnson sees the Russians, since his conference with Foreign Minister Gromyko, as anxious as the Americans to find a solution for Vietnam. This confirms the cautious optimism expressed by British Foreign Secretary George Brown following his meeting recently with Johnson in Washington.

The U.S. press is replete with instances documenting the treachery of the Soviet leaders. Here are more examples of the Munich-style efforts of the revisionists:

UPI, Moscow, November 13, 1966—Foy Kohler in his farewell talks with Soviet leaders raised the Vietnam issue. The Soviets indicated to Kohler that an end to the bombing would produce a better atmosphere and possibly lead toward progress in Vietnam.

A *New York Times* article dated November 13, 1966:

The Soviets were reliably reported to have demanded an end to U.S. bombings in North Vietnam. . . . The Soviets did not specifically mention the issue of withdrawal.

A UPI report from London, dated November 7, 1966:

Top American and British leaders are becoming increasingly convinced that Russia wants to see the Vietnamese hostilities ended. . . . The Soviet leaders have indicated cautiously . . . they may yet play an active part in a settlement.

Drew Pearson, writing in the second week of November, 1966:

Lyndon Johnson acting as his own salesman for his peace talks did some selling with Foreign Minister Gromyko. Since then some noises have come out of the Kremlin indicating that Mr. Johnson's sales effort was not in vain . . . a development of recent diplomatic events is a tacit agreement of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to pull together for peace.

The November 7, 1966 issue of the *U.S. News and World Report* gave a full roundup of the reaction of U.S. allies to Washington-Moscow collaboration. It began by saying that a "deal" was beginning to be cooked up between the U.S. and the USSR. The deal arose from the fact that "the U.S. wants the tacit aid of Russia in de-escalating the war in Vietnam," while the Soviet Union was "interested in shelving the Cold War so that they might concentrate on opposing China."

It cited Western observers as saying that:

There is growing evidence that the Soviets are moving gingerly to press for a political settlement in Vietnam. . . . The Russians want peace in Vietnam almost as much as the U.S. does because Vietnam was a handicap to its plan for peaceful co-existence with the West. . . .

Despite Vietnam, there is

a noticeable thaw in the diplomatic climate between the United States and Russia. Cautious probing is under way for agreements. . . . All around the world, in Western Europe, America and Asia—diplomats are signalling that something big is stirring in relations between the U.S. and Russia.

At the recent Bulgarian Party Congress:

A high Bulgarian official, commenting on the Soviet bloc's attitude on the war, said the main objective was to bring about a peace conference. Pre-conditions, such as a halt in U.S. bombing raids, are of no great importance. . . . He voiced concern over the intransigence of powerful groups in Hanoi, that he said, were

closer to Peking. . . . The nations of the Soviet bloc must bring pressure on Hanoi to counteract the influence of the pro-Chinese forces (*New York Times*, November 15, 1966).

A week after the Bulgarian Party Congress, the main task of which was the launching of a proposal for the convening of a conference of "communist" parties to attack China and her revolutionary policies, the United States rewarded the Bulgarians for services rendered by improving diplomatic relations, raising its representative in Sofia to the rank of ambassador and permitting a Bulgarian ambassador in Washington.

Clearly, the U.S. and the Soviet Union are trying to entrap the entire revolutionary movement into uniting with imperialism in opposition to the revolution in Vietnam. By a combination of expanded terror by the United States and "aid" with political pressure from the USSR, the Vietnamese are being pushed to make a deal, a deal they have rejected over and over again. What sort of friends of the Vietnamese would enter into this collusion? What kind of friendship is that?

Commenting on the quality of this "friendship," I.F. Stone wrote:

Let us try to see what is happening in a fresh perspective. What if Japan were again a great military power, and it was bombing a small country in Latin America allied with the United States? What would we think if our Secretary of State paid a friendly visit to the Prime Minister of Japan under such circumstances and began to negotiate favors from him, like landing rights for a New York to Tokyo airline? Imagine how Latin allies under Japanese bombardment would feel if they saw pictures of their supposed American protector in a friendly confabulation with Tokyo? This may help us to see what Johnson has already achieved in his talks with Gromyko. Whatever else comes from them, the moral effect is debasing. Johnson debases the Russians, and he debases the American people. (I.F. Stone's Weekly, October 17, 1966.)

The Soviet Union is trying to subvert the principles of people's war. The Soviet leaders would like the Vietnamese to become dependent on weaponry rather than to rely primarily on their own strength, which has been proved invincible time and time again. The Vietnamese are winning because they have developed the art of people's war to new heights. The forces of revolution grow stronger as U.S. imperialism becomes more isolated. People's war in Vietnam can't be coped with by the U.S. If the revisionists, by

increasing the doses of their "aid," were to seduce the Vietnamese into de-emphasizing the main concept of people's war—that it depends in the first place on the efforts of the entire people—this would result in undermining the revolution.

We recognize that the comrades in Vietnam are on the horns of a serious and complex dilemma. Taking "aid" from the revisionists may bring some momentary help in their battle. And it may give the appearance of unity. But the imperialists are not fooled.

To the extent that people are confused about the real nature of revisionism, revisionism is perpetuated. The cleverer tactics of the Soviet leaders have tended to lull and confuse many honest people. After all, they say, "whatever way you cut the cake, the Soviet Union is helping the Vietnamese."

The point is that there have been instances, and there will be more instances, in which different class forces work together in temporary and unstable alliances. But if each case is examined, it will be seen that a progressive aspect dominated the partial unity of purpose. For example, during World War II the Soviet Union was in an alliance with the U.S. Both wanted the defeat of Hitler but each for a different reason. Since the defeat of Hitler was critical for mankind's progress to socialism, there was a basis for partial and temporary unity. And the result was that the socialist revolution did advance.

But in the case of Vietnam, things are quite the opposite. Both the Soviet Union and the U.S. want the revolution crushed now! Therefore, there is no basis for partial and temporary unity with the revisionists. Revolutionaries should not enter into Soviet-inspired alliances. They are traps to thwart the revolution.

It's not really a new trick—this Trojan Horse. Less than two years ago, LBJ himself offered (on behalf of U.S. imperialism) to provide a multi-billion dollar program of "aid" and "development" to North Vietnam. Some might argue that the North Vietnamese leadership should have accepted Johnson's offer ("take aid wherever you can get it!"). But the strings on LBJ's "aid" were too obvious—the Trojan Horse was too transparent.

So the anti-revolutionary forces fixed up a new Trojan-Horse "aid" program and re-routed it this time via Moscow.

But the essence is the same. You can't take increasing "aid" from the revisionists and fight revisionism at the same time. That is the nub of it.

The struggle against revisionism and for unity around Marxist-Leninist principles is the responsibility of all true revolutionaries.

If some comrades believe it's possible to take "aid" from the revisionists "without strings," let them test it. Let *all* who claim to be revolutionary parties publicly call upon the revisionists to renounce their collaboration with U.S. imperialism, their phony test-ban treaty, their constant "peace" conferences, their repeated anti-China activities, their support for U.N.-U.S. aggression in the Congo, Middle East and Latin America, their applause for such reactionaries as Popes John and Paul, their military aid to the counter-revolutionaries in India and Indonesia, and abandon their attempts to deal away the Vietnamese revolution in phony "negotiations." Let *all* who claim to be revolutionary parties *publicly* call on the revisionists to *really* aid the Vietnamese revolution by renouncing their own revisionism. And see how long the revisionists continue their material "aid" to Vietnam—supposedly "without strings." (How long did Soviet material "aid" to China continue when the Chinese party publicly maintained its revolutionary position?)

In a recent interview Fidel Castro unwittingly hammered the point home:

Question: When the U.S. and Russia came to an agreement that the missiles would be removed, did Cuba have any influence by which she might have kept them?

Castro: It would have been at the cost of a complete break with the Soviet Union and that would have been really absurd on our part.

Question: Wasn't there great popular sentiment in Cuba for keeping the missiles?

Castro: All of us were advocates of keeping the missiles in Cuba. Furthermore, the possibility that the Soviet Union would withdraw them was an alternative that had never entered our minds. (*Playboy* magazine, January, 1967, p. 70.)

In our own country, people are learning with whom to make alliances and from whom to accept aid. While the situation isn't as much a military confrontation as in Vietnam, it is quite sharp in the Black Liberation Movement. Haven't Black militants learned what "unity of action" with the liberals means? Haven't they learned what it means just to take money from the liberals? It means, in essence, working with the Establishment. To take their "aid" means to accept their domination. To unite with liberals

means to abandon Black Liberation. Liberals do not give "aid" without conditions. Only to the extent that Black Liberation forces rely primarily on their own resources and unite with genuinely radical and revolutionary forces, can they hope to achieve self-determination.

In the final analysis, the Vietnamese comrades may reject Soviet "aid." They may characterize Soviet "aid" and its so-called "unity" for what it is. This would be a sharp blow to revisionism. It would demonstrate that the road to victory is reliance on the strength of the masses coupled with genuine aid from really revolutionary forces.

Of late, some previously anti-revisionist parties have attacked the Chinese for being opposed to the notion of unity with revisionism. The Chinese party has been called "dogmatic and sectarian" for this. We believe that the Japanese and north Korean parties have been sucked in by the revisionist slogan "unity in action." They define their "independence" from the Chinese party by declaring that they are ready to work with the revisionists. Inasmuch as they were always organizationally independent, this new-found cry has a false ring.

The Koreans in particular chastise the Chinese for not doing more in Vietnam. They say the socialist countries ought to be sending troops to Vietnam. But the Chinese have made it clear that if the Vietnamese ask for more aid or men, they will supply them. Certainly U.S. imperialism remembers how the Chinese honored their commitments in the Korean War, if the Koreans have temporarily forgotten.

If the Korean party leaders really believe that the revisionists want to mend their ways and conduct a real struggle against U.S. imperialism, in particular against its aggression in Vietnam, then why don't the Korean party leaders address their statements to the revisionists? Why don't they call upon the revisionists to repudiate their policies of collaboration with U.S. imperialism, to utilize their political, economic and military power throughout the world to expose, isolate and defeat U.S. imperialism? No one is tying the hands of the revisionists if they are really anxious to build a genuine struggle against U.S. imperialism.

We believe the proposal to send volunteers to Vietnam now, as advocated by the Koreans and Cubans, is a bluff. Why don't the Koreans send troops? Who stops them? (Or why don't they make a start by preventing the South Korean puppet troops from

being sent to Vietnam?) The truth of the matter is that the Vietnamese haven't asked for troops and don't want them now. The people of Vietnam are quite a match for U.S. imperialism.

The sight of the cream of U.S. armed strength being ground up by people's war in Vietnam is the greatest political lesson in the world today. It proves that oppressed peoples can take on imperialism and defeat it by relying primarily on their own efforts—even in a war.

This lesson exposes the arguments of U.S. pacifists and revisionists who use the "horrors of war" to urge phony negotiations with the U.S. aggressors—just another way of saying "lay down your arms and abandon the revolution."

What we believe is the problem with parties like the Korean and Japanese (and with many elements within revolutionary movements around the world) is their unclear estimate of revisionism. Is it counter-revolutionary or isn't it? A group of students at the University of California in Berkeley recently indicated that even non-communist radicals are becoming more and more alarmed by the revisionist position. In a leaflet calling on students to picket the First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy (who was speaking in Berkeley), they declared:

Moscow tilts Westward. This news disturbs us. We fear that the "Soviet tilt" could not come at a worse time. . . . By tilting towards the U.S. at this time, the Soviet Union encourages the most adventurist and militaristic U.S. leaders. . . . We are concerned that actions and statements of the Soviet Union give U.S. policymakers the view that the Soviet Union is prepared to sell-out China and Vietnam for a big-power division of the world into "spheres of influence."

We hope that parties like the Korean and Japanese will withdraw from the anti-China campaign which, in its essence, is a campaign for revisionism and against revolution.

Success for China's Cultural Revolution Is a Defeat for Imperialism

The Communist Party of China recognizes the serious counter-revolutionary efforts of U.S. imperialism and its revisionist allies, and is preparing itself and the world revolutionary movement to fight back and win.

There are similarities between this preparation and the period in which the Soviet Union prepared itself politically, ideologically, economically, and militarily to defeat Hitlerism. If the Soviet Union had not taken stern measures in the face of the greatest imperialist danger of that time, it would have been smashed. Instead, the greatest menace to the world, up to that point in history, was defeated. But the Chinese communists are going one big step further than the Soviets.

Revisionism received a qualitative boost at the 20th Party Congress of the S.U. It was at this Congress that the process of restoration made the "great leap." However, the roots of revisionism in the Soviet Union go deep. The ideological transformation of the masses didn't nearly keep abreast of the material development of Soviet society. Given the enormous difficulties of a backward country surrounded and under continuous attack by world imperialism, and a lack of previous socialist experience to draw from, the Soviets placed a one-sided emphasis on material development.

Stalin recognized the rightist danger and its consequences early. At a speech to a Plenum of the Moscow Party Committee in 1938 he said:

A victory of the right deviation in our party would mean an enormous accession of strength to the capitalist elements in our country. And what does this mean? It means weakening the proletarian dictatorship and multiplying the chances for the restoration of capitalism. . . Hence, a victory of the right deviation in our party would add to the conditions necessary for the restoration of capitalism in our country.

However, in fighting the rightist danger the stress was put on eliminating the small commodity producers (soil for capitalist ideas) and replacing them with new advanced techniques. Ideological struggle was limited even within the party, and certainly not developed to transform the millions.

The Chinese communists are making a thorough-going effort to transform the thinking and develop the ideology of hundreds of millions of people. Under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, led by Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese people are demonstrating that people determine the course of history.

The CPC is not making material incentives the primary motivation for the transformation of China's masses. It is really

elevating ideas, man's dialectical and creative thought, into an invincible force. And this force, the revolutionary ideology of hundreds of millions of people, is becoming the key force in shaping the future as these people join in active battle to carry the revolution through to the end.

It is in this struggle that Mao and the Chinese party are implementing the essence of Leninism. The revisionists claim that the cultural revolution is anti-Leninist. They claim that it is perverting and making a mockery of Leninism. From the outset, Lenin and Stalin warned about the possibilities of capitalist restoration. They warned that the class struggle goes on fiercely long after the smoke of revolution has died down.

Lenin wrote:

The abolition of classes is a matter of long, difficult, stubborn *class struggle* which, after the overthrow of the power of capital, *after* the destruction of the bourgeois state, *after* the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, does not *disappear* (as the vulgar people of the old socialism and of the old Social-Democracy imagine), but only changes its forms and in many respects grows fiercer still.

The proletariat must maintain its power, strengthen its organizing influence, neutralize those sections which are afraid of parting company with the bourgeoisie and too hesitatingly follow the proletariat, by waging the class struggle against the resistance of the bourgeoisie, against conservatism, routine, indecision, and the waverings of the petty bourgeoisie. It must consolidate the new discipline, the comradely discipline of the toilers, their firm ties with the proletariat, their rallying around the proletariat, this new discipline, the new basis of social ties, which is replacing the feudal discipline of the medieval ages, the discipline of starvation, the discipline of "free" wage slavery under capitalism.

In order to abolish the classes a period of the dictatorship of one class is necessary, namely, of the oppressed class which is capable not only of overthrowing the exploiters, not only of ruthlessly suppressing their resistance, but also of breaking with the entire bourgeois democratic ideology, with all the philistine phrases about freedom and equality in general (in fact, as Marx has long ago pointed out, these phrases mean the "freedom and equality" of the *commodity owners*, the "freedom and equality" of the *capitalists*. . . (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russian Edition, Vol. XXIV, pp. 314-315.)

The strength of the overthrown bourgeoisie rests in the fact that:

. . . for a long time after the revolution the exploiters inevitably continue to enjoy a number of great practical advantages: they still have money (since it is impossible to abolish money all at once), some movable property—often fairly considerable; they still have various connections, habits of organization and management, superior education, close connections with the higher technical personnel (who live and think like the bourgeoisie), incomparably greater experience in the art of war (this is very important) and so on, and so forth. (V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 140.)

Further strength of the overthrown exploiting class lies

in the *force of habit*, in the strength of *small-scale production*. For unfortunately, there is still very, very much of small-scale production left in the world, and small-scale production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale; . . .

. . . the abolition of classes means not only driving out the landlords and capitalists—that we accomplished with comparative ease; it means also *getting rid of the small commodity producers*, and they *cannot be driven out*, they cannot be crushed, we must *live in harmony* with them; they can (and must) be remoulded and re-educated only by very prolonged, slow, cautious organizational work (V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, pp. 60 and 83).

Thus, Lenin wrote:

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a most determined and most ruthless war waged by the new class against a *more powerful* enemy, the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased *tenfold* by its overthrow . . . the dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle—sanguinary and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society. (V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, pp. 60 and 84.)

China has seen the Soviet experience. The Chinese have witnessed the persistence of bourgeois ideas in many sections of their own population, especially among the intellectuals. They have seen that the institutions of higher education have, to a great degree, remained as training grounds for the children of the old middle and upper classes. Until recently, 50 per cent of the students at universities were of non-proletarian origin. To allow this to continue would indeed give great help to U.S. imperialism's cherished hopes that capitalist restoration will become possible

after the death of the original revolutionary leaders. U.S. imperialism bases its hopes for restoration (or collaboration in the event of armed struggle) on the youth. Imperialism feels that the youth, who have not gone through actual revolutionary struggle, are good targets for bourgeois ideology.

The Chinese have also seen the dry rot of intellectual corruption in Hungary and Poland burst into the flames of counter-revolution. They see its current insidious effects. A recent article in the *New York Times* (November 7, 1966) showed the sickening effect of revisionism on the youth of a so-called socialist country:

POLISH STUDENTS ADMIRE KENNEDY

LATE PRESIDENT FIRST CHOICE IN POLL TO NAME HERO

JFK was the choice of a great majority of students at the Cracow Metallurgy and Mining Academy, an advanced technical college, when asked to name their hero.

The inquiry was not a banal popularity poll but part of a sounding of the state of political and ideological awareness of Poland's future elite. . . . Only 45 per cent of 734 first-year students gave correct answers about the political organization of Poland, whereas 80 per cent were informed as to the main political parties in the United States.

Not only did President Kennedy head the list of "heroes," but no Pole placed among the first five. Following the late President were Yuri Gagarin, first man in space, President de Gaulle, Pope John XXIII and Karl Marx.

On the other hand 18 students were unable to say what job Mr. Gomulka had, and two gave wrong answers. 43 did not know that Edward Ochab was President of Poland, and 24 others said he held a different post.

Communist Party officials felt that this was a "serious matter." In the same article, further indications of the general corruption in a revisionist-controlled state are given:

Another problem that is provoking grave misgivings among Communist leaders is the progressive transformation of the party from a body held together by principles and ideals to an association of freeloaders and careerists. The same is true of student organizations, according to *Zyzie Literackie*, the literary weekly that took the poll. The article accused the leadership of the Union of Polish Students at an unidentified college of devoting its efforts to forming cliques, arranging agreeable free vacation trips for themselves and their girl friends, and above all, "impudent belittling" of learning.

These manifestations of revisionism are characteristic of all the countries dominated by the counter-revolutionaries. And just as their imperialist friends wail about the degeneration of their youth and are powerless to rectify it, so too the revisionists cry bitterly and fruitlessly. The degeneration to careerism and perversion is the logical consequence of bourgeois ideology.

Should the Chinese Communist Party sit by and twiddle its thumbs and allow China's youth to become corrupted in the guise of "liberating man's inner nature"? This corruption is not "liberating" but is one of the oldest enslavements known to man. The Chinese know that the socialist development of youth requires the destruction of individualism, of egoism, and the fostering of an unselfish approach to society. It means the end of "what's-in-it-for-me?" and the substitution of "what can I do to build socialism and make myself better in the process?" This is truly liberating. This would unleash real creativity, the real flowering of the individual and the actual development of millions of youth into an invincible revolutionary force.

Knowing that the Soviet Union has betrayed the cause of revolution in Vietnam and everywhere else; knowing that the Soviet Union and the United States are sharpening their ideological and military knives to destroy China, should not the Chinese move vigorously to defeat revisionist elements in their own ranks? Should not the Chinese prepare themselves to rely fully on their own resources? Or should they make themselves dependent on aid from revisionism? We say no! To lay themselves open to revisionism would guarantee the defeat of China, the defeat of the bulwark of world revolution.

Edgar Snow wrote in the July 30, 1966 issue of the *New Republic*:

Apart from revamping the economy to devote a major section to defense industry, great questions face Peking's leadership. What would be the character of China's military strategy against the United States? If war was unavoidable, would it not be prudent to mend fences with Russia? China's own defenses were not adequate to protect her urban industrial bases against heavy American air attack. What would be Russia's price for providing an air defense umbrella? To submit to Moscow and revisionism was unthinkable; to subject to American destruction the results of nearly two decades of sacrifice to modernize China was also unthinkable. Yet both had to be thought through.

Acceptance of the Russian line would mean a compromise

in Vietnam which would leave the United States firmly planted in Southeast Asia. If Vietnam were surrendered, why not Taiwan? And if Taiwan were abandoned why not concede American dominance in general, accept a secondary role for China, and also seek aid from the United States, like India. This reverse view of the dominoes collapsing inward on China could lead to the conclusion that capitulation to Russian pressure was synonymous with capitulation to the United States, abandonment of the revolution as well as vital national interests: and suicide for the Chinese party leadership. . . .

Marshal Lin Piao has emerged as the spokesman for the dominant view, which simply invokes all the experience of the Chinese revolutionary wars to prove Mao's old thesis, man is more important than weapons; the only kind of war China could fight and win, alone, is a protracted war dependent essentially on manpower, space, and resolute social revolutionary leadership based on unrevised Marxism-Leninism. The presence of large American armies in Asia makes Mao's kind of war possible, and the more Americans the better. China would suffer, there could be no doubt about that, but there could also be no doubt (according to Lin) about the ultimate victory.

In China the long range effort to fight the revolution through to the end is called "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution." This is a decisive class struggle. As Chou En-lai explained:

After the socialist revolution on the economic front had been basically completed the socialist revolution on political and ideological fronts was started. This revolution in its present stage of development has become the dynamic mass movement of the great proletarian cultural revolution which has stirred up the whole of society and in which hundreds of millions of people are consciously taking part. (*New York Times*, December 6, 1966.)

As the objective situation is sharpening, class sides become more distinct. Erroneous viewpoints, which might have been dealt with in a less sharp manner under different conditions, must now be dealt with quickly, thoroughly, and sharply. Now they are a dire threat to the Chinese people's ability to withstand the on-rushing efforts of revisionism and imperialism, whose new "grand alliance" waits for no one. This struggle is no Sunday picnic.

In the Chinese cultural revolution, the main criteria are deeds, not words.

What counts above all in their eyes is the conduct of one's daily life. A good communist is someone who lives in complete austerity and who on all occasions shoulders the heaviest burden.

Every official, every intellectual, who takes advantage of his position to make his life easier immediately unveils his "revisionist nature." (K.S. Karol, *New Statesman*, September 9, 1966.)

The defeat of revisionism in China involves the future of the entire world. Upon that defeat depends the freedom of hundreds of millions of workers to live as free men in a socialist state. They are fighting in China to eliminate the class base from which a return to private accumulation of society's wealth could spring because, as K. S. Karol points out, "China, over and above Vietnam, remains the main target of American aggression, and by virtue of this fact alone, she is the vanguard of the resistance to the Pax Americana."

The imperialists and revisionists spread mountains of lies about the Cultural Revolution. They know it is aimed at them from a class point of view and they are trying to defeat it at all costs.

When have the revisionists and imperialists ever based themselves on the truth? Are they really concerned about the people of China? Imperialism still prattles about the "good old China" where millions of people died from hunger, where children were sold into prostitution and any imperialist could make a buck. They openly discuss plans to "bomb them back into the Stone Age."

Revisionists and imperialists spout about their love of the Chinese masses. But the only love they have is for their lost opportunities to oppress and exploit them. In fact, the revisionists have contempt for and fear of the Chinese masses. They hate the Chinese Communist Party and its great leader Mao Tse-tung. Their hate is born of the fear that the Chinese Communist Party and people are the most powerful revolutionary force in the world, the chief obstacle to carving up the world into "spheres of influence."

All revolutionaries have a vital stake in the outcome of the Cultural Revolution. 700,000,000 Chinese steeped in revolutionary ideology would be an invincible force. It would be the first time that Marxism-Leninism became the ideology of an entire population. Heretofore, ideology was the "property" of only a few, the special province of intellectuals and a relatively few party leaders. A powerful revolutionary China is a tremendous boost to the emerging forces of revolution all over the world. Their example of proletarian self-reliance, ideologically and materially, is an inspiration to all. We wish the Cultural Revolution every success. Its every success is a key defeat for U.S. imperialism

and modern revisionism. We have great confidence that by utilizing the thought of Mao Tse-tung the experienced and tested CPC will succeed in its new historic endeavor.

The thought of Mao Tse-tung is the summarization of the experiences of the Chinese revolution. It points the way for the revolutionary process everywhere.

Therefore, the Cultural Revolution assumes historic proportions. The development of the world revolutionary movement will be immeasurably strengthened by its success.

Defeating Revisionism Internationally Is the Basis for Revolutionary Advance

The fight against revisionism must be one of the main tasks in the international communist movement. The history of the emergence of Marxism-Leninism is a history of consistent battle against all deviation. Even though Marxism-Leninism is now a minority position in the international movement, it will eventually triumph. Marxism-Leninism is invincible because it is in accord with the aspirations of the people. Revisionism, like imperialism, runs counter to the tide of history. The danger of modern revisionism is great. We cannot simply take the position that Marxism-Leninism is true and therefore it will all come out right in the end. Revisionism can only be defeated by struggle based on reality. Some of the newer features that make the struggle against revisionism difficult and complex are:

(1) Today a series of states is held in the grip of the revisionists. This is the first time in history that revisionism holds state power.

(2) The revisionists have covered up their tracks considerably. They no longer build open platforms as the Bernsteins and Kautskys did. Everything they say and do is in the name of Lenin. They claim they are bringing Leninism up to date. As they move to greater defeats they may well claim that they are bringing Stalin up to date.

(3) They play upon the fears of the world's people because of the advent of atomic weapons. Instead of demonstrating that peace can only be secured through sharpening the class struggle, they resort to the deceit of bourgeois pacifism. They try to terrorize and blackmail people to keep them from aspiring to revolution.

Because of the spread of revisionism, the imperialists have been given some short-term tactical advantages. Revisionism in power in the Soviet Union and in other countries means defeats for the international working class. Revisionism prolongs the fight against imperialism. Specific battles against imperialism will be successful to the extent they overcome revisionism. It is important for all revolutionaries to learn from defeats as well as successes. Unless revolutionary forces learn from their errors they will not be able to exploit the generally favorable conditions for revolution.

Revisionism cannot be underestimated. In the long run it will be smashed. In the short run it can cause considerable harm. What makes Marxism-Leninism powerful is the ability to learn from failure and change. Imperialism cannot do this. At best it can make tactical, but never strategic, changes. Sometimes imperialism is so pragmatic and subjective that it can't make even tactical adjustments.

History has shown that Marxism-Leninism has emerged stronger from each major struggle with revisionism. But the struggle against revisionism isn't won on the pages of a magazine, but in life! Real struggles have to be carried on against the enemy. His forces must be sapped until he can be defeated.

Our party, like scores of groups around the world, has sprung up to carry forward the banner of revolution. All these groups will be judged by their ability to wage struggles with the enemy and win. Only those that learn over a long period of time to apply Marxism-Leninism to their particular circumstances will earn the confidence of the people and stand the test of life.

It is useful to look at Stalin's description of revisionism in the Second International. Revisionists appeared to have dominated the movement.

I said above that between Marx and Engels on the one hand and Lenin on the other lay a whole period of domination by the opportunism of the Second International. To be more precise, I must add that it was not so much a question of the formal as of the actual domination of opportunism. Formally, the Second International was headed by "orthodox" Marxists like Kautsky and others. Actually, however, its fundamental work followed the line of opportunism. Because of their petty-bourgeois adaptable nature, the opportunists adapted themselves to the bourgeoisie; as for the "orthodox" they adapted themselves to the opportunists in order to "maintain unity" with the latter, to maintain "peace within

the Party"! As a result, opportunism dominated, because the links between the policy of the bourgeoisie and the policy of the "orthodox" were joined.

It was a period of relatively peaceful development of capitalism, a pre-war period so to speak, when the disastrous contradictions of imperialism have not yet so obviously revealed themselves, when economic strikes and trade unions developed more or less "normally," when in the electoral struggles and parliamentary fractions "dizzy" successes were exalted to the skies, and when it was hoped to "kill" capitalism by legal means. In other words, it was a period when the parties of the Second International were becoming gross and stodgy, and no longer wanted to think seriously about revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the revolutionary training of the masses.

Instead of a coherent revolutionary theory, they propounded contradictory theoretical postulates, fragments of theory isolated from the actual revolutionary struggle of the masses, and which had been transformed into threadbare dogmas. For the sake of appearances they always, of course, referred to the theory of Marx, but only to rob it of its living revolutionary spirit.

Instead of a revolutionary policy there was effete philistinism, practical politics, parliamentary diplomacy and parliamentary scheming. For the sake of appearances, of course, "revolutionary" resolutions and slogans were passed only to be pigeon-holed.

Instead of educating and teaching the Party true revolutionary tactics from a study of its own mistakes, we find a studied evasion of thorny questions, which were glossed over and veiled. In order to keep up appearances they were not averse to talking about these awkward questions, only to wind up with some sort of "elastic" resolution.

Such were the features, the methods of work and the armoury of the Second International. (J.V. Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism.*)

Despite the opportunism in the Second International the mighty communist movement was born.

Today, even though Marxism-Leninism is not the majority in the old communist movement, Marxism-Leninism is a much more powerful force throughout the world than in Lenin's time. It is becoming the dominant trend in all the newly-emerging revolutionary forces, and for all the revolutionary peoples of the world. In the final analysis this is more important than whether or not revisionism will be defeated within the old C.P.'s.

Also, the current struggle against modern revisionism, led by the Communist Party of China, has raised Marxist thought to new heights. The thought of Mao Tse-tung is proving invaluable to revolutionaries all over the world. In this debate revisionism is being challenged to a degree that it was never challenged before.

A far more fundamental approach is being taken by millions, *not just a few*. And backing up this titanic struggle is the powerful Chinese Communist Party which gives the revolutionary movement a courageous example.

Only the development of a new, powerful, united revolutionary movement can halt the increasing possibility of World War III. Revisionism has increased the danger of World War III and has made a vast Asian war probable! Revisionism has split the solid front of struggle against U.S. imperialism. The split has only emboldened U.S. imperialism. It is true that only a world communist movement united around a revolutionary line, and developing the widest front against U.S. imperialism, might be powerful enough to prevent World War III.

But whatever difficulties revisionism has imposed on the revolutionary movement, and despite the apparent strength of imperialism, great possibilities exist for waging varied revolutionary actions. The political and economic base of imperialism is dwindling as contradictions upon contradictions arise and sharpen.

Combat Revisionism Within the Progressive Labor Party

It would be most naïve of us not to recognize the danger of revisionism in our party. We function in the center of the strongest imperialist power in the world. The ideological pressures on us are extremely strong. The ruling class has a million and one ways of undermining our commitment to Marxism-Leninism. Corruption is a big aspect of American life. We all bring some into the party. Therefore our efforts have to be complete and not partial. Only the most diligent exemplary efforts can maintain our initial positive efforts.

Even though we have embarked on a more consistent educational program the results are still limited. It will take a long hard effort for our study to bear fruit. We must learn how to overcome laziness in thought. After all, this is a bourgeois trait. Studying by rote, instead of by struggle and practice, is a very dangerous tendency in our party. It limits our ability to apply universally true Marxist-Leninist ideas to the conditions in which we are working. The mere recital and memorization of "truth" leads only to passivity on our part and "leftist" errors. It prevents us from strug-

gling in a constructive and creative way and winning over the people with whom we are working.

Moreover, the object of our study must be to learn Marxism-Leninism. As our struggles develop, the Marxist classics will take on a new and more profound meaning. They will become far more relevant and will be invaluable in guiding our work. We must time and time again study, restudy, think and rethink so as to understand the fundamental question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Imperialism has been partially successful in undermining communists' understanding of this valid and essential concept. In our country, because of the non-class ideas about democracy, much more work and study must be done to solidify ourselves, and be able to win others to this idea.

The main manifestation of revisionism inside our party at the present time is the continued isolation of too many members from the working people. We have made some progress here in recent months, but not enough.

It's important to recognize this, because we usually view isolation simply as a sectarian or "leftist" error—which it is—but we seldom attack it as a reflection of revisionism. Yet revisionism is fundamentally the substitution of individual bourgeois interests for the interests of the working class, and that is precisely what happens when members refuse to join the people. Examples are numerous in every area of work:

One member spends his time running around from one internal meeting to another, usually giving advice, so he is "too busy" to get a job. Another member manages to get a job but manages also to quit or get fired from each job after no more than two months. Another member finally manages to hold a job for six months but spends all his free time getting as far away from his fellow-workers as possible. Another member does pretty good political work on his job, but when his wife—who is doing community work with workers in the neighborhood—asks him to come to a party at the home of a local tenant, he refuses, saying he would rather spend his Saturday nights at another party with students. Among student members the idea of a worker-student alliance is advocated on paper, but to get some people to actually go out and meet the workers is like pulling teeth. Still other members know workers (either on the job or in the community) but make no real effort to become friends, and are unable to have

political discussions with them except in the most patronizing and missionary manner.

Essentially what these members—most of whom come from middle-class backgrounds—are saying is that working people are a drag. You have to spend time with them (because that's the line) but mainly others should do it. ("As for me, I agree but I'm too busy.") It comes down to: spend time with workers if you have to—but spend as little time as you have to. On paper, they say the working class must lead the revolution, etc., but their lives say they don't really give a damn about working people. One who is not willing to devote a Saturday night to workers is hardly likely to devote his whole life.

These people really wish that some way could be found to make the revolution without bothering with the working class. And after the revolution, if they do not change their ideology, these people would be the first to abandon the working class.

That is revisionism. It takes the form of "leftism" in day-to-day work. It not only comes from a bourgeois outlook, it leads (through continuing isolation from the working class) to a more bourgeois outlook. If it is not fiercely opposed and overcome by our party, our party will never lead the working class. And no matter what these members might secretly wish, socialism cannot be achieved without the leadership of the working class.

Of course, there are other examples of revisionism, mentioned above, and at different stages of development one or another of these might be the main danger to our party's work. (It's possible, for example, to have a party whose members have close ties among the working class yet which follows a reformist, "peaceful struggle," line or some other revisionist policy.) But at this stage, we must fight isolation.

Because of the tactical strength of U.S. imperialism we must develop an impregnable, unshakable class position. The revolution will succeed in this country only to the degree that it has a base among large sections of the working class. Bourgeois ideology is particularly strong when it comes to undermining confidence in the working class. The enemy likes nothing better than to hear radicals talk about the "corrupt workers," and to hear self-professed "independent" socialists wail about the "utter hopelessness of white workers." The United States is a modern industrial country. It has millions of workers. Without them we can throw in the towel.

It's funny how the ruling class is becoming less smug about the ability of their current labor lieutenants to keep the workers in line. Hence the spate of articles in *Life*, *Fortune* and other magazines promoting new "leaders" better able to mislead workers. In this sense Gus Hall's apparent idiocy that "every honest trade union leader will welcome our help in mobilizing and educating his members—if he feels it is not directed against him" (*Labor, Key Force*, Gus Hall, p. 31) takes on a real and ominous meaning.

Our party must become the party of the working class in every sense. We have made progress in this effort. Obviously, we have a long way to go.

We can best measure our efforts to combat revisionism by measuring the results of our work. Are we growing in our ability to bring people into struggle with imperialism? Are we developing a base among key sections of the people for the party and its line? Do we fight to do this in a serious way? Do non-party forces with whom we work view us as serious in our outlook? Have we overcome pragmatism in our work? Do we have a long-range perspective? Is our performance the best we can do? Are we self-critical about our work, or are we content and satisfied with everything? Is the party the most important thing in our lives? Is the party, the working class, the fight for revolutionary socialism the main thing in all that we think, in all that we do? We believe that on all those matters we are learning to improve and have improved. But we are far from satisfied. No partial effort can defeat U.S. imperialism.

U.S. imperialism and revisionism are determined to destroy the revolutionary process. They hate revolution. They hate revolutionaries. History past and recent has shown us their hatred—the hundreds of freedom fighters murdered in our country, the hundreds of thousands of Indonesians, the hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese—all murdered by imperialism and its junior partner, modern revisionism. Do we ardently hate them? Can we match them in determination to win our class goals? We must if we want to win.

To win means to defeat revisionism. Revisionism is imperialist ideology in our midst to prevent our victory. The enemy will never let up, so long as he has a breath in him. Nor can we!