

PROLETARIAT

THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANIZATION
OF THE U.S.A.

Republication of the

Report of the Central Committee of the
MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANIZATION OF BRITAIN

on

THE ROLE OF "CENTRIST" REVISIONISM

WORKERS OF ALL LANDS AND OPPRESSED PEOPLES UNITE!



Vol.2, No.1

Jan.-Feb.,1971

PROLETARIAT

THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANIZATION OF THE U.S.A.

Volume 2, Number 1

January-February, 1971

CONTENTS

Report of the Central Committee of the
MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANIZATION OF BRITAIN

on
THE ROLE OF "CENTRIST" REVISIONISM

The PROLETARIAT is published bi-monthly by the Marxist-Leninist Organization of the U.S.A. The articles appearing in the PROLETARIAT represent the views of the Organization.

The Editorial Board of the PROLETARIAT encourages all Marxist-Leninists to send their manuscripts, criticisms, comments and correspondence to:

PROLETARIAT
c/o M.L.O.U.S.A.
1550 Steiner St.
Station A
P.O. Box 15094
San Francisco, Calif. 94115



WORKERS OF ALL LANDS AND OPPRESSED PEOPLES UNITE!

CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION:</u>	1
<u>PART ONE:</u>	3
Japanese Revisionism	4
Indonesian Revisionism	7
Vietnamese Revisionism	11
Korean Revisionism	14
Cuban Revisionism	18
<u>PART TWO:</u>	23
The Reason for the Development of "Centrist" Revisionism	26
New "Centrist" Revisionist Parties	28
Indian Revisionism	29
Belgian Revisionism	35
Revisionist Tendencies in the Leadership of the Communist Party of China 1959-1966	41
<u>PART THREE:</u>	46
The Reorientation of Soviet Foreign Policy	48
The Reorientation of the "International Communist Movement"	49
The Soviet-Chinese Inter-Capitalist Contradiction	53
The New Soviet Foreign Policy	55
The "European Collective Security" Scheme	56
Soviet and "Centrist" Revisionist Policy in Relation to Latin America	61
The New Chinese Foreign Policy	64
The New United States Foreign Policy	67
<u>PART FOUR:</u>	75
The "Reunification" of the "International Communist Movement"	75
The Proposal for a "Small State Bloc"	78
Ultra-Revisionism in the Established Capitalist Countries	80
The (Reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium Enters the "Centrist" Revisionist Camp	85
Reunifying the Split Revisionist-Led Parties	88
"Reorganisation" of the Ultra-Revisionist-Led Parties	89
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	90
<u>SUMMARY</u>	91

REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE M.L.O.B.

ON

THE ROLE OF "CENTRIST" REVISIONISM

INTRODUCTION

Revisionism is the perversion of Marxism-Leninism so as to produce an ideology which - while claiming to be "the creative development of Marxism-Leninism" in order to deceive the working class - in reality serves the interests of the capitalist class.

During the last twenty years in particular, a number of trends of modern revisionism have come to dominate the communist parties of the world, converting them almost without exception into political instruments serving the interests of the capitalist class. As a result of this betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, the science of socialist revolution, on the part of the leaderships of the communist parties of the overwhelming majority of countries, the working class in these countries is without a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party and so is unable to make any significant social advance towards socialist revolution.

The task of rebuilding Marxist-Leninist vanguard parties of the working class is an essential task facing Marxist-Leninists in all these countries. In order that they may be, indeed, genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, it is important to examine the various trends of revisionism that have raised their heads in recent years and to expose them clearly as ideologies which serve the interests of the class enemy of the proletariat. Only if this is done can the revolutionary purity of Marxism-Leninism as the science of proletarian revolution be maintained; only if this is done can the new Marxist-Leninist parties now in course of construction in each country be armed to defeat decisively the various new revisionist doctrines - reflecting bourgeois thought and practice - which world imperialism, in the desperation of its final death agony, throws up in its attempts to confuse and disorientate the proletarian revolutionary forces; only if this is done can the new Marxist-Leninist parties now in course of construction be capable of leading the working class in each country to the victory of the socialist revolution.

Revisionism of the right which has its international headquarters in Moscow, serves in general the interests of the capitalist classes of countries where this class holds state power. In the older capitalist countries (as distinct from the neo-capitalist countries which were formerly socialist), it misrepresents the capitalist state, the machinery of rule of the capitalist class, as a "democratic" structure capable of being utilised by the working class to establish "socialism" by peaceful, constitutional means. The parties dominated by right revisionism in such countries have degenerated into new types of social-democratic parties which serve the interests of the capitalist class by diverting the working class from the essential task of organising themselves to prepare for the destruction of the capitalist state machine - without which revolutionary action the working class cannot establish its political power and proceed to build a socialist society - into non-revolutionary electoral and reformist activity harmless to the capitalist ruling class.

Right revisionism also serves the interests of a privileged stratum in a socialist society where such a stratum has been permitted to develop as a result of some distortion of socialist principles - for example, the distortion of the principle of remuneration according to work performed. In these countries it stands - under slogans such as "freedom" and "democracy" - for the restoration of a capitalist society and the conversion of this privileged stratum into a neo-capitalist class which exploits the labour of the working people through the medium of a state apparatus within the framework of which the mechanism for the extraction of surplus value has been developed, while the false banner of "socialism" is maintained as a deceptive facade. Soviet right revisionism serves, in particular, the interests of the new class of state capitalists which has emerged in the Soviet Union as a result of this process of degeneration.

Ultra-revisionism, which has its international headquarters in Bucarest, is a logical development of right revisionism in those former socialist countries where, as a result of the development of capitalist relations of production, the neo-capitalist class has become differentiated into two factions: one faction, that represented politically by the "orthodox" right revisionists, sees its best interests served by the retention of the apparatus of a state-capitalist exploitation within the international framework of neo-colonial subservience to the Soviet Union; the other faction, that represented politically by the ultra-revisionists, sees its best interests served by the replacement of the "socialist" state facade by an indirectly structured system more akin to that of the older capitalist countries and known popularly as the "free enterprise" system, and by the withdrawal of the country in question from the Soviet-dominated bloc into the sphere of influence of one or other of the older imperialist powers. Ultra-revisionism serves the interests of this latter faction of the capitalist class in a formerly socialist country by calling - under slogans such as "more freedom" and "more democracy" - for the establishment of multi-party parliamentary "democracy" within the framework of which the neo-capitalist class can organise its own open political parties and do away with certain limitations on its home and foreign policy imposed by the retention of the "socialist" state facade.

Revisionism of the "left", which has its international headquarters in Peking, is so called because it opposes the concept of peaceful transition to socialism put forward by the right revisionists and urges the necessity for armed struggle. "Left" revisionism serves, in general, the interests of the nascent capitalist classes of colonial-type countries dominated by imperialism. The key concept of the "left" revisionist ideology known as "Mao Tse-tung Thought" is that the national bourgeoisie in a colonial-type country (i.e., that section of the capitalist class which is not dependent upon imperialism but has, on the contrary, its economic development frustrated by imperialism) may play a revolutionary role not only in the national-democratic revolution (for the victory of which the national capitalist class of the oppressed country needs to put forward the concept of armed struggle) but also in the socialist revolution. Consequently, the "left" revisionists propagate the illusory view that, following the victory of the national-democratic revolution, "socialism" may be peacefully constructed by a ruling coalition of classes which includes the national bourgeoisie. Of course, the "socialism" which the national capitalists willingly - even enthusiastically - cooperate in building is, in fact, one or other form of state capitalism in which the "new democratic state" represents a disguised machinery of rule of the national bourgeoisie and permits them to continue - and to increase - their exploitation of the working class through such media as "joint state-private enterprises" and pseudo-"cooperatives." In colonial-type countries where the capitalist class needs the active cooperation of the workers and peasants to achieve national liberation, but where the political consciousness of these workers and peasants is such that (given leadership by a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party) they could themselves seize and maintain the leading role in the national-democratic revolution, the "left" revisionist party serves as the political and organisational weapon by means of which the national bourgeoisie can hold, in practice, the leading role in the national-democratic revolution.

Chinese "left" revisionism serves, in particular, the interests of the Chinese national capitalist class which, since the victory of the counter-revolutionary "cultural revolution" in 1966-68, holds political power by means of a military dictatorship which, for demagogic reasons, it chooses to call "the dictatorship of the proletariat." At home, it presents the system of state capitalism to the exploited working class as "socialism" for which "sacrifices must be made"; abroad, it serves as an ideological weapon for the Chinese capitalist class to secure positions in the national liberation movements of colonial-type countries emerging from imperialist domination (as well as within the People's Republic of Albania, for the moment the only socialist state left in the world) with a view to the transformation of these countries into semi-colonies of the People's Republic of China.

"Left" revisionism - with its concept of the necessity for armed revolutionary struggle - is only of secondary service to the capitalist classes of developed capitalist countries. Such service by the maoist parties and groups is performed mainly through the stimulation (under "Marxist-Leninist" slogans) of racialism and spurious nationalism (such as, in Britain, "black nationalism", spurious Scottish and Welsh "nationalism") which, to the extent that it is successful, disrupts unified struggle by the working class, as well as through attempts to hold back and disrupt the cardinal task of rebuilding genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class.

"Centrist" revisionism, which is the subject of this Report, is a trend of revisionism which appeared on the international scene about 1962. It is so called because, during the first phase of its development, it appeared to be intermediate in a number of respects between Marxism-Leninism and right revisionism - that is, it appeared to be to the left of Soviet revisionism (many concepts and actions of which it criticised) while not fully accepting Marxist-Leninist positions.

In recent years a number of important communist parties came to adopt such "centrist" position, including the Communist Party of Japan, the Communist Party of Indonesia, the Workers' Party of Vietnam, the Workers' Party of Korea and the Communist Party of Cuba.

The aim of this Report is to analyse the role of "centrist" revisionism in relation to the changing world situation and in the light of the developing world imperialist crisis.

PART ONE

In this first part of the Report we wish to analyse objectively the main programmatic line of:

- a) the Communist Party of Japan;
- b) the Communist Party of Indonesia;
- c) the Workers' Party of Vietnam;
- d) the Workers' Party of Korea; and
- e) the Communist Party of Cuba.

This analysis will demonstrate that all these parties, without exception, were under blatant revisionist leadership at the time when they took up a "centrist" position.

JAPANESE REVISIONISM

a) In the service of the alliance between Japanese monopoly capital and US monopoly capital.

Following the defeat of Japanese imperialism in World War II, Japan was occupied, disarmed and economically weakened by the forces of US imperialism. In the period following the end of the war, the Japanese monopoly capitalists pursued a policy of full collaboration with the US imperialists - at the same time making use of this collaboration to rebuild their economic and military strength.

During this immediate post-war period the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of Japan placed the party's services at the disposal of the US-Japanese alliance. Nosaka, returning to Japan from exile with the Chinese "left" revisionists in Yanan, was the leading figure who initiated the illusory concept of "peaceful transition to socialism" in Japan - as a result of the "democracy" brought to the country by US imperialism:

"The stay of Allied troops is aimed at disarming Japan and, at the same time, at liberating the people from a totalitarian policy, at making Japan a democratic country." (S.Nosaka: Report to the Second Congress of the Communist Party of Japan, cited in: "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!", January 6th, 1950; p.3).

"The Party intends, by peaceful democratic means, to develop the social system into a ... socialist system." (S.Nosaka: Draft Manifesto of the Communist Party of Japan, cited in: "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!", January 6th, 1950; p.3).

In January 1950, the Communist Information Bureau issued a very strong criticism of the policy of the Japanese revisionists:

"Nosaka, one of the leading figures in the Communist Party of Japan endeavoured to prove that all the necessary conditions are at hand in post-war Japan for effecting the peaceful transition to socialism, even under conditions of the occupying regime. ...

Nosaka's 'theory' is the theory of boosting American imperialism, and, consequently, a theory of deception of the popular masses of Japan. ...

As we see, Nosaka's 'theory' has nothing whatever in common with Marxism-Leninism. ... It serves only the imperialist occupiers in Japan." ("Concerning the Situation in Japan", in "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!", January 6th, 1950, p.3).

As a result of the Communist Information Bureau's correct criticism, a serious split occurred in the Communist Party of Japan. As Nosaka himself put it seven years later:

"The situation which developed at that time revealed the weak sides of the Communist Party. The split which took place in the Central Committee split the entire Party." (S. Nosaka: "Results of the Seventh Congress of the Japanese Communist Party", in: "World Marxist Review", November 1958; p.39).

Not for eleven years was it possible for the Japanese revisionists to regroup their forces and secure acceptance of a new programme:

"The Seventh Congress... (held in 1958 - P.B., MLOB) was unable to adopt a programme. ... This task was solved by the Eighth Congress (held in 1961 - P.B., MLOB) (S.Nosaka: "For an Independent, Democratic Japan," in: "World Marxist Review", February 1962: p.14).

b) In the service of Japanese "national" monopoly capital.

As long ago as 1952 Stalin drew attention to the inevitability that the defeated Japanese imperialists would eventually (like their counterparts in Europe, the West German imperialists) endeavour to break free from the domination of US imperialism in order to strike out on an independent course in their own interests:

"Let us pass to the major vanquished countries, Germany (Western) and Japan. These countries are now languishing in misery under the jackboot of American imperialism. Their industry and agriculture, their trade, their foreign and home policies, and their whole life are fettered by the American occupation "regime". Yet only yesterday these countries were great imperialist powers and were shaking the foundations of the domination of Britain, the USA and France in Europe and Asia. To think that these countries will not try to get on their feet again, will not try to smash the US "regime", and force their way to independent development, is to believe in miracles." (J.V. Stalin: "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR"; Moscow; 1952; p.38-39).

As a result of the uneven development of capitalism, by the beginning of the 1960's the economic and military strength of Japanese imperialism was increasing rapidly, while that of US imperialism was already declining. By 1964 Japanese capital investment abroad, most of it directed towards South-East Asia, had reached more than 2,000 million dollars, and Japan had more than 270,000 men in the armed forces and a large elite officer corps capable of rapidly training a much larger force.

By the 1960's, therefore, favourable conditions were beginning to develop for the Japanese imperialists to begin serious preparations to break free from the domination of the USA. Today, indeed, the Japanese imperialists feel themselves strong enough to resist important US demands. For example, when the US delegation to the US-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs presented demands to the Committee at its meeting in Tokyo in July, 1969, that Japan should lift its import restrictions on 120 US export lines and grant more favourable conditions for the sale of US cars in Japan and for US investment in the Japanese car industry, while at the same time limiting Japanese textile exports to the United States, the Japanese Minister of Foreign Trade, Ohira, firmly rejected the US demands. And at the Japanese-American Assembly held in Shimoda in September 1969, Yasuhiro Nakasone - a prominent member of Japan's ruling Liberal Democrat Party - demanded that the Japan-US security Treaty be annulled, and Okinawa returned to Japan, not later than 1975.

By the 1960s, too, the Japanese imperialists had begun to make their own preparations for the building of alliances in South-East Asia. Such was the "Basic Treaty" concluded in 1965 between Japan and South Korea, intended to pave the way for the use of South Korea as a springboard for Japanese aggression on to the Asian Continent. Such, too, are the plans announced by the Sato government for the establishment of a "common market" to include South Korea and Taiwan, and a "yen monetary area" to include Malaysia, Thailand and the Philippines.

When the Japanese revisionists adopted their new programme at the Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of Japan in 1961, they recognized the new situation that was beginning to develop.

"The situation in the country is defined by the programme as follows:...'Although Japan is a highly developed capitalist country, she has become a semi-colonial appendage to US imperialism'. ...

The positions of the Japanese monopoly bourgeoisie have been strengthened somewhat both at home and abroad, and this fact has aggravated the contradictions between the US and the Japanese monopolies, particularly in the sphere of foreign trade and Japan's economic development." (S.Nosaka: "For an Independent, Democratic Japan" in: "World Marxist Review", February 1962; p.14,15).

In their new programme, therefore, the Japanese revisionists adopted policies having the effect of placing the Communist Party of Japan at the service of the Japanese "national" monopoly capitalists - i.e., of that section of the Japanese monopoly capitalist class which, in its own imperialist interests, wishes, and is preparing, to break free from the fetters imposed by US imperialism.

"The task devolving on our Party and the working class in this situation is to broaden the joint struggle of the working people and other democratic forces, to preserve the united front and to develop it into a united national democratic front against the domination of American imperialism...regarding the joint struggle against the 'security treaty' as the main task." (S.Nosaka: *ibid.*; p.16).

The new programme of the Japanese revisionists does not, of course, call upon the working people of Japan to prepare for the violent, revolutionary overthrow of the rule of monopoly capital. Its aim is to secure the election of a "coalition government" which will represent the interests of the 'patriotic monopoly capitalists' who wish to break free from US domination.

"The Communist Party calls on the people to fight during the forthcoming elections, and through mass action, for the formation of a 'democratic coalition government which will oppose the security treaty'". (S.Tanaka: "The Japanese People Strike a Blow at American Policy", in: "World Marxist Review", August 1960; p.34).

The change of government is described as

"a democratic revolution" (S.Nosaka: "For an Independent, Democratic Japan", in: "World Marxist Review", February 1962; p.15).

since the "patriotic monopoly capitalists" are expected to be so grateful to the Japanese working people for their assistance in ousting the "treacherous monopoly capitalists" from office that they will collaborate, through the "united national democratic front" in establishing

"genuine independence and democracy", (S.Nosaka: *ibid.*; p.15)

under which a "peaceful transition to socialism" may be brought about.

"Thus from a revolution with the objective of achieving independence and democracy, it will inevitably and steadily develop into a socialist revolution." (S.Nosaka: *ibid.*; p.16).

The leaders of the Japanese Communist Party have not changed the fundamentals of their revisionist policy since the 1940s. Then, however, it was US imperialism which would bring "genuine democracy" to Japan; now it is the Japanese "patriotic monopoly capitalists."

But - the revisionist concept of "peaceful transition to socialism" apart from the whole concept of a "national front" in an imperialist country such as Japan is wholly foreign to Marxism-Leninism. In a colonial-type country dominated by imperialism it is, of course, correct for Marxist-Leninists to strive to build a national democratic front of all the forces interested in national liberation - including, if possible, the national bourgeoisie - under the leadership of the working class. But in an imperialist country which is in contradiction with another imperialist state - whether that contradiction take the form of rivalry, war or domination by the latter - the slogan of "national independence" is one which serves, not the interests of the working class but those of 'one's own' imperialists. The task of Marxist-Leninists of an imperialist country in such a situation is to take advantage of these inter-imperialist contradictions in order to advance the position of the working class, not to assist one national group of imperialists against another. In calling for "a national front" to struggle for "national independence", the Japanese revisionists have sunk to a position of outright chauvinism equivalent to that of the "socialists" of the Second International, who betrayed the working classes of the imperialist countries in the inter-imperialist war of 1914-18 under the slogan "Defence of the Fatherland!"

INDONESIAN REVISIONISM

In the service of Indonesian national capital.

The leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party characterised Indonesia after "independence" as a semi-colonial state in which political power was in the hands of the comprador capitalists (i.e., that section of the capitalist class closely linked with and dependent upon foreign imperialism) and the landlords - that is, as a state in which the national-democratic revolution had not been completed.

"In Indonesia, political power was in the hands of compradors and landlords who represented the interests of imperialism and the vestiges of feudalism." (Self-criticism of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia, September 1966, in: "Peking Review", July 21st, 1967; p.18).

"The task of national liberation is far from being completed. Economically Indonesia is not yet fully independent and, in essence, is still a semi-colony." (D.N.Aidit: "For National Unity", in: "World Marxist Review", February 1960; p.22).

It held that the revolutionary forces of the uncompleted Indonesian national-democratic revolution consisted of the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. For example, the Seventh National (Extraordinary) Congress of the Party held in April 1962

"described the period between the two last congresses as one of fierce struggle between the workers, peasants, the petty urban bourgeoisie, intellectuals and the national bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the imperialists, landowners, compradors and bureaucratic capital, on the other." (R.Yunus: "Party Congresses: Indonesia", in: "World Marxist Review", August 1962; p.64).

The policy of the Party was thus to form a "revolutionary united front" composed of the above revolutionary classes for the purpose, first, of completing the national-democratic revolution. In theory, this revolutionary united front was to be led by the working class, but instead of mobilising the working class to struggle against the national capitalist class to establish its leading role, the

revisionist leadership of the Party adopted a policy of "support" of and "assistance" to the national bourgeoisie, that is, a policy in practice of tailing behind the national bourgeoisie. As the programme of the Party emphasised:

"It is necessary to support and assist the national industrialists." (Programme of the Communist Party of Indonesia, cited in: "World Marxist Review", November 1963; p.59).

The revisionist leaders of the Party stated categorically:

"Far from combating it (i.e., national capitalism - P.B., MLOB), we insist that each government assist and protect national industrialists and traders against the competition of the big foreign capitalists. The plight of the people of Indonesia is caused not by the existence of an excessive number of national capitalists but, on the contrary, along with other reasons, by the small number of national capitalists and the dominance of foreign imperialists." (D.N. Aidit, cited in: S.L.: "The Communist Party of Indonesia and the National Capitalists", in: "World Marxist Review", November 1963; p.59).

"Greater activity by the national industrialists would also provide more jobs for the workers. ...

The Party organisations give every support and assistance to those organisations of national capitalists which truly represent the interests of the national capitalists generally, and of industrialists in particular." (S.L.: "The Communist Party of Indonesia and the National Capitalists", in: "World Marxist Review", November 1963; p.59-60).

The policy of accepting, in practice, the leadership of the national capitalist class in the national-democratic revolution was reflected in the recognition of Sukarno, a representative of the national bourgeoisie, as "the leader of the Indonesian revolution", whose "theoretical works" were required reading for members of the Communist Party:

"The Party leadership went so far as to accept without any struggle the recognition of Sukarno as 'the great leader of the revolution!'" (Self-criticism of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia, September 1966, in: "Peking Review", July 21st, 1967; p.18).

"He who has not studied and understood the works by the leading personalities of the Indonesian Revolution, particularly Sukarno's books 'For an Independent Indonesia' and 'Indonesia Accuses', cannot become a conscious revolutionary in the conditions of today." (D. N. Aidit: "Ideological Work in the Communist Party of Indonesia", in: "World Marxist Review", July 1959; p.27).

In short, the "revolutionary united front"

"was not a revolutionary united front, because it was not led by the working class, nor was it based on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry under the leadership of the working class." (Self-criticism of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia, September 1966, in: "Peking Review", July 21st, 1967; p.18).

The revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia presented the state in Indonesia, not as the machinery of rule of the oppressing classes, but as one of dual power - a "state" in which the progressive classes favouring the

completion of the national-democratic revolution shared power with the reactionary classes opposed to this. And because Sukarno, a representative of the national bourgeoisie, held the post of President, while other nationalists (and, after August 1964, a communist) held cabinet posts, it was held that "the people's aspect" of the state had become the dominant aspect:

"The climax of the deviation from Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state committed by the Party leadership was the formulation of the 'theory of the two aspects' in the state power of the Republic of Indonesia.

The 'two-aspect theory' viewed the state and the state power in the following way:

'The state power of the Republic, viewed as contradiction, is a contradiction between two opposing aspects. The first aspect is the aspect which represents the interests of the people (manifested by the progressive stands and policies of President Sukarno that are supported by the C.P.I. and other groups of the people). The second aspect is the aspect that represents the enemies of the people (manifested by the stands and policies of the Right-wing forces and die-hards). The people's aspect has now become the main aspect and takes the leading role in the state power of the Republic.'

The 'two-aspect' theory is an opportunist or revisionist deviation, because it denies the Marxist-Leninist teaching that 'the state is an organ of the rule of a definite class which cannot be reconciled with its antipode (the class opposite to it)'. It is unthinkable that the Republic of Indonesia can be jointly ruled by the people and the enemies of the people." (Self-criticism of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia, *ibid.*; p. 17).

The revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of Indonesia presented the reactionary officer caste of the armed forces of the state as "revolutionary democrats":

"Revolutionary tradition is strong among the officers and non-commissioned officers and other ranks of Indonesia's armed forces, so that it is not easy to entice them into betraying the Republic and democracy." (D.N. Aidit:

"For National Unity", in: "World Marxist Review", February 1960; p. 21).

In conjunction with their "two-aspect theory" of the state, the revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of Indonesia presented the prospect of the victory of the national-democratic revolution by means of a peaceful "shifting of the internal balance of forces" within the state, to be followed by an equally peaceful further shifting of this balance of forces to bring about the socialist revolution:

"The struggle for democracy is also a struggle for removing from the state apparatus those elements who are anti-democratic." (Rawang: "From the Experience of the Communist Party of Indonesia", in: "World Marxist Review", August 1963; p. 59).

"The Fourth Plenary Session of the Central Committee...uncritically approved a report which supported the lines of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and adopted the line of 'achieving socialism peacefully through parliamentary means'... This 'peaceful road', one of the characteristics of modern revisionism, was further reaffirmed in the Sixth National Congress of the CPI...

This revisionist line was further emphasised in the Seventh (Extraordinary) National Congress of the CPI (in 1962 - PB, MLOB) and was never corrected. ...

The CPI gradually got bogged down in parliamentary and other forms of legal struggle. The Party leadership even considered this to be the main form of struggle to achieve the strategic aim of the Indonesian revolution. ...

In practice, the Party leadership did not prepare the whole ranks of the Party, the working class and the masses of the people to face the possibility of a non-peaceful road. ...

The Party leadership declared that the 'two-aspect theory' was completely different from the 'theory of structural reform' of the leadership of the revisionist Italian Communist Party. However, the fact is, theoretically or on the basis of practical realities, there is no difference between the two 'theories'. Both have for their starting point the 'peaceful road' to socialism. Both dream of a gradual change in the internal balance of forces in the state power. Both reject the road of revolution and both are revisionist in character." (Self-criticism of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia; *ibid.*; p.14,15,16,17).

That the "socialist revolution" in Indonesia could be peaceful was, according to the revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of Indonesia, because the great majority of the national capitalists would cooperate in the building of socialism, so that this socialist construction could be carried through by the continuing united front between the working class and the national bourgeoisie:

"We will fight unsparingly for this goal (i.e., of preserving the united front between the working class and the national bourgeoisie - P.B., MLOB) because the possibility of establishing a strong united front with the national bourgeoisie before the working class comes to power means that conditions will be created for the continuation of this front after the victory of the national revolution, for the sake of the political, economic and cultural advance of our people." (M.Lukman: "A Correct Party Policy Guarantees a Strong United Front", in: "World Marxist Review", August 1959; p. 83).

In short, the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia converted the party into a loose political organisation with a very large membership, an organisation impregnated with bourgeois ideas, which put forward, under the false cloak of "Marxism-Leninism" a policy which served the interests of the Indonesian national capitalist class. Membership of the Party had in 1963 reached a total of

"more than two and a half million members as compared to a membership of less than 10,000...about ten years ago." (H.Junus: "Four-Year Plan of the Communist Party of Indonesia", in: "World Marxist Review", December 1963; p.53).

"The line of liberalism in the organisational field manifested itself in the tendency to make the CPI a party with as large a membership as possible, a party with a loose organisation, which was called a mass Party." (Self-criticism of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Indonesia; *ibid.*; p.19).

"The penetration of bourgeois ideology developed along two channels, through contacts with the national bourgeoisie when the Party established a united front with them, and through the bourgeoisification of Party cadres, especially the leadership, after the governmental and semi-governmental institutions." (*ibid.*; p.14).

"The policy of the Communist Party is...aid and support for the national employers with a view to building and developing a national industry and trade as a foundation for a free national economy." (M.Lukman: cited in: S.L.: "The Communist Party and the National Capitalists", in: "World Marxist Review", November 1963; p.59).

The betrayal of Marxist-Leninist principles by the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia, their concept of a "peaceful road to socialism" within the framework of a "national front" with the capitalist class, their failure to prepare the Party and the working class even for self-defence against the forces of reaction - all this led directly to the massacre of hundreds of thousands of honest Communists and progressives in the bloody counter-revolutionary onslaught of 1965-66, to the defeat of the Indonesian national-democratic revolution by the forces of the imperialists and their landlord and comprador capitalist allies within the country, and to the establishment of

"the military dictatorship of the right-wing generals led by Nasution-Suharto, ...the rule by the most reactionary classes in the country, namely, the comprador-bourgeoisie, the bureaucrat-capitalists and the landlords." (Self-criticism of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia; *ibid.*; p.21).

VIETNAMESE REVISIONISM

In the service of Vietnamese national capital.

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam was formally established in September 1945 following the victory of the Vietnamese national-democratic revolution against imperialism - a victory which has as yet been consolidated only in the northern half of the country. The Vietnamese national-democratic revolution was carried out by an alliance of classes, including the national capitalist class, which took the organisational form of a "national united front" under the leadership of the Indochinese Communist Party:

"Our Party guided the workers and peasants to establish a national united front with the bourgeoisie." (Le Duan: "Leninism and Vietnam's Revolution", in: "On the Socialist Revolution in Vietnam", Volume 1; Hanoi; 1965; p.34).

Thus, according to the Vietnamese leadership, state power in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is held by this national alliance of classes, among which the national capitalist class has, for the first time in its existence, been brought into the foreground:

"In the political sphere the national bourgeoisie have definite rights and their place in the Patriotic Front. ...

In the past the colonial status always precluded the national bourgeoisie from being an important class force. The imperialists and the feudal lords retarded their development and relegated them to the background." (Ho Chi Minh: "Thirty Years of the Working People's Party of Vietnam", in: "World Marxist Review", February 1960; p.58).

Two months after the establishment of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in November 1945, the revisionist leaders of the Indochinese Communist Party dissolved the party - so that no national capitalist or imperialist might, as a result of "misunderstanding", fear that it was really their intention to work for a socialist society. As the communique announcing the dissolution put it, this action was taken

"to destroy all misunderstandings, domestic and foreign, which can hinder the liberation of our country." (Communique of Indochinese Communist Party, November 11th, 1945).

Six years later, in February 1951, a new "Marxist-Leninist" party was established by the revisionists of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. According to its constitution:

"The basis of the Vietnam Workers' Party and its guiding line in all fields of its activities is the doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao tse-Tung, adapted to the realities of the Vietnamese revolution". (Preamble to the Constitution of the Vietnamese Workers' Party; Hanoi; 1951).

The omission of the name of Stalin in this context - in 1951, two years before his death and five years before the 20th Congress of the CPSU - is not without significance.

Under the 1960 Constitution of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam:

"The state by law protects the rights of national capitalists to own means of production and other capital." ("Constitution of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam", Article 16).

However, despite this constitutional protection of the property rights of the national capitalists,

"The Democratic Republic of Vietnam is advancing step by step from people's democracy to socialism by developing and transforming the country along socialist lines." (Ibid.; Article 9),

and by 1962 the leaders of the Vietnam Workers' Party were holding that "in the main" this "socialist transformation" had been completed:

"Now, as regards the means of production, socialist transformation has been completed in the main." (Le Duan: "For a Radical Change in Ideological Work", in: "On the Socialist Revolution in Vietnam", Vol.3; Hanoi; 1967; p.20).

Furthermore, according to the Vietnamese revisionists, the Party's aim of a "smooth" and "peaceful" transition to "socialism" had been accomplished by reason by the fact that the Vietnamese national capitalists had been ready to advance to "socialism" and had remoulded themselves into workers:

"As for our country, the socialist revolution is difficult and complex but not violent". (Le Duan: "Enthusiastically to March Forward to Fulfil the First Five Year Plan", in: ibid.; Vol.2; Hanoi; 1965; p.181).

"Another task of major importance is the peaceful remoulding of the national bourgeoisie along socialist lines." (Ho Chi Minh: "Thirty Years of the Working People's Party of Vietnam", in: "World Marxist Review", February 1960; p.58).

"In North Vietnam...we stand for peaceful transformation of the bourgeoisie. This differs from what was done in the Soviet Union, where proletarian dictatorship had to resort to ruthless repression to smash the bourgeoisie as a class."

Progressive elements among them agree to, and support, the march forward (to socialism - P.B., MLOB)". (Le Duan: "We Must Foster New Thoughts to Build up Socialism", in: "On the Socialist Revolution in Vietnam", Vol.3; Hanoi; p.65,106).

"In our country, owing to the fact that the national bourgeoisie...are now willing to accept socialist transformation...through peaceful transformation we turn step by step the capitalist economy into a socialist one, and the capitalists into labouring people, thereby making their interests and aspirations after transformation gradually become one with those of the labouring people." (Le Duan: "The Tasks of Socialist Revolution in North Vietnam", in: *ibid.*; Vol.3; Hanoi; 1967; p.172).

"The national bourgeois willingly transform themselves and gradually join the toilers' ranks.

In socialist revolution the unified front includes the toiling classes and the self-transformed national bourgeois." (Le Duan: "Revolution is the Work of the Masses", in: *ibid.*; Vol.1; Hanoi; 1965; p.102).

The strange, lemming-like behaviour of the Vietnamese capitalists who show such enthusiasm to "end" their exploitation of the working class and remould themselves into "socialists" becomes somewhat easier to understand when the Vietnamese revisionists explain that by the term "socialism" they mean, in fact, state capitalism operated through the medium of "joint state-private enterprises":

"The state encourages and guides the national capitalists in following the path of socialist transformation through the form of joint state-private enterprises." (Constitution of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, 1960, Article 16).

"Socialist transformation is aimed at turning capitalist production relations into socialist production relations under the form of joint state-private exploitation." (Le Duan: "Socialist Industrialisation, the Common Cause of the Entire People", in: "On the Socialist Revolution in Vietnam", Vol.2; Hanoi; 1965; p.15).

"The forces of the national bourgeoisie...are willing to accept socialist transformation, therefore our Party's policy is peacefully to transform capitalist ownership into socialist ownership, through state capitalism" (Le Duan: "Leninism and Vietnam's Revolution", in: *ibid.*; Vol.1; Hanoi; 1965; p.39).

Within the framework of these joint state-private enterprises, in other words, the Vietnamese capitalist class is able to continue - and expand - its exploitation of the working class and is assisted in this process by the centralised accumulation and investment of capital through the state. Or, as the Vietnamese revisionists put it:

"Concerning joint State-private enterprises, though they appear to yield some interests to private owners, they practically belong to the system of socialist economy." (Le Duan: "We Must Foster New Thoughts to Build Up Socialism", in: *ibid.*; Vol.3; Hanoi; 1967; p.64).

In the service of Korean national capital.

North Korea was liberated from Japanese imperialism by the Soviet army in 1945, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was proclaimed in September 1948, after which the Soviet troops withdrew in December:

"The annihilation of Japanese imperialism by the great Soviet Army in the Second World War opened for the Korean people the way to a free democratic development." (Kim Il Sung: Report of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea to the Third Congress. In: "Third Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea: Documents and Materials"; Pyongyang; 1956; p.16).

The Workers' Party of Korea was formed in 1946 by the fusion of the Communist Party of Korea (re-established after liberation in 1945 after having ceased to exist since 1928) and the New Democratic Party (the "liberal" party of the Korean national capitalist class):

"The Communist Party of Korea which was founded in 1925...could not maintain its ranks any longer, and at last in 1928 it ceased to exist as an organised force...."

In our country a party of the working class could not be maintained before the liberation, and therefore we lacked militant traditions of the Party. ...

In October 1945 we formed the North Korean Organising Committee of the Communist Party of Korea in North Korea where the Soviet troops were stationed....

Later, in keeping with the development of our revolution, the Communist Party and the New Democratic Party were merged into a mass political party, which was named the Workers' Party. ...

The Party put forward a proposal to found the Workers' Party as a measure for uniting broad, patriotic, democratic forces." (Kim Il Sung: *ibid.*; p.89, 103, 91, 97)

Although the Constitution of the Workers' Party of Korea claims that it is "guided in its activities by the theory of Marxism-Leninism", the Party is described as a non-class political organisation which represents the interests of the entire Korean nation:

"The Workers' Party of Korea represents the interests of the Korean nation and the Korean people. ..."

The Workers' Party of Korea is guided in its activities by the theory of Marxism-Leninism". (Rules of the Workers' Party of Korea, in: *ibid.*; p.387).

"Our Party is not a party which champions exclusively the interests of one class or one social stratum, but a party which champions the interests of the Korean nation." (Pak Jung Ai: Report of the Revision of the Rules of the Workers' Party of Korea, in: *ibid.*; p.362).

The liquidation of the Party as the vanguard of the working class was strongly opposed by Korean Marxist-Leninists, characterised by Kim Il Sung, the revisionist leader of the Workers' Party of Korea, as "Stalinist sectarians":

"The sectarian elements... idolised a particular individual, overestimating his role rated his wisdom higher than that of the collective body of the masses, and followed him so blindly that they became unable to discern his errors, even took them for merits." (Kim Il Sung: *ibid.*; p.103-4)

The policy of the Korean Party was to establish a "people's democratic dictatorship", a state based on a united front of all "patriotic" classes and their parties - that is, including the national capitalist class but excluding the allies of imperialism, the comprador-capitalist and landlord classes.

"The Party formed extensive mass organisations and strengthened in every way solidarity with the progressive friendly parties. It set up the North Korean People's Committee on the basis of a broad united front.

The North Korean Provisional People's Committee, as a people's regime based on a united democratic national front which rallied broad anti-imperialist, anti-feudal democratic forces of the country... performed the functions of a people's democratic dictatorship." (Kim Il Sung, *ibid.*; p.91, 16-17).

"The people's regime is a regime that exercises dictatorship so far as the reactionary pro-Americans, other underlings of imperialists and national traitors as well as the landowners and compradors who are trying to implant the imperialist force are concerned, and exercises democracy as far as the people are concerned." (Kim Doo Bong: Speech at Third Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea, in: *ibid.*; 1.143).

"It is possible for all political parties, factions, social organisations and all patriotic persons of our country, even though of different political views, to sit around one table to settle the fate of our country." (Choi Yong Kun: Speech at 3rd Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea, in: *ibid.*; p.224-5).

"The general political line and the practical activities of our Party at present in North Korea are to establish a unified democratic power in our country on the basis of a broad coalition with all political parties and social organisations and to turn North Korea into a mighty democratic base." (Kim Il Sung: Report to the 3rd Enlarged Meeting of the North Korea Organising Committee of the Communist Party of Korea, 1945, cited by: Choy Yung Kun: *ibid.*; p.223).

The "people's democratic dictatorship" proceeded to nationalise the factories, banks, communications enterprises, etc., owned by the Japanese imperialists and the comprador capitalists, thus placing the "commanding heights" of the economy in the hands of the state:

"The industrial enterprises which were in the hands of the Japanese imperialists and national traitors and which are the major lifeline in the economic life of our country have been nationalised." (Kim Il Sung: Report to the Inaugural Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea, 1946, in: "Selected Works", Vol.1; Pyongyang; 1954; p.226).

This state sector of the economy came to be called by the revisionist leaders of the Workers' Party of Korea, the "socialist sector":

"As a result of the nationalisation of industries, transport, communications, banks, etc., which had belonged to the Japanese imperialists and comprador capitalists, the socialist state sector became predominant in the national economy." (Kim Il Sung: Report of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea to the Fourth Congress, in: "Documents of the Fourth Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea"; Pyongyang; 1961; p.12).

During this period, i.e., before 1953, the "private enterprise" of the national capitalists was not altered in form:

"Since the enforcement of the various democratic reforms of historic significance in the northern half of the Republic, there have been in the economy of our country three basic forms - the socialist economic form consisting of state and cooperative economies; the economic form of small commodity production consisting of individual farming in the countryside and private handicraft in towns; and the capitalist economic form comprising private capitalist commerce and industry in towns and the farming of the rich peasants in the countryside." (Kim Il Sung: Report of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea to the Third Congress, in: "Third Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea: Documents and Materials"; Pyongyang; 1956; p.41-42).

"The nationalisation of industry in the northern half of the Republic...did not deny capital in general." (Choi Chang Ik: Speech at the Third Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea, in: *ibid.*; p.240).

In 1953, however, the Workers' Party of Korea put forward the programme of "socialist transformation" of North Korea:

"With the successful carrying out of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal democratic revolution in the northern part of our country after liberation, North Korea gradually embarked on the path of transition to socialism, and socialist transformation began already at that time." (Kim Il Sung: Report of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea to the Fourth Congress, in: "Documents of the Fourth Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea"; Pyongyang; 1961; p.5).

According to the revisionist leadership of the Workers' Party of Korea, this "socialist transformation" was carried out smoothly and peacefully by "reinforcing" the ruling national front, which included the national capitalist class:

"For a successful achievement of...the socialist construction in the northern half of the Republic, ...the Party should, first of all, reinforce the work of the United Democratic Fatherland Front.

At the present stage, the United Democratic Fatherland Front is a powerful political organisation which has united the entire revolutionary forces of ours. ...

The entire patriotic forces, led by the working class and united under the banner of the United Democratic Fatherland Front..., have an essential role to play in the socialist construction. ...

And we must promote our solidarity with the broad circles, i.e., members of friendly parties, men of religion, middle and petty traders and industrialists, and those engaged in free trades, etc.; and sincerely render political and economic assistance to them." (Kim Il Sung: Report of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea to the Third Congress, in: "Third Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea: Documents and Materials"; Pyongyang; 1956; p.75-76).

"The Workers' Party of Korea successfully carries on the building of socialism in the northern half of our country by consolidating the people's democratic system." (Rules of the Workers' Party of Korea, in: *ibid.*; p.388).

"Our people's power as a powerful weapon of the socialist revolution and socialist construction has excellently carried out its functions." (Kim Il Sung: Report of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea to the Fourth Congress, in: "Documents of the Fourth Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea"; Pyongyang; 1961; p.47).

"The socialist reorganisation of capitalist trade and industry, too, progressed rather smoothly in our country." (Kim Il Sung: *ibid.*; p.11).

This smooth transition to "socialism" came about because the Korean national capitalists supported "socialist transformation", those in the occupied South being enthused by the "free, happy life" of their counterparts in the "socialist" North:

"The majority of enterprisers and merchants, together with the entire people... gave support to the policies pursued by our Party and people's government in socialist construction. ...

Today, the growth of the socialist forces and the free, happy life of the people under the socialist system in the North exert a tremendous revolutionary influence on all the patriotic forces, including even the national bourgeoisie... in South Korea." (Kim Il Sung: *ibid.*; p.15-17).

In fact, the revisionist leaders of the Workers' Party of Korea themselves make it clear that the system of state capitalism labelled by them as "socialism" was necessary to the national capitalists for their development:

"The capitalist tradesmen and industrialists found it impossible to restore their ruined economy unless they relied on the assistance of the state and the socialist economy. ...

Only when they were embraced in the socialist system of economy could the enterprisers and merchants improve their position." (Kim Il Sung: *ibid.*; p.12-13).

The "socialist transformation" of the Korean national capitalists was accomplished by their voluntarily joining "cooperatives":

"Our Party mapped out the line of transforming capitalist trade and industry in varied forms of cooperative economy. Realising that the line conformed with their interests, ... the enterprisers and tradesmen gave support to the Party line of cooperativisation. Thus, the socialist organisation of capitalist trade and industry was brought to completion in a brief space of time... in strict adherence to the voluntary principle." (Kim Il Sung: *ibid.*; p.13).

That "cooperativisation" should conform to the interests of the Korean capitalists is explained by the fact that these cooperatives were of the "semi-socialist form":

"Enterprisers were gradually embraced in the cooperative economy and, in particular, the semi-socialist form of cooperative economy was broadly used." (Kim Il Sung: *ibid.*; p.13).

Thus, these spurious "cooperatives" conforming to the interests of the national capitalists were of

"a semi-socialist economic form in which private ownership of the means of production remains and the incomes are shared in accordance with...the means of production pooled." (Kim Il Sung: Report of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea to the Third Congress, in: "Third Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea: Documents and Materials"; Pyongyang; 1956;p.43).

Promoted in most cases to directorial positions by reason of their "administrative experience" in private enterprise, the "cooperativised" capitalists also received an income proportionate to their capital assets and received the state assistance which they required:

"Thanks to...the active help by the state and the devoted labour of the members, the economic foundation of the producers' cooperatives has been speedily reinforced." (Kim Il Sung: Report of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea to the Fourth Congress, in: "Documents of the Fourth Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea"; Pyongyang; 1961; p.14).

Nevertheless, say the revisionist leaders of the Workers' Party of Korea, as a result of this "cooperativisation", the Korean capitalists are being ideologically remoulded into "socialist working people":

"Joining the producers' cooperatives, the enterprisers and traders... have been transformed into the working people of a socialist type. ...In this process, their ideological remoulding has also been facilitated." (Kim Il Sung: *ibid.*; p.13).

Thus, within the system of state capitalism in North Korea the "socialist" capitalists of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea continue - thanks to the revisionist leadership of the Workers' Party of Korea - to exploit the working class.

One of the most unconsciously humorous statements ever made must surely be:

"In our country revisionism exerted no big influence". (Kim Chang Man, Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea: Speech at Fourth Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea, in: *ibid.*; p.311).

CUBAN REVISIONISM

a) In the service of the alliance between US monopoly capital and the Cuban comprador capitalist and landlord classes.

In 1944 the Cuban Communist Party changed its name, for purely opportunist reasons, to that of the "Popular Socialist Party":

"In 1944, with a view to drawing into its ranks some people from the trade unions - an attempt which, however, did not produce results - it adopted its present name, Popular Socialist Party." (B. Roca: "Eighth Congress of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba"; in: "World Marxist Review", November 1960; p.35).

From 1930 to 1944 and again from 1952 to 1959 Cuba lay under the military dictatorship of Batista. The Batista regime represented the interests of the US imperialists and their allies within Cuba, the comprador capitalist and landlord classes. During this period the revisionists in the leadership of the Popular

Socialist Party served the interests of these ruling classes by opposing the armed struggle necessary to overthrow the repressive regime:

"During the years of the tyranny, the Party tried to avoid violence." (Theses of the Executive Committee of the Popular Socialist Party, in: "World Marxist Review", April 1959; p.69).

As a result of this betrayal by the revisionist leadership of the Popular Socialist Party, leadership of the national-democratic revolution was left, without any challenge from the working class, in the hands of the petty-bourgeois representatives of the national bourgeoisie in the "Movement of July 26" headed by Fidel Castro, a university graduate, lawyer, and son of a wealthy planter:

"Although we had foreseen and had pointed to the need for armed struggle, we had done practically nothing to prepare for it. This was our mistake. It is to the everlasting credit of Fidel Castro that he attended precisely to this side of the question." (B.Roca: Eighth National Congress of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba, in: "World Marxist Review", November 1960; p.36).

"The armed struggle was initiated by the petty bourgeoisie. Working class action could not be the decisive factor owing to a number of circumstances." (B.Roca: "The Cuban Revolution in Action", in: "World Marxist Review", August 1959; p.17).

"The petty bourgeoisie are in reality dependent upon the bourgeoisie...and follow the bourgeoisie in their way of thinking." (V.I.Lenin: "The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution", in: "Selected Works", Vol.6; London; 1946; p.49-50).

b) In the service of the alliance between Soviet neo-capital and Cuban national capital.

After the victory of the Cuban revolution in 1959, the revisionist leaders of the Popular Socialist Party characterised it correctly as a national-democratic revolution which had placed in power the Cuban national capitalist class:

"Our National Congress...defined the Cuban revolution as a patriotic and democratic, national-liberation and agrarian, a popular, progressive revolution." (B.Roca: "Eighth National Congress of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba", in: "World Marxist Review", November 1960; p.38).

"The driving forces of the revolution are the peasants, the working class and the national bourgeoisie." (B.Roca: "The Cuban Revolution in Action", in: "World Marxist Review", August 1959; p.16).

"Power has passed into the hands of the 'Movement of July 26' led by Fidel Castro...with the national bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie playing the leading role." (Theses of the Executive Committee of the Popular Socialist Party, in: "World Marxist Review", April 1959; p.68).

In this situation the revisionist leaders of the Popular Socialist Party changed masters and placed the party at the disposal of the victorious national capitalist class, striving to use what influence they had among the working people to bring about the "national unity" objectively needed by that class to resist the coming clashes with US imperialism:

"The Party...supports the new regime...."

The immediate task of the Party is to preserve and strengthen the alliance of all revolutionary and popular forces represented by the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie." (Theses of the Executive Committee of the Popular Socialist Party, in: *ibid.*: p.69).

The representatives of the Cuban national capitalist class had little confidence in their ability to build Cuba, in the existing world situation, into an independent capitalist state. They had fought to overthrow the detested and corrupt Batista dictatorship and for a greater share in the exploitation of the Cuban working people, along with the US imperialists and their comprador and land-owning allies within the country. Following the resignation of Prime Minister Cardena, who was opposed to Castro's scheme to reopen the gambling casinos for American tourists and wealthy Cubans, Castro took his place in February 1959 and in April proceeded to the United States to assure the American monopoly capitalists that the new regime was more than willing to continue Cuba's status as a semi-colony of US imperialism:

"Dr. Castro...has stated repeatedly that his movement is not Communist and that if Cuba can obtain some degree of prosperity Communism cannot grow there...."

He has put it that...Cuba's problems are such that in the view of many experts substantial infusions of foreign aid will be needed." ("The Times", April 20th, 1959; p.8).

"Dr. Fidel Castro, Prime Minister of Cuba, today went before the National Press Club here to repeat the assurances made so often during his visit to the capital that he means nothing but friendship to the United States, that there are no Communists in his Government, that he has no plans to expropriate any foreign holdings in Cuba." ("The Times", April 21st, 1959; p.11).

But the US imperialists turned a cold and hostile face to this Cuban upstart who had had the affrontery to organise the overthrow of one of their puppet regimes almost within a stone's throw of Miami. Assured by their "experts" in the CIA that a little pressure would bring the new Cuban regime down in but a short time, they embarked on a programme of economic aggression and "emigre" raids. Faced with the choice between taking control of the vast property in Cuba of the US imperialists and Cuban comprador capitalists or permitting the complete sabotage of the economy of the country, the Cuban government reluctantly chose the former course:

"When the imperialist enterprises...threatened to cut off all our oil supplies, introduction of control over the oil refineries, state management and, finally, the nationalisation of these refineries became a matter of life or death for the country. There was no alternative. Either we had to do this or surrender...."

Imperialist reprisals...followed one after another. They evoked retaliatory measures in the form of speedy nationalisation of all the US imperialist enterprises in Cuba. ...

As the revolution developed, the national bourgeoisie's (in Marxist-Leninist terminology, the comprador bourgeoisie's - PB, MLOB) multifarious economic links with the imperialists and latifundists came to light. ...

That meant taking prompt measures against them: going over from nationalisation of enterprises owned by imperialist capital to the nationalisation of enterprises belonging to national capitalists (in Marxist-Leninist

terminology, comprador capitalists - PB, MLOB)" (B.Roca: "New Stage in the Cuban Revolution", in: "World Marxist Review", October 1961; p.4-5).

After having been forced to undertake the nationalisation of the enterprises belonging to US imperialists and Cuban comprador capitalists, the Cuban government found that the state now owned "the main levers of the economy":

"Since the US imperialists owned vast property in Cuba, its nationalisation predetermined the subsequent course of economic development. ...

The nationalisation placed the main levers of the economy, formerly held by the US imperialists, in the hands of the revolutionary state. This process was completed in the main by August 1960. ...

The law on the nationalisation of private enterprises owned by Cuban capitalists (that is, comprador capitalists - PB, MLOB) was adopted in October 1960 and the remaining North American industrial and trading enterprises were nationalised at the same time." (B.Roca: *ibid.*; p.6).

At the same time, the government made it clear that it had no intention of nationalising the enterprises owned by the Cuban national capitalists:

"Another question of great import in this process is that of maintaining contact with the still remaining private-capitalist sector. ...

The procedure which we used in uprooting US imperialist domination, latifundism and big parasitic capital cannot be applied in extirpating the survivals of capitalism." (B.Roca: *ibid.*; p.7).

Despite certain social advances brought by the victory of the national-democratic revolution, for the workers the result of the nationalisation measures (as in all cases of nationalisation by a state controlled by the capitalist class) merely exchanged one set of exploiters for another - and, if they were employed in the continuing private sector, not even that. As a result, a certain lack of enthusiasm, a certain uneasiness, a certain mood of questioning, was very apparent among the working people of Cuba by the spring of 1961 - precisely at a time when Cuba was threatened with actual invasion organised by US imperialism and the ruling class of national capitalists desperately needed militant unity around their government.

In this situation the ideology of revisionism came to the aid of the Cuban national capitalists. They had been compelled to undertake substantial measures of nationalisation. Were not revisionists all over the world calling such measures "the construction of socialism" and winning thereby considerable popularity? And so, on April 16th, 1961 the Cuban capitalists authorised Castro - surely one of the most voluble demagogues any country has produced - to proclaim that the Cuban revolution had been, was or would be "a socialist revolution":

"On April 16th the revolution in Cuba was officially proclaimed a socialist revolution. The declaration was made at a dramatic moment when we were preparing for a hard and decisive struggle against the combined US imperialists and counter-revolutionary forces. ...

The enthusiasm with which these words were met defies description. ...

For a long time the people had been asking for a categorical statement concerning the aims and character of the revolution. ...

The absence of a clear-cut definition of aims created not a few difficulties." (B.Roca: "New Stage in the Cuban Revolution", in: "World Marxist Review", October 1961; p.2).

The leaders of the Cuban capitalist class were nothing of not well-read, and they knew that a socialist revolution required things called "Marxism-Leninism" and "a Marxist-Leninist Party".

And so, in December 1961, Castro declared that he was "a Marxist-Leninist" and will be one till the day I die". He said that he had hitherto hidden his belief in Communism from the Cuban people because "otherwise we might have alienated the bourgeoisie." (F.Castro: Speech of December 2nd, 1961.)

"When the new state turned to the job of building Socialism,...the leaders of the revolution...were faced with the imperative need for a party of a new kind, a Marxist-Leninist party, whose ranks would unite revolutionaries dedicated to socialism". (Hernan Berrera: "Building the United Party of the Socialist Revolution in Cuba", in: "World Marxist Review", December 1963; p.55).

Some years earlier, in offering their services to the victorious national capitalist class, the revisionist leaders of the Popular Socialist Party had made it clear that they stood for "the peaceful transition to socialism", that is, that the "socialism" for which they stood was merely a word and no threat to the capitalists:

"The Popular Socialist Party...aims at achieving its lofty liberation goals and socialist future without another civil war". (Theses of the Executive Committee of the Popular Socialist Party, in: "World Marxist Review", April 1959; p.69.)

But the capitalist class needed a "Marxist-Leninist Party" that was more securely under its control than the Popular Socialist Party. And so in 1962-3 the revisionist leaders of the Popular Socialist Party obediently liquidated the party dissolving it along with the "Movement of July 26" (the party of the national capitalists) and the "Revolutionary Directorate" (a government-appointed committee) into the "United Party of the Socialist Revolution" headed by Castro and the leaders of the national bourgeoisie. In 1965 the manoeuvre was completed by the changing of the name to that of the "Communist Party of Cuba".

But, despite their "socialist revolution" the Cuban bourgeoisie had no more confidence in their ability to develop an independent capitalist economy in their country than when, in 1959, Castro had gone to Washington cap in hand to try to resell his country to the US imperialists. Spurned in Washington and preparing to don the cloak of "Marxism-Leninism", Castro turned to Moscow. In February 1960 the Soviet revisionist leader Mikoyan visited Cuba and the Cuban government will- ing accepted the role of administering a Soviet neo-colony. In the next two and a half years (according to the Cuban paper HOY in November 1962) the Cuban govern- ment received more than 303 million pounds in Soviet "aid". The other side of the picture is shown, for example, by the agreement of January 1964, by which Cuba undertook to sell increasing quantities of its sugar crop (rising from 2 million tons in 1965 to 5 million tons in 1968-70) at a price of 6 US cents per lb. against a current world price of 10.84 cents.

Acceptance by the Cuban national capitalists of the country's continued semi-colonial status has resulted in no steps being taken to abolish the dependence of the Cuban agricultural economy on export crops:

"Farmers ought to specialise in one, two or three crops, but especially in a single crop. ...

The farmer who traditionally planted tobacco should continue his cultivation of tobacco, improving his technique, raising his productivity; the one who has been cultivating coffee should continue cultivating coffee. ...

There has been a policy that goes against the national interests. What is this policy? Ripping up the canefields. Ripping up the canefields harms the economy. ... We have no other alternative in those provinces where the small farmers grow a lot of cane than to ask them to keep on growing cane, and try to find a way to compensate them. ...

We are working to raise our cane production, in order to reach a harvest of 10 million tons." (Fidel Castro: Address to the Third National Congress of A.N.A.P., May 18th, 1967; p.36,37,52,53).

The treachery of the Cuban revisionists - treachery first to the national-democratic revolution and then to the socialist revolution - has led to the creation in Cuba of a mixed economy of state capitalism and private enterprise controlled economically and politically by the Cuban national capitalist class, which continues to exploit the Cuban working class under the false banner of "socialism" and which, under the same banner, has converted the country into a semi-colony of the neo-capitalist class of the Soviet Union.

PART TWO

In this second part of the Report we wish to analyse the principal content of the first stage of development of "centrist" revisionism and the reasons for its emergence.

The "Great Debate" between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism assumed an open, international form in October 1961, when the Soviet revisionists launched a public attack on the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour from the rostrum of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

By the autumn of 1962, when the Soviet revisionists and their Eastern European revisionist allies began publicly to attack the leadership of the Communist Party of China, in which Marxist-Leninists were then in the ascendancy, the leaders of most of the communist parties of the world had taken up some kind of position in relation to the "Great Debate". While the majority of party leaderships sided with the Soviet revisionists, those of a number of important parties adopted a "centrist" position - including all those the programmes of which have been analysed in the first part of this Report, namely, the Communist Party of Japan, the Communist Party of Indonesia, the Workers' Party of Vietnam, the Workers' Party of Korea and the Communist Party of Cuba. The principal content of this "centrist" position, in the first stage of development of "centrist" revisionism, was as follows:

1). criticism of modern revisionism - usually in general and comparatively mild terms and without explicitly denouncing the leaders of the CPSU:

"A thorough exposure of the Yugoslav revisionists is essential to the smooth progress of the people's revolutionary cause." (Le Duan: Speech at the Nguyen Ai Quoc Party School, March 1963, in: "On Some Present International Problems"; Hanoi; 1964; p.109).

"The followers of modern revisionism hold that today the imperialists whose nature changed also want to safeguard world peace; and that the danger of war is created not by the imperialists, but by a certain socialist country which is carrying out an 'adventurous' and 'bellicose' policy. This viewpoint clearly upsets the truth purposely to embellish imperialism and defend the imperialists' bellicose and aggressive policy." ("The Correct Road to Defend World Peace", in: "Hoc Tap" No.1, 1964, in: "On the Problems of War and Peace"; Hanoi; 1964; p.119).

"The peace policy of modern revisionism weakens the forces fighting against aggressive and warlike imperialism. ...

Therefore, those who cherish peace and are interested in stepping up the struggle for peace, cannot take apart this struggle from the struggle against the dangerous peace policy upheld by modern revisionism." ("Problem of War and Peace", in: "Tuyen Huan", No. 4, 1964; in: *ibid.*; p.60).

2). where the Soviet revisionists launched a public attack upon the leadership of a "centrist" party or organised attempts to overthrow this leadership, stronger and more explicit criticism of the revisionist leaders of the CPSU:

"The CPSU leaders not only have used their Party organ and broadcast to attack our Party, they have gone so far as to launch a direct attack on us by helping the renegades expelled from our Party (e.g., Shigeo Kamiyama, Shojiro Kasuga, Tomachika Naito, Yoshio Shiga, Ichizo Suzuki - PB, MLOB) in their attempt to organise factional anti-Party activities within our Party." (Editorial in "Akhata", organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, July 24th, 1964, cited in: "Peking Review", August 24th, 1964; p.23).

3). rejection of a fully Marxist-Leninist position, as manifested in, for example:

a) continued recognition of the Soviet Union as a "socialist state" despite the fact that the process of restoration of capitalism there was by now well advanced:

"The marvellous progress made by the Soviet Union during the past forty-five years and by the other fraternal socialist countries in less than twenty years has obviously reduced the gap in economic development between our camp and the imperialist camp." (Le Duan: Speech at 9th Session of the Central Committee of the Vietnam Workers' Party, December 1963, in: "On Some Present International Problems"; Hanoi; 1964; p.147).

b) recognition of the People's Republic of China, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Cuba as a "socialist states" despite the fact that the socialist revolution had not been yet carried out in these countries:

"The socialist camp...includes...the Soviet Union,...China and Cuba,...Vietnam and Korea." (Le Duan: *ibid.*; p.140).

c) recognition of all parties within the framework of the international communist movement as "fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties"

"This (i.e., the organisation of factional activity against the leadership of the Communist Party of Japan by the Soviet revisionists - PB, MLOB)...violates the principle of solidarity among the fraternal Parties."

("Refutation of Attacks by Radio Moscow and Other Quarters", in: "Akahata", organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, July 24th, 1964, in: "Peking Review", August 7th, 1964; p.27).

"Should an international conference of the fraternal parties be held under the present circumstances; it will become a platform for the fiercest disputes." ("Meeting of Parties which will Cause a Split Must Be Averted", editorial in: "Rodong Shinmoon", organ of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, August 31st, 1964; Peking; 1965; p.5).

4). conciliationism, as manifested in, for example,

a) disapproval of public polemics:

"The Indonesian Communists enthusiastically welcome the proposal made by Comrade Khrushchov at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany that polemics between fraternal parties should stop, and it was in response to this suggestion that the special column that had been started in the 'Harian Rakjat' (People's Daily) to reproduce the views of various fraternal parties on the disputed issues was stopped." (D.N.Aidit: "Indonesian Communists March Forward for Full National Independence", in: "World Marxist Review", June 1963; p.16).

"I am not going to speak at length about the problems leading to the differences and divisions in the socialist camp. ...

As far as talk is concerned, enough and more than enough has already been said.

Here it's not a question of analysing the problems under dispute theoretically or philosophically, but of recognising the great truth: that in the face of an enemy that attacks, in the face of an enemy that becomes more and more aggressive, there is no justification for division; division doesn't make sense; there is no reason for division. ...

It would be humiliating to wash dirty linen in front of our enemies. ...

We have...millions of tons of sugar to be cut." (Fidel Castro: Speech at the University of Havana, March 13th, 1965).

b) disapproval of any action that would be likely to lead to an organisational split in the international communist movement:

"It is at present the most exalted and urgent internationalist duty of all Communists to prevent the split of the ranks of the international communist movement." ("Meeting of Parties which will Cause a Split Must Be Averted", Editorial in "Rodong Shinmoon", organ of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, August 31st, 1964; Peking; 1965; p.2).

"Today, the disunity within the international communist movement is already very complicated and serious. But we consider that a final split is even worse than the situation at present." (Editorial in "Akahata", organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, October 5th, 1964; cited in: "Peking Review", February 12th, 1965; p.24).

c) approval of continuing attempts to "resolve" the dispute within the international communist movement by means of a negotiated settlement, i.e. on the basis of a compromise.

"The Indonesian Communists warmly welcomed Comrade Khrushchov's statement to the effect that the dispute that has arisen is a dispute within a family, and we believe that it would be resolved in a family spirit. ..."

We fervently urge all leaders of Communist parties and Workers' parties throughout the world to make strenuous and sincere efforts to restore the spirit of harmony and cordiality within the world family of Communists." (D.N.Aidit: "Indonesian Communists March Forward for Full National Independence", in: "World Marxist Review", June 1963; p.16).

"Since the emergence of the differences, our Party, together with a number of fraternal Parties, has held that the differences should be treated as an internal issue of the international communist movement and solved through sincere, comradely consultations." ("Meeting of Parties which will Cause a Split Must be Averted", Editorial in "Rodong Shinmoon", organ of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, August 31st, 1964; Peking; 1965; p.2).

"Since January 1962, we have repeatedly proposed the convening of a conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties in order to resolve the differences and strengthen solidarity and unity. ..."

- first stage - resumption of negotiations between the CPSU and the CPC with a view to achieving an agreed viewpoint and jointly to prepare points for discussion at a preliminary meeting of representatives of a number of parties." (Letter addressed to all Communist and Workers' Parties from the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Vietnam in: "World Marxist Review", June 1964; p.40).

The basis proposed by the "centrist" parties for this negotiated settlement will be discussed below. First we wish to examine the reason for the development of "centrist" revisionism.

THE REASON FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF "CENTRIST" REVISIONISM

In the first part of this report it was established that, at the time when they adopted a "centrist" position, the leaderships of the Communist Party of Japan, the Communist Party of Indonesia, the Workers' Party of Vietnam, the Workers' Party of Korea and the Communist Party of Cuba were blatantly revisionist.

The question must be answered, therefore, why these parties did not take up a position in the developing "Great Debate" alongside the Soviet revisionists and most other revisionist leaderships, but adopted a "centrist" position.

During the period immediately following the usurpation and consolidation of power in the Soviet Union by the modern revisionists, the Soviet government, headed by N.S. Khrushchov, pursued a foreign policy the cardinal point of which was collaboration with United States imperialism.

"The international situation as a whole depends to a large extent on the relations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union." (N.S. Khrushchov: Speech at the Soviet-Indian Friendship Rally, September 8th, 1961).

"History has imposed on our two peoples a great responsibility for the destiny of the world." (N.S. Khrushchov & L.I. Brezhnev: New Year Greetings to President Kennedy, December 30th, 1961).

"Our interests do not clash directly anywhere, either territorially or economically." (N.S.Khrushchov: Interview with American publisher Gardner Cowles, April 20th, 1962).

"Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchov acts like an American politician." (U.S. Under-Secretary of State Harriman: Television interview, August 18th, 1963).

This Soviet foreign policy was completely acceptable to the revisionist leaderships of most of the communist parties of the world, since they had come to serve the interests of those sections of the capitalist classes of their countries which themselves favoured collaboration with the US imperialists.

But, as has been established in the first part of this Report, the revisionist leadership of the Communist party of Japan had come to represent the interests of Japanese "national" monopoly capital which was seeking to throw off the domination of US imperialism in order to pursue an independent course in its own interests. The revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia represented the interests of a national bourgeoisie of an under-developed neo-colonial country for which, as Aidit stated in 1963,

"enemy number one...is US imperialism". (D.N. Aidit: "Indonesian Communists March Forward for Full National Independence" in: "World Marxist Review" June 1963; p.13).

And the revisionist leaderships of the Workers' Party of Vietnam, the Workers' Party of Korea and the Communist Party of Cuba represented the interests of ruling national bourgeoisies of newly-independent under-developed countries - national bourgeoisies which, wishing to retain their independence, were in sharp contradiction with the aggressive forces of US imperialism.

Thus, the revisionist leaderships of these parties found Soviet foreign policy, the cardinal point of which was collaboration with US imperialism, completely unacceptable.

It was these factors - and not adoption of Marxism-Leninism - which led the revisionist leaderships of these parties to take up, as the "Great Debate" gathered force, a position of "centrism", a position of partial opposition to the Soviet revisionists.

It was these factors which led the revisionist leaderships of these parties to press for the restoration of the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of a negotiated compromise settlement, the basis of which would be that the international movement would accept the principal aspects of the revisionist programme of the Soviet leaders except that of collaboration with US imperialism while the Soviet leaders, for their part, would agree to abandon this aspect of their policy.

"The international trend of modern revisionism has adopted a foreign policy, the core of which is to practice unprincipled compromise with the Government of US imperialism, and...it has actually adopted an attitude of repressing the anti-imperialist struggles of the peoples. Therefore, one of the central issues in dispute both in the international communist movement and the international democratic movement is whether or not to wage a struggle in earnest against US imperialism, 'the enemy of the peoples of the whole world'".

Right now, concrete agreement should be reached on the problem of unfolding a common struggle against imperialism, headed by the United States." ("More on the Question of an International Conference of Communist Parties";

Editorial in: "Akahata"; Organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, January 21st, 1965, in: "Peking Review", February 12th, 1965; p.24-25).

"Modern revisionism must be opposed in order to strengthen the anti-imperialist struggle. ...Therefore, our Party's attitude is: firstly, to unambiguously speak the truth, lay bare the viewpoint of modern revisionism; secondly, to strive to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, especially the solidarity between the Soviet Union and China. ...

By upholding revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, distinguishing right from wrong, persisting in the struggle against modern revisionism, upholding international unity, particularly unity between the Soviet Union and China, and working for the fulfilment of revolutionary tasks, our Party and people are making valuable contributions to the common struggle of the world's people against US-led imperialism." (Le Duan: Speech at the 9th Session of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Vietnam, December 1963, in: "On Some Present International Problems"; Hanoi; 1964; p.180, 181, 183).

NEW "CENTRIST" REVISIONIST PARTIES

As has been said, most of the revisionist leaderships of the world's communist parties represented the interests of sections of capitalist classes which favoured collaboration with US imperialism (or, in the case of the CPUSA, the interests of the US imperialists directly).

But by the early 1960s, the uneven development of capitalism had already caused a great change in the world situation from that which existed immediately after the Second World War. In particular the economic and military strength of US imperialism was declining relative to that of the Western European imperialist states and of Japanese imperialism. By this time increasingly significant sections of monopoly capital in these latter countries were beginning to take steps to throw off the domination of the American imperialists in order to pursue an independent course of action in their own interests. In some non-imperialist states, such as India, where the ruling capitalist class had pursued a policy of collaboration with Washington, the same process developed.

These "national" sections of capital and monopoly capital needed to mobilise the working people of their countries behind a policy of "national" independence from US domination, a task which could be assisted by revisionist-led "communist parties" in the name of "Marxism-Leninism". In some countries, such as Japan after the split in the Communist Party in the 1950s, the old revisionist leadership adapted itself to the new situation by changing masters and policies.

But in most of the states of Western Europe, and in India, the revisionist leaderships of the communist parties continued their loyalty to the pro-US imperialist sections of their capitalist classes and to their counterparts in Moscow, the Khrushchovite revisionists, and were able to retain control of the organisational machinery of their parties. In these countries, therefore, the new situation was reflected in the splitting away of sections of the parties to form new parties based on "centrist" revisionism. Such parties served the interests of their capitalist masters not only by striving to mobilise the working people behind the slogan of "national independence from US imperialism", but also by diverting into their ranks numbers of honest Marxist-Leninists who had broken with right revisionism and believed that they were assisting in the building of genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class.

We analyse briefly below two significant examples of such new "centrist" revisionist parties, namely, the Communist Party of India (Marxist) and the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium.

INDIAN REVISIONISM

a) In the service of the alliance between US monopoly capital and Indian capital.

The revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of India hold that the Indian state since "independence" - within the British Commonwealth! - in 1947 has been controlled by the Indian capitalist class as a whole:

"The state of India is the organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole." (Programme of the Communist Party of India, para.46, cited in: B.T.Ranadiva: "Two Programmes - Marxist and Revisionist"; Calcutta; 1966; p.12-13).

Because this class led the movement for national liberation, the leaders of the Communist Party of India hold that it remains a progressive, anti-imperialist class:

"Our Party came to a re-evaluation of the class character of the present Government and of its role in building an independent national economy, in maintaining an independent foreign policy of non-alignment and peace, and in maintaining a certain measure of democracy." (Programme of the Communist Party of India, para. 80, cited in: *ibid.*; p.18).

According to the revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of India, however, because of the "compromising policies" of the national bourgeoisie,

"In the formation and exercise of governmental power, the big bourgeoisie wields considerable influence.

The national bourgeoisie compromises with the landlords, admits them in ministries and governmental composition." (Programme of the Communist Party of India, para. 46, cited in: *ibid.*; p.13).

It is these social elements, and not the capitalist class as a whole, which, in the opinion of the leaders of the Communist Party of India, form

"the forces of reaction - the feudal and pro-imperialist elements and monopoly groups." (Programme of the Communist Party of India, para.80, cited in: *ibid.*; p.21).

Thus, say the leaders of the Communist Party of India, the way forward in India is that of "National Democratic Revolution", to bring about which the Party must

"rally all the patriotic democratic forces that can be rallied to build a powerful National Democratic Front to defeat reaction." (Programme of the CPI; para. 80; cited in: *ibid.*; p.21).

Then,

"as the National Democratic Front becomes ever more broad-based..., it defeats the forces of reaction inside and outside the ruling party and comes to the position of taking governmental power into its own hands." (Programme

of the Communist Party of India, para.80, cited in: *ibid*; p.17-18).

It is envisaged that when this National Democratic Front becomes the ruling class alliance, not only will power be shared between the capitalist class and the working class, but also the leadership of the class alliance itself:

"In this class alliance, the exclusive leadership of the working class is not established, though the exclusive leadership of the bourgeoisie no longer exists." (Programme of the Communist Party of India, para.82, cited in: *ibid*.; p.3).

According to the revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of India, the existence of "parliamentary democracy" offers the distinct possibility that the "national democratic revolution" can be carried through peacefully and constitutionally:

"In spite of the bourgeois character of the state, the ushering in of the bourgeois democratic state was a historic advance over the imperialist bureaucratic rule over our country. The Constitution of the Republic of India provides for a parliamentary democracy." (Programme of the Communist Party of India, cited in: E.M.S. Namboodiripad: "The Programme Explained"; Calcutta; 1966; p.51).

"The Programme further stresses that the Communist Party of India can and will strive to achieve the establishment of national democracy and create conditions for the advance to socialism by peaceful means." (Mohit Sen: "The Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of India", in: "World Marxist Review", May 1968; p.42).

The new state of "national democracy" envisaged by the revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of India, a state in which the capitalist class shares power with the working people, will then proceed to take India "along the non-capitalist road." It will, for example,

"institute an enquiry into the anti-national and anti-people practices of these monopolists." (Programme of the Communist Party of India, para.93, cited in: B.T. Ranadiva: "The Two Programmes - Marxist and Revisionist"; Calcutta; 1966; p.73).

The new state will, however, take more positive action by carrying out a programme of

"rapidly expanding the scope of the state sector and making it the dominant sector in our national economy." (Programme of the Communist Party of India, para.89; cited in: *ibid*.; p.74),

and of assisting non-monopoly private enterprise:

"It (i.e., the national democratic government - PB, MLOB) will give facilities to all non-monopolistic private sector enterprises and small-scale industries by providing them with raw materials at reasonable prices, credit and marketing facilities and allowing them reasonable profits;" (Programme of the Communist Party of India, para.93D, cited in: *ibid*.; p.75).

This state capitalist mixed economy, in which the state is used to assist the capitalist class to develop Indian capitalism, is the "non-capitalist road" to be attained by achievement of the programme of the revisionist-led Communist Party of India.

Since 1958 the ruling capitalist class of India has been pursuing a policy of increasing alignment with and increasing dependence on American imperialism, manifested in acceptance of US economic and military "aid", joint exercises with US forces, the "Voice of America" agreement, support for the US government on many international issues. Until recently, however, the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of India maintained that the ruling capitalist class was pursuing "a patriotic policy of non-alignment", even of "anti-imperialism":

"Foreign policy pursued by the Government of India is, in the main, a policy of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism. It conforms to the interests of the national bourgeoisie, meets the needs of India's economic development and reflects the sentiments of the mass of the people of India." (Programme of the Communist Party of India, para. 67, cited in: B.T.Ranadiva: "The Two Programmes - Marxist and Revisionist"; Calcutta; 1966; p.94-5).

"Our Party categorically rejects the thesis...that the Nehru government has 'become a favourite of the Kennedy administration'...

In the main, India's foreign policy, whose main architect is Prime Minister Nehru, continues to be a policy of non-alignment and anti-colonialism. As such all patriotic Indians support this policy." (A.Ghosh: "Some Features of the Indian Situation", in: "World Marxist Review", February 1962;p.6).

At the time of the Indian aggression against the People's Republic of China in October-November 1962, an aggression carried out in collusion with US imperialism, the Chairman of the Communist Party of India delivered a report to the General Council of the All-India Trade Union Congress:

"We unconditionally support the war effort, ...

Conditions of the national emergency, defence and near-war conditions require that the trade unions of the A.I.T.U.C. do modify temporarily their normal relations with the bourgeoisie....

We as the working class say that for the time being we suspend the question of strike struggles and protecting our class interests by that method. ...

Industrial truth is, in a sense, 'class collaboration'. But it is consciously accepted. ...

The question of unstinted support to the national bourgeoisie at this juncture of history is not a matter contradictory to the principles of the working class movement. ...

So we support the war effort. We are with the national bourgeoisie." (S.A. Dange: Report to All-India Trade Union Congress, November 1962, cited in: "A Mirror for Revisionists"; Peking; 1963; p.7-8),

while a leaflet distributed by S.G.Sardesai, a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of India, in November 1962 declared:

"Our moral responsibility to defend our country when a socialist country attacks us is greater than that of our compatriots, not less. ...

The crucial need of the day, the acid test of our patriotism, is...to give monolithic support to Prime Minister Nehru, to strengthen his hand, and to carry out his behest. He is the country's supreme field marshal, its commander-in-chief." (C.P.I. leaflet, cited in: *ibid.*; p.6,7).

And on November 2nd, 1962 the National Council of the Communist Party of India adopted a resolution approving the purchase of arms by the Indian government from the imperialist powers:

"The Communist Party of India is not opposed to buying arms from any country." (Resolution of N.C. of C.P.I., cited in: E.M.S.Namboodiripad: "The Programme Explained"; Calcutta; 1966; p.33).

As the editorial in the Chinese paper "Renmin Ribao" put it:

"Internally, the national chauvinism of the Dange clique serves the reactionary nationalist purposes of India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords; externally, it serves the purposes of US imperialism, which is promoting neo-colonialism in India." ("A Mirror for Revisionists", Peking; 1969; p.5) (our emphasis - PB, MLOB).

b) In the service of Indian "national" capital

Although claiming at first to be the continuator of the Communist Party of India, the Communist Party of India (Marxist) - as it later called itself - was founded in fact in November 1964.

According to the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), the state in India is one in which the capitalist class shares power with the landlord class, a state in which the leading role is played by the big capitalists who "are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital":

"The present Indian state is the organ of the class rule of the bourgeoisie and landlords, led by the big bourgeoisie who are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital." (Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), para.56; Calcutta; 1966; p.25).

As a result of the leading role of the big capitalists:

"The penetration of American capital in India and our growing reliance on American 'aid' are creating a dangerous situation for our country. ..."

The government's foreign policy...objectively facilitates the US designs of neo-colonialism and aggression.: (Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), paras. 30,55; *ibid.*; p.12,24).

Therefore, according to the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), a "democratic revolution" is necessary to remove the reactionary, anti-national forces - the big capitalists and the landlords - from the state machinery:

"Dislodging the present big bourgeois leadership which has allied with landlordism from the leading position of state power and in its place establishing the hegemony of the working class over the state' - such is the basic task of the Indian revolution." (E.N.S.Namboodiripad: "The Programme explained"; Calcutta; 1966; p.55).

"The nature of our revolution in the present stage of its development is essentially anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and democratic. ... Ours is a democratic revolution." (Progress of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), para.96; *ibid.*; p.46).

In order to bring about this "democratic revolution", it is necessary to create a "people's democratic front" to include the non-monopoly national capitalists (i.e., that section of the capitalist class which is not linked with foreign finance capital) and the rich peasants (i.e., the rural capitalists):

"The people's democratic front...is to be forged to achieve the revolution. ...

The other broader sections of the national bourgeoisie which are either having no links altogether with foreign monopolists or having no durable links, which are not by themselves monopolistic, ...can find a place in the people's democratic front. ...

The rich peasants...can also, therefore, be brought into the democratic front and retained as allies in the people's democratic revolution." (Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), paras. 99,106,103; *ibid.*; p.48,50,49).

As a result of the victory of the "democratic revolution", the "people's democratic front" will establish itself in power as a "people's democratic state", in which the capitalist class will share power with the working class:

"The Communist Party of India (Marxist - PB, MLOB)...places before the people as the immediate objective the establishment of people's democracy based on the coalition of all genuine anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces headed by the working class. This demands first and foremost the...replacement of the present bourgeois-landlord state and government by a state of people's democracy." (Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), para.87; *ibid.*; p.37).

"What is shared...between the bourgeoisie and the working class is...state power, established in the course of the joint struggle of all the patriotic classes. Such a sharing of power by all those who jointly fight and defeat imperialism, feudalism and monopoly capitalism is inherent in the concept of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-monopoly democratic front establishing itself as a state of the patriotic classes." (E.M.S.Namboodiripad: "The Programme Explained"; *ibid.*; p.75).

According to the revisionists in the leadership of the Communist Party of India(Marxist), it is possible to carry through both the "democratic revolution" and the subsequent "socialist transformation" by peaceful means:

"Parliament and state legislatures can serve as instruments of the people in their struggle for democracy. ...

The Communist Party of India(Marxist - PB, MLOB) strives to achieve the establishment of people's democracy and socialist transformation through peaceful means." (Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), paras.71,113), *ibid.*; p.30, 53).

"The relevant passages regarding...the peaceful path are almost similar in our Programme and the Programme of the revisionists (i.e., of the Communist Party of India - PB, MLOB). This is the most telling refutation of the canard by the Congress rulers...that our Party stands for the insurrectionary method while the revisionists are the champions of the peaceful parliamentary path." (E.M.S.Namboodiripad: "The Programme Explained"; *ibid.*; p.74).

The programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) does not take us beyond the social stage of laying "the pre-conditions of socialism." When these "pre-conditions of socialism" are examined, however, they reveal why the capitalist class

might be expected to collaborate in laying them, for they represent nothing but a state capitalist mixed economy:

"The state sector, or the public sector as it is otherwise called, can play a progressive role in an under-developed economy, if it is promoted along anti-imperialist, anti-monopolist, democratic lines." (Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), para.21, *ibid.*; p.8).

"A state of the people's democracy...can build up socialism only by transferring the basic means of production into the property of the state...."

These are the steps we take, namely, nationalisation, extending the public sector, and planning. ...This is creating the pre-conditions of socialism." (B.T.Ranadiva: "The Two Programmes - Marxist and Revisionist"; Calcutta, 1966; p.11; 69).

Under the "people's democracy" envisaged by the revisionist leaders of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), in fact, the state will "assist" private enterprise, which will be permitted to continue "on a considerable scale":

"Our main attack is not concentrated against capitalism in general, nor against all private production...."

During this period of transition, when private production will be carried on on a considerable scale, we will help and aid the small and medium industries." (B.T.Ranadiva: "The Two Programmes - Marxist and Revisionist"; *ibid.*; p.69).

"The people's democratic government will...assist the small and medium industries by providing them with credit, raw materials and reasonable prices and by helping them in regard to marketing facilities." (Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), para.90; *ibid.*; p.43).

It will be seen from the above analysis that the programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) differs from that of the Communist Party of India (as it was in 1964) in that the revisionist leadership of the former seeks to serve the interests of that section of the Indian capitalist class which wishes to break free from the domination of US imperialism, while the revisionist leadership of the latter sought to serve the interests of that section of the Indian capitalist class which wished to continue collaboration with and dependence on US imperialism:

"The people's democratic government will:

1) take over all foreign capital in plantations, mines, oil refineries and factories, shipping and trade." (Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), para.90; *ibid.*; p.43).

"We must totally root out from among the people those reactionary parties that advocate India's joining the US imperialist camp. ..."

Marxist-Leninists...insist on India's foreign policy being consistently anti-imperialist.

The main edge of this policy must be directed against US imperialism." (B.T. Ranadiva: "The Two Programmes - Marxist and Revisionist"; *ibid.*; p.22, 78-79).

The fundamentally national-chauvinist, anti-Marxist-Leninist character of the outlook of the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) is reflected in such phrases as

"Our Programme expresses its concern over the fact that in recent years India has been losing its position in Asian and African countries." (P.Sundarayya et al.: "Reply from Prison"; Calcutta; 1965; p.15)

and in the fact that, in regard to the aggression of the Indian capitalist government against the People's Republic of China (held by the leaders of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) to be "a socialist state"), they could not bring themselves to characterise the war as unjust on the side of India and just on the part of the People's Republic of China:

"While there is no question of our 'toeing the Chinese line', ...

We were not and are not prepared to give up our view that the responsibility for the Chinese offensive of October 1962 should be shared also by the Indian ruling classes." (E.M.S.Namboodiripad: "The Programme Explained"; Calcutta; 1966; p.107-8).

The essentially "centrist" stand of the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) in 1964-5 may be seen from the following:

"The decision of the Tenali Convention of our Party, held in July 1964, to exclude the discussion on the questions of international debate when we met in the all-India Party Congress came in for a good deal of criticism. ...

More than two years have passed since the Calcutta Congress of our Party... adopted a special resolution postponing the discussion on the questions concerning the international Communist movement. ...

We have not taken our stand either in support of, or in opposition to, the ideological-theoretical stand of the Chinese Communist Party. ...

The essence of the Committee's approach thus was that the open polemics within the international Communist movement.. should be stopped. ...

The crux of the difference between our Party and the Dangeites (i.e., the Communist Party of India - PB, MLOB) on the problem of Communist unity, therefore, amounts to a difference between partisanship on the one hand and earnest attempts at resolving the differences on the other." (E.M.S.Namboodiripad: "The Programme Explained"; Calcutta; 1966; p.1,4,5,6).

BELGIAN REVISIONISM

a) In the service of the alliance between Belgian monopoly capital and US monopoly capital

According to the revisionists in the leadership of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium, the state in imperialist Belgium is, in principle, the machinery of rule of the Belgium people as a whole:

"It is therefore normal to put forward the demand that the State should show itself useful in directing the economy which in fact it finances. It is normal that the country should fight in order that this State, by modifying itself democratically, should reflect in its activities the aspirations of the Belgians and the interests of the country." (E.Burnelle: Report to National Conference of the Communist Party of Belgium, December 1961, cited in: J. Grippa: "Marxisme-Leninisme et Revisionnisme"; Brussels; 1963; p 120).

However, this principle has been distorted by the influence of the big monopolies, who have been able to convert the state into, in effect,

"the dictatorship of the monopolies". (J.Blume: "Forthcoming Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium", in: "World Marxist Review", April 1960; p.62).

However, say the Belgian revisionists, measures of nationalisation (within the framework of a capitalist society) represent

"stages in the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society." (Draft Constitution of the Communist Party of Belgium, Article 1; cited in: J. Grippa: "Marxisme-Leninisme et Revisionnisme"; Brussels; 1963; p.88).

Thus, the development of state monopoly capitalism in Belgium does not represent (as Marxist-Leninists maintain) an increase in the control of the state machine by the monopolies, but is a reflection of

"the superiority demonstrated by the socialist system" (Draft Theses for the 14th Congress of the CPB, Thesis 64; cited in: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.88).

and of

"the growing power of the working class movement". (Draft Theses for the 14th Congress of the CPB, Thesis 3; cited in: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p. 87).

According to the revisionists of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium therefore, Imperialist Belgium is in "a transitional stage between capitalist society and socialist society" - represented by state monopoly capitalism! Further progress towards socialism (that is, towards further measures of nationalisation) is being impeded by the influence of the monopolies, so that the Party must strive to organise a united front of all social forces whose interests are opposed to those of the big monopolies (including, that is, non-monopoly capitalists):

"The Communist Party believes that the conditions for the formation of an anti-monopolist front, combining together all the forces threatened by the power of the monopolies. It considers one of its essential tasks to be the formation of this front." (Draft Constitution of the Communist Party of Belgium, Article 1; cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.144).

The principal aim of this united front will be

"to modify the relation of forces in the interior of the state, to modify the structures of power and transform them into means of the control of the monopolies and the reduction of their power.

This implies mass pressure continually exerted on the State and its organs." (Draft Theses for the 14th Congress of the CPB, Thesis 53; cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.121),

in particular by means of mass lobbying of Members of Parliament,

"the method which can bring Parliament back to life" ("Drapeau Rouge", July 28th, 1962; cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.108).

and which will bring about

"the liquidation of the divorce between Parliament and the working masses of

Belgium." (Draft Theses for the 14th Congress of the CPB, Thesis 39; cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.109).

By these means, say the Belgian revisionists, the Belgian working class can advance to socialism peacefully, by means of "democratic structural reforms" of the political system:

"The advance to socialism...implies the realisation of a series of structural reforms which will constitute a broadening of democracy and will mark stages on the road of the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society." (Draft Constitution of the Communist Party of Belgium, Article 1; cited in: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.144).

"The Communist Party is working for a peaceful transition to socialism, for a revolution unaccompanied by the horrors of civil war." (E.Burnelle: "Forthcoming Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium", in: "World Marxist Review", April 1960; p.62).

In accordance with its role of servicing the interests of that section of Belgian monopoly capital which wishes to maintain collaboration with and dependence on United States imperialism, the revisionist leadership of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium presented the leaders of US imperialism as "men of peace" who should be supported and collaborated with, and opposed the campaign for the withdrawal of Belgium from NATO.

According to the revisionist leaders of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium in 1962-3,

"Kennedy represents one of the principal factors in the struggle for peace" (J.Terfve: Article in "Drapeau Rouge", September 7th, 1962, cited in: J. Grippa: "Marxisme-Leninisme et Revisionnisme"; Brussels: 1963; p.18),

so that the party had to do everything possible

"to strengthen the position of Kennedy" (J.Terfve: Article in: "Drapeau Rouge", February 4-5th, 1963; cited in: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.19).

The Draft Theses of the Central Committee for the 14th Congress of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium in 1963 did not once denounce US imperialism even in words, while Thesis 37 declared:

"The Communist Party does not consider it yet possible to bring about the withdrawal of Belgium from NATO." (Draft Theses of the CC of the CPB; Thesis 37, cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.19).

and a resolution of solidarity with Cuba passed by the Brussels Federal Bureau of the party on November 6th, 1962 was denounced by the Central Committee as

"contrary to the Party line." (Cited by: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.33-34).

b) In the service of Belgian "national" monopoly capital

Some months after the reorganisation of the Communist Party of Belgium on an "anti-revisionist" basis in December 1963, the party began to put forward the policy of building a "People's United Front", a cardinal point in the programme of which should be "the struggle for the national independence of Belgium."

This policy is not put forward in the book by Jacques Grippa, the secretary of the Central Committee of the reorganised Communist Party of Belgium, in which the struggle against the revisionist leadership of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium is described. Nor does it appear in the "Programme of Action" adopted by the reorganisation conference of the Communist Party of Belgium itself, as summarized in "Peking Review" of January 17th, 1964.

By the late spring of 1964, however, the Communist Party of Belgium had adopted the "national independence" policy, as was stated by Grippa in his speech at the Higher Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in June 1964.

In this speech Grippa emphasises the contradictions between the imperialists of the countries dominated by US imperialism on the one hand and the US imperialists on the other:

"One of the principal aspects of the contradictions among the imperialists today is the contradiction between the different capitalist countries and US imperialism. US imperialism is still pursuing its plan of world domination which includes the political, economic and military control of other capitalist countries.

Under such conditions it is inevitable that these contradictions should surge up and grow bigger." (J.Grippa: Speech at Higher Party School of the CC of the CPC, in "Peking Review", June 26th, 1964; p.17).

He says correctly that

"it is necessary to make use of the contradictions among the imperialists within the framework of realising our own strategic aims," (J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.17).

He goes on to say that these inter-imperialist contradictions - that is, the conflict between the need of the West European imperialists to pursue an independent course in their own interests and the opposite need of the US imperialists to control the policies of the West European imperialists in their interests - are already manifesting themselves in a struggle on the part of the West European imperialists for "national independence", for "liberation from the US yoke." In other words, he declares that the "struggle for liberation from the US yoke," is a policy which serves the interests of the West European imperialists:

"We can note that these contradictions in action are already taking on the aspect of a struggle for national independence and for liberation from the US yoke." (J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.17).

He then goes on to say that the leadership of the reorganised Communist Party of Belgium consider that the party should, in effect, be placed at the disposal of the Belgian "national" imperialists, i.e., of that section of Belgian monopoly capital which is striving for liberation from the US yoke, and that the party should urge the working class to form an alliance with this section of Belgian monopoly capital:

"We consider that our course of action should be one of struggle for national independence, ... by forming the widest possible alliances, including even alliances with certain capitalist strata whose interests are opposed to US imperialism." (J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.17).

Thus, within a few months of the reorganisation of the Communist Party of Belgium on an "anti-revisionist" basis, the leadership had set the party on a new revisionist course. In opposition to the revisionist leadership of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium, which had placed the party at the disposal of that section of the Belgian imperialists which favoured continued collaboration with and subservience to US imperialism, the leadership of the reorganised party had placed it at the disposal of that section of the Belgian imperialists which favoured the liberation of imperialist Belgium from the yoke of US monopoly capital.

Faced with the objections of Marxist-Leninists that this course of striving to persuade the working class to ally itself with a section of its exploiting ruling class amounted to class collaboration and social-chauvinism, the leadership of the reorganised party modified the formulation put forward by Grippa in Peking. Under this new formulation, which has been maintained since, the "Belgian" imperialists (the adjective came to be written in inverted commas) disappeared from the scene except as mere agents and puppets of US imperialism:

"The 'Belgian' financial oligarchy...had deliberately chosen...to become a bourgeoisie of banking and sub-contractors, putting its capital at the disposal of yankee finance capital and literally selling out the country to it.

Its policy of national treason manifests itself by political servitude, economic colonisation and the military occupation of the country by American imperialism." ("Balance Sheet and Perspectives of the Workers' Struggle", in: "La Voix du Peuple", May 1st 1969; p.2).

Despite the mysterious "disappearance of the "capitalist strata whose interests are opposed to US imperialism", to which Grippa referred in his 1964 speech in Peking, the leadership of the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium continued to speak of "the increasing contradictions between the West European imperialists and the US imperialists":

"Stalin in 'The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR' (1952) had already drawn attention to the importance of the sharpening of inter-imperialist contradictions, especially between the USA and the countries of Western Europe." (Letter from J.Grippa, Secretary of the CC of the CPB, to the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain, June 7th, 1969).

In a memorandum to the Communist Party of Belgium dated June 17th 1969 (sent in circumstances to be recounted later in this Report), the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain stated:

"An essential principle of Marxism-Leninism is that the world is not static, but in process of continual change. A Marxist-Leninist analysis of the world situation must therefore not only see the world in its development, but must from time to time be brought into line with the changes that are occurring. In our view the conception you put forward of the West European imperialists as subordinate accomplices of United States imperialism is generally true for the period 1945 to c.1958. At the same time, we feel that it needs to be made clear that the policy of 'national treason' pursued by the West European imperialists during this period was in no way due to any desire on their part to liquidate their imperialist exploitation in favour of American monopoly capital, but was dictated by the post-war situation in which the weakness of the developed capitalist states of Western Europe made it necessary for their ruling classes to adopt - in defence of their own interests as imperialists - a position of dependence upon Washington.

There can, of course, be no doubt that the US imperialists have been taking advantage of this situation to penetrate the economies of Western Europe with goods and capital, and to wrest certain spheres of influence from the West European imperialists. These factors have led to the development of increasing contradictions between US imperialism and the imperialist states of Western Europe, as you say in para 1 of your proposed amendment. These increasing contradictions reflect an increasing conflict of interest between the US and West European imperialists.

But if there is an increasing conflict of interest between US imperialism and the West European imperialist states, if the interests of the West European imperialists are suffering as a result of their subordination to US imperialism, it is inevitable that they will wish to break free from this subordination in their own imperialist interests. It is also inevitable that they will endeavour to put this wish into effect; that they will endeavour to break free from US domination when favourable circumstances permit.

It seems to us, with respect, that your proposed amendment is illogical in stating that there are increasing inter-imperialist contradictions between the US imperialists and those of Western Europe (that is to say, that there is an increasing conflict of interest between them) and that the interests of the West European imperialists are suffering as a result of US domination, and yet denying by implication that the West European imperialists must therefore wish to break free from US domination and must endeavour to do so when favourable circumstances permit.

In this connection we ask you to allow us to raise a fraternal criticism of your slogan calling for 'national independence' for Belgium. In our view this slogan cannot be correct for an imperialist country such as Belgium, in conditions where this country is under the domination of another imperialist state - in this case the United States.

We realise that this slogan is presented as directed against the Belgian imperialists, in that these are described as functioning as mere managers for the US imperialists, as 'national traitors' with no interests apart from those of serving US imperialism. But we believe it is not correct to speak of the imperialists of the Western European states in this way. Such a description is, we feel, irreconcilable with the statement in para. 1 of your proposed amendment which speaks of increasing contradictions (that is to say, an increasing conflict of interest) between the US imperialists and those of Western Europe, for if the latter were mere managers for the US imperialists, with no interests apart from those of serving US imperialism, there would be no such increasing conflict of interest.

But since there is such a conflict of interest between the US imperialists and those of Western Europe, a conflict of interest which the West European imperialists cannot but try to solve by pursuing an independent course in their own imperialist interests, must it not be said that for Marxist-Leninists in a West European imperialist country to adopt the slogan of 'national independence' for that country is, in effect, to support the imperialists of that country in their contradictions with those of the US? Is not the slogan of 'national independence' in a situation where one's own imperialist country is involved in inter-imperialist contradictions with another equivalent to the slogan 'defence of the fatherland' in a more violent inter-imperialist conflict? ...

We must say, with respect but sincerely, that we believe that the slogan calling for 'national independence', while correct for a non-imperialist

country under the domination of an imperialist power, is incorrect for an imperialist country under the domination of another imperialist power, in that it has the effect not of mobilising one's working people against imperialism but of mobilising them to the support of 'one's own' imperialists in their inter-imperialist contradictions with foreign imperialists." (Memorandum of PB of CC of the MLOB to the Communist Party of Belgium June 17th, 1969).

Although pursuing this revisionist policy from 1964 to the present time, the leadership of the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium may be said to have entered the international camp of "centrist" revisionism only in 1967-8, when the party began to publish broadly correct analyses of Chinese "left" revisionism leading gradually to an exposure of the counter-revolutionary character of the so-called "cultural revolution" in China. By this time international "centrist" revisionism had entered the second phase of its development, so that the political positions of the CPB after 1967-8 will be discussed in the next part of the Report, which deals with this second phase of "centrist" revisionism.

REVISIONIST TENDENCIES IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA 1959-1966

Having established the fact that the basic policies of such parties as the Communist Party of Japan and the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium were revisionist and served the interest of "national" monopoly capital in the countries concerned, it is necessary to ask how these policies came to be publicly accepted as "Marxist-Leninist" by the leadership of the Communist Party of China:

"Peng Chen in his speech hailed the Japanese Communist Party as a glorious Marxist-Leninist Party, as the defender of the interests of the Japanese working class and the Japanese people. He said:

'Holding aloft the banner of opposition to US imperialism and striving for national independence, holding aloft the banner of revolution, the great and heroic Communist Party of Japan...is worthy of the name of a firm and highly militant vanguard of the proletariat.'" ("Rousing Welcome for Japanese Communist Party Delegation", in: "Peking Review", April 1st, 1966; p.7-8).

In the Report of the Central Committee of the MLOB on the Situation in the People's Republic of China of January 1968, we said that during the period 1959-1966 the leadership of the Communist Party of China was one

"with the Marxist-Leninists in the ascendancy." (Report of the Central Committee of the MLOB on the Situation in the People's Republic of China, in: "Red Front", January 1968; p.9).

We cannot know at present the details of the internal political struggles within the leadership of the Communist Party of China, but from the evidence available it would appear that it was in the late 1950s that certain leading comrades

"were forced to realise by these developments that before effective action could be taken in the direction of ousting the representatives of the capitalist class from the new-democratic state and so opening the way to socialism in China, they were compelled to wage an inner-party struggle against the revisionist faction headed by Mao tse-Tung." (ibid.; p.9).

It appears likely that some of these comrades had not yet reached a completely Marxist-Leninist position even when the full counter-revolutionary violence of the "cultural revolution" organised by the faction headed by Mao Tse-Tung burst upon them in the summer of 1966. But whatever later information may reveal about the individual attitudes of these comrades, it is clear that, although they were "in the ascendancy", they were compelled in the period 1959-66 to share the leadership with revisionists.

It was for these reasons that, as we said, the anti-revisionist documents emanating from the collective leadership of the Communist Party of China in the period 1960-1966 were

"on the whole, magnificent exposés of the treacherous role being played by the modern revisionists." (ibid.; p.9 - our emphasis; RB, MLOB).

As a result of the fact that the collective leadership of the Communist Party of China during this period was not solidly and unitedly Marxist-Leninist, its anti-revisionist stance showed certain "centrist" revisionist weaknesses, particularly in the period 1960-1964, less so in the period 1964-1966.

For example, at the 1960 meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties,

"the delegations of the CPC and some other fraternal parties also made certain concessions. For instance, we differed on the questions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and on the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism, but out of consideration for the needs of the CPSU and certain other fraternal parties we agreed to the inclusion of this same wording on those questions as that used in the 1957 Declaration." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves"; Peking; 1963; p.58).

As a result of these concessions to the revisionists on important questions of principle, the delegation of the Communist Party of China gave its approval to the following revisionist formulations in the Statement of the 1960 world meeting:

"Today, in a number of capitalist countries the working class, headed by its vanguard, has the opportunity... to unite a majority of the people, win state power without civil war and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people. ...The working class can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in parliament, transform parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people, and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realisation of the socialist revolution."

The historic decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU are not only of great importance for the CPSU and communist construction in the USSR, but have initiated a new state in the world Communist movement, and have promoted its development on the basis of Marxism-Leninism." (Statement of Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1960; in "World Marxist Review", December 1960; p.21,24).

Four years later, in 1964, the leadership of the Communist Party of China had moved to a position of self-criticism of the concessions they had made at the world meeting:

"If comrades now made the criticism that we were wrong in giving this consideration to the leaders of the CPSU, we are quite ready to accept this criticism." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "The Proletarian

Revolution and Khrushchov's Revisionism"; Peking; 1964; p.23).

As late as February 1964, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China was still putting forward the concept of reaching by negotiation with the Soviet revisionists "a reasonable formula acceptable to all".

"We on our part made a four-point proposal in our letter to you dated February 29th, 1964 for the preparation and convocation of an international meeting of the fraternal parties. The proposal read as follows: 1) For the cessation of the public polemics it is necessary for the Chinese and Soviet Parties and other fraternal Parties concerned to hold various bilateral and multilateral talks in order to find through consultation a fair and reasonable formula acceptable to all and to conclude a common agreement." (Letter of the CC of the CPC in Reply to a Letter of the CC of the CPSU dated June 15, 1964; Peking; 1964; p.5).

By July 1964, however, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China was declaring firmly:

"A thorough criticism and repudiation of your revisionist line is imperative if the international meeting of the fraternal Parties is to be a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. ..."

The Marxist-Leninist Parties which have been rebuilt after breaking with revisionism...will, of course, be allowed to participate (in any international meeting - PB, MLOB) and no one has any right to exclude them.

So long as you persist in your revisionist line and refuse to admit your errors publicly, we will certainly continue the great debate." (Letter of the CC of the CPC in Reply to a Letter of the CC of the CPSU dated June 15, 1964; Peking; 1964; p.16,21,29).

Again, it was clear to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China that

"In completely negating Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, Khrushchov in effect negated the dictatorship of the proletariat and the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism which Stalin defended and developed." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves"; Peking; 1963; p9).

Nevertheless, the CC of the CPC took the line that the attacks upon Stalin were merely "excessive" in that they "completely negated" Stalin - instead of, presumably, only partly negating him!

"It was necessary to criticize Stalin's mistakes. But in his secret report to the 20th Congress, Comrade Khrushchov completely negated Stalin. ..."

Stalin deserves to be criticised, but...at no time and in no place did the Chinese Communist Party...agree with the complete negation of Stalin." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": *ibid.*; p.8,12,13).

"In his way of thinking, Stalin departed from dialectical materialism and fell into metaphysics and subjectivism on certain questions and consequently he was sometimes divorced from reality and from the masses. ...He confused two types of contradictions which are different in nature, contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and contradictions among the people, and also confused the different methods needed in handling them. In the work led

by Stalin of suppressing the counter-revolution, ... there were innocent people who were wrongly convicted; and in 1937 and 1938 there occurred the error of enlarging the scope of the suppression of counter-revolutionaries. In the matter of Party and government organisation, he did not fully apply proletarian democratic centralism and, to some extent, violated it. In handling relations with fraternal parties and countries, he made some mistakes. He also gave some bad counsel in the international communist movement. These mistakes caused some losses to the Soviet Union and the international communist movement. ...

Long ago the Chinese Communists had first-hand experience of some of his mistakes. Of the erroneous "Left" and Right opportunist lines which emerged in the Chinese Communist Party at one time or another, some arose under the influence of certain mistakes of Stalin." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "On the Question of Stalin"; 1963; p.5-6, 8).

In 1963 the CC of the CPC was including in the "socialist camp" of countries not only China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam - where socialism had never been established - but also Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and the Soviet Union - where socialism had been destroyed by the policies of the right revisionist leaderships.

"Now there is a socialist camp consisting of thirteen countries, Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam." (CC of the CPC: "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement;" Peking; 1963; p.10)

By July 1964 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China had recognized that the Soviet Union, at least, could hardly any longer be included in the "socialist camp" of countries:

"The revisionist Khrushchov clique are the political representatives of the Soviet bourgeoisie, and particularly of its privileged stratum. ...

The Soviet privileged stratum has gained control of the Party, the government and other important organisations. ...

The relationship of such persons to the workers has turned into one between exploiters and exploited, between oppressors and oppressed. ...

The Khrushchov clique...are turning the Soviet state under the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state under the dictatorship of the revisionist Khrushchov clique; and, step by step, they are turning socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership into ownership by the privileged stratum. ...

The Khrushchov clique is betraying socialism and restoring capitalism." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "On Khrushchov's Phoney Communism and its Historical Lessons for the World"; Peking; 1964; p.43, 44, 27, 45-46, 48):

It is clear, therefore, that during the period 1960 to 1966 the leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in its collective will,

was moving closer to a full Marxist-Leninist position but that its statement during this period still contained revisionist elements.

One of the gravest of these deviations from a Marxist-Leninist position was a tendency to substitute for the correct formulation "struggle against world imperialism, headed by United States imperialism" the incorrect formulation "struggle against United States imperialism." In addition to the factors mentioned previously, other factors operated in connection with this particular deviation: the fact that US imperialism at this time still held a dominating position over other imperialist powers; the fact that US imperialism was the particular imperialism with which the Soviet revisionists were collaborating; the fact that the immediate threat to the People's Republic of China came from US imperialism; the fact that their "centrist" revisionist allies in the "Great Debate" - such as the leaderships of the Communist Party of Japan, the Workers' Party of Vietnam, the Workers' Party of Korea, the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium - had adopted this policy.

As a result of a combination of all these factors, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China adopted the "centrist" revisionist policy in relation to the struggle against world imperialism which gave support to those revisionist leaderships in developed capitalist countries under the domination of US imperialism when these leaderships sought to place their parties at the disposal of those sections of monopoly capital in their countries which wished to break free from the US yoke:

"In the contemporary world opposition to or alliance with US imperialism constitutes the hallmark for deciding whether or not a political force can be included in the united front against the United States. ...

In the imperialist countries which are in sharp contradiction with the United States, some monopoly capitalists follow the US imperialists, but there are also others who desire in varying degrees to oppose the United States. In the struggle against the United States, the people of the world can take united action with the latter on some questions and to a certain degree." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "Refutation of the New Leaders of the CPSU on 'United Action'", in: "Peking Review", November 12th, 1965; p.14-15).

At the 1960 meeting of the representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties, it was the pressure of the Chinese delegation and the delegation of the "centrist" revisionist parties which, against the opposition of the Soviet revisionists, secured the partial adoption of this policy formulation in the Statement.

"In the latter half of 1960, a sharp struggle developed in the international communist movement around the meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties. ...

Many correct views on important principles set forth by the delegations of the Chinese and other fraternal parties were written into the Statement. The theses on the need for the working class and the masses in certain advanced capitalist countries under US imperialist political, economic and military domination to direct their chief blows at US imperialist domination and also at the monopoly capitalists and other reactionary forces at home which betray their national interests: ... all these theses are in the Statement as a result of the acceptance of the views of the Chinese and some other delegations." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "The Origin and Development of the Differences between the Leadership of the CPSU

and Ourselves"; Peking; 1963; p.33,37-38).

The compromise reached on this question was remarkable in its illogicality. The "centrist" revisionist policy was accepted for Japan, rejected for the European developed capitalist states.

"In some non-European developed capitalist countries which are under the political, economic and military domination of US imperialism, the working class and the people direct the main blow against US imperialist domination, and also against monopoly capital and other domestic reactionary forces that betray the interests of the nation. In the course of this struggle all the democratic, patriotic forces of the nation come together in a united front fighting for the victory of a revolution aimed at achieving genuine national independence and democracy." (Statement of the Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties; Moscow 1960, in: "World Marxist Review"; December 1960, p.18).

As will be seen, since 1965 the essence of this formulation - extended to include Europe - has been taken over by the Soviet revisionists.

PART THREE

In this part of our Report we wish to indicate the principal features of the second phase of development of "centrist" revisionism and the reasons for its development into this new phase.

In this second phase of development, "centrist" revisionism began to move closer to Soviet revisionism - towards, in fact, a position of constituting a semi-independent "left"-wing of Soviet revisionism.

While continuing to criticise Soviet revisionism, in this second phase of development the "centrist" revisionists took the line - expressed explicitly by the Communist Party of Japan in a statement issued in September 1966 - that the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was composed partly of revisionists and partly of "anti-revisionists", so that the international struggle against revisionism made it essential to collaborate with the Soviet leadership in order to assist the Soviet "anti-revisionists" in their struggle against the revisionists. (This policy became in practice one of collaborating with "orthodox" revisionists in their struggle against ultra-revisionists.)

At the same time the "centrist" revisionists broke away from their ideological alliance with the Communist Party of China, in which Marxist-Leninists were in the ascendancy until the summer of 1966, and adopted a policy of open hostility towards the leadership of that Party.

For example:

On January 1st, 1966 Kenji Miyamoto, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Japan, stated that it was essential to organise concerted international action against imperialist aggression in Vietnam even if ideological unity could not be re-established.

Thus, the leadership of the Communist Party of Japan set a line which was in contradiction with that adopted by the leadership of the Communist Party of China:

"So far from opposing US imperialism, the new leaders of the CPSU are allying themselves and collaborating with it. ...If they really opposed US imperialism

and did so by actual deeds we would readily take united action with them! But their so-called opposition to US imperialism is only verbal and not genuine. ... So long as they do not abandon their alliance with US imperialism and reaction, we absolutely refuse to take any 'united action' with them." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "Refutation of the New Leaders of the CPSU on 'United Action'", in: "Peking Review", November 12th, 1965; p.15).

On January 2nd 1966 Castro publicly attacked the Chinese government in connection with the preliminary trade negotiations then proceeding between the two countries. As an official of the Chinese Ministry of Trade said:

"Prime Minister Castro has taken a step which is extraordinary in normal state relations. ... he unilaterally and untruthfully made public contents of the preliminary trade negotiations now going on between the governmental departments concerned of the two countries. ..."

There have been trade negotiations between China and Cuba every year, and every year differing views of one kind or another have cropped up in the course of them. But in the past Prime Minister Castro never acted as he has now. Why then has he suddenly taken such an extraordinary step on the eve of the three continents people's solidarity conference in Havana? This offers food for thought." (Interview with an Official of China's Ministry of Foreign Trade, in: "Peking Review", January 14th, 1966; p.23).

On February 6th, 1966, Castro delivered a strongly worded attack on the government of the People's Republic of China, declaring that the alleged refusal of the Chinese government to meet Cuba's demands in full during the preliminary trade talks was an "economic reprisal" for the restrictions imposed by the Cuban government on the distribution of Chinese political material:

"The Chinese Government carried out a criminal act of economic aggression against our country. ..."

It is precisely that Government, with its perfidy, its hypocrisy, its malicious insinuations and its contempt for our small country which forces us to do it. (i.e., to complain of - PB, MLOB).

...the disrespect shown by the Chinese representatives towards our demands in connection with the massive distribution of propaganda material involving matters of a political nature." (Fidel Castro: Reply to the Statements of the Chinese Government, February 6th, 1966 in: "Peking Review", February 25th, 1966; p.19,21).

In March 1966 a delegation of the Communist Party of Japan visited Pyongyang, where a joint statement was issued by the Workers' Party of Korea and the Communist Party of Japan calling for united action.

On August 4th, 1966 the Communist Party of Japan instructed its members to remove all portraits of Mao tse-Tung from the party's local headquarters and to withdraw all Chinese books from party bookshops.

On August 12th, 1966 the Workers' Party of Korea issued a statement which accused the Communist Party of China by implication of attempting to impose its own theories and policies on the North Korean and Japanese parties, declaring that it was impermissible for a large party to put pressure on "a small party and the party of a capitalist country."

In early September 1966 the Communist Party of Japan issued a statement which denounced the opposition of the Communist Party of China to united action as "purely negative." The statement suggested that the Soviet leadership was divided between revisionists and "anti-revisionists" and advocated that parties should continue their struggle against modern revisionism while collaborating with the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with the aim of promoting the development of anti-revisionist policies within that party.

On September 18th, 1966 "Pravda" reprinted from "Rodong Shinmoon", organ of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, an article which attacked "trotskyists" in terms which made it obvious that the attack was directed against the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

THE REORIENTATION OF SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

One basic cause for the change in orientation of "centrist" revisionism in passing from the first to the second phase of its development was the major re-orientation in Soviet foreign policy which began in the Autumn of 1964 - a re-orientation which reflected the same fundamental changes in the world balance of forces which had given rise to "centrist" revisionism itself.

By the early 1960s the decline in the economic and military strength of US imperialism in relation to that of the imperialist powers of continental Europe and Japan had raised serious doubts as to whether the continuation of a Soviet foreign policy in which collaboration with US imperialism was the cardinal point was in the best interests of the Soviet neo-imperialist class. These doubts were reinforced by the fact that, six months after Khrushchov had declared that Soviet and US interests "do not clash directly anywhere", came the Caribbean crisis in which the Soviet revisionists were compelled to withdraw their missile bases from Cuba and to submit to the ignominy of suffering their ships to be examined on the high seas by US warships. By this time, too, it had become clear that the Khrushchovite policy had caused great loss of Soviet influence in many colonial-type countries. When in 1964 the Soviet government had to give serious consideration to a demand from Washington for the dismantling of the German Democratic Republic, one of the most important states within the Soviet sphere of influence, the new ruling class of Soviet state capitalists was forced to make an "agonising reappraisal" of their foreign policy. As a result it was decided - though not without continuing opposition - to jettison the Khrushchovite policy of making collaboration with US imperialism the cornerstone of foreign policy - together with, in October 1964, its principal architect, Khrushchov - and gradually to re-orientate this foreign policy into one the cardinal point of which was collaboration with all capitalist classes and strata in the world which are in contradiction with US imperialism - that is, with those capitalists forces which were now in the ascendant.

Although this reorientation was - could only be - a gradual process, accompanied at first by declarations by the new Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership that "no changes in foreign policy were envisaged", information as to the real significance of the dismissal of Khrushchov was clearly made available to the "centrist" revisionist leaderships so that they might grasp the fact that the major obstacle to their collaboration with the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had now been removed.

Thus Miyamoto, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Japan, told a press conference on October 16th, 1964:

"His removal in this manner is of very great importance. ..."

I feel that the fact that the former helmsman is no longer allowed to take the helm will have a great effect on the future of its (the CPSU's - PB, MIOB) line." (Cited in: "Peking Review", November 6th, 1964; p.15).

And Nosaka, the Chairman of the Communist Party of Japan, said a few days later:

"Khrushchov's removal from office and China's successful nuclear test are... telling blows to imperialism headed by the United States." (Cited in: "Peking Review", November 13th, 1964; p.20).

That this information was not conveyed to the leadership of the Communist Party of China, however, then with Marxist-Leninists in the ascendancy, is suggested by the declaration from Peking that

"the replacement of Khrushchov by these new leaders has been merely a change of personalities in the revisionist dynasty." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "Refutation of the New Leaders of the CPSU on 'United Action'", in: "Peking Review", November 12th, 1965; p.19).

THE REORIENTATION OF THE "INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT"

The reorientation of Soviet foreign policy away from collaboration with US imperialism as its cardinal point towards one of collaboration with the social forces opposed to US imperialism was reflected in the communique issued from the "consultative meeting" of representatives of "Communist and Workers' Parties" held in Moscow in March 1965:

"The communique...stressed...that world reaction, headed by US imperialism, was stepping up its activities in various areas of the world. There is the naked aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The participants in the meeting expressed their full solidarity with the people of Vietnam; they issued a call to all Communist and Workers' Parties, to all the socialist countries, and to all the progressive and democratic movements to force US imperialism to halt its aggression in South Vietnam and withdraw its armed forces from that country. ...

Now more than ever before, it is necessary for all Communist parties to show their sense of international responsibility and to unite for the common struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism and...for active support of the liberation movement and in defence of the peoples who have been attacked by imperialism. ...

'Even though there are differences over the political line and many important problems of theory and tactics, it is quite possible and necessary to work for united action in the struggle against imperialism, in the matter of ensuring all-round support for the liberation movement of the peoples.'" ("Unity of Action on the World Communist Movement", in: "World Marxist Review", April 1965; p.2).

It is easy to overlook the significance of these formulations, since they are no different in substance from those embodied in the Statement of the 1960 Meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties:

"US imperialism is the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme, ...it has become an enemy of the peoples of the whole world. ...

All the socialist countries and the international working class and Communist movement recognise their duty to render the fullest moral and material assistance to the peoples fighting to free themselves from imperialist and colonial tyranny." (Statement of Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties, November 1960, in: "World Marxist Review", December 1960; p.6,18).

The 1965 formulations acquire significance, however, when taken in conjunction with the statement of the Communist Party of China in 1963 that the similar formulations in the 1960 Statement were inserted under the pressure of the Chinese and "centrist" revisionist delegations and against the resistance of the Soviet delegation:

"In the latter half of 1960, a sharp struggle developed in the international communist movement around the meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties. ...

Many correct views on important principles set forth by the delegations of the Chinese and other fraternal Parties were written into the Statement. The theses...on US imperialism as the enemy of the people of the whole world; on the formation of the most extensive united front against US imperialism; ...on support by the socialist countries and the international working class movement for the national liberation struggle; ... - all these theses are in the Statement as a result of the acceptance of the views of the Chinese and some other delegations." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "The Origin and Development of the Difference Between the leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves"; Peking; 1963; p.33,37-38).

Four and a half years later these formulations have been accepted at an international meeting of right revisionist-led parties at which neither the Communist Party of China nor any of the "centrist" revisionist-led parties was present.

The reorientation of the revisionist-led communist parties to the new Soviet foreign policy was taken a stage further at a meeting of the parties of the capitalist countries of Europe in Brussels in June 1965. The meeting adopted the policy of working for the concept of "European collective security" sponsored by the Soviet revisionists:

"To the cold-war policy and the US interference through NATO in the internal affairs of the European countries, the meeting advanced the alternative, corresponding to the interests of all the nations of Europe and of world peace, of European collective security." (A.Sodersen: "Conference in Brussels", in: "World Marxist Review", July 1965; p.44).

In April 1967 a conference of 24 "Communist and Workers' Parties" from Eastern Europe took place at Karlovy Vary at which the Soviet revisionists' programme for "European security" was adopted.

The dominating features of the documents adopted by the "International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties" held in Moscow in June of 1969 were a strongly worded indictment of

"the United States of America, the chief imperialist power." (Documents adopted by the "International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow 1969"; Prague; 1969; p.12).

and a declaration that the fundamental task of the "international communist movement" was

"the struggle against imperialism, ...that of the US above all." (ibid.; p. 11,14).

since

"The events of the past decade have laid bare more forcibly than ever the nature of US imperialism as a world exploiter and gendarme, as the sworn enemy of the liberation movements. ..."

The existing situation demands united action of Communists and all other anti-imperialist forces so that maximum use may be made of the mounting possibilities for a broader offensive against imperialism, against the forces of reaction and war. ...

A primary objective of united action is to give all-round support to the heroic Vietnamese people. ...

The policy of peaceful co-existence does not contradict the right of any oppressed people to fight for its liberation by any means it considers necessary - armed or peaceful. ...

Communists reiterate their solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for independence and national sovereignty, for liberation from every kind of economic and political hegemony of the imperialist circles. ...

The present situation demands greater militant solidarity of the peoples of the socialist countries, of all contingents of the international working class movement and national liberation in the struggle against imperialism." (ibid.; p.17,11,30,31,34,35-36).

A second basic cause for the change in orientation of "centrist" revisionism in passing from the first to the second phase of its development was the attitude of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, in which Marxist-Leninists were then in the ascendancy, that the leadership of a communist party must participate in the ideological exposure of Soviet revisionism in order to be recognised as genuinely anti-imperialist - and therefore, by implication, entitled to the full support of the Communist Party of China (and, in the case of a ruling communist party, to the full support of the People's Republic of China):

"To oppose US imperialism, ...it is imperative to oppose Khrushchov revisionism." (Chou En-lai: Speech of November 29th, 1965, in: "Peking Review", December 3rd, 1965; p.5).

The Chinese leadership could not but be aware that the new leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were continuing the Khrushchovite policies of restoring capitalism and opposing the Communist Party of China:

"In numerous speeches, documents and articles the new leaders of the CPSU have been vociferously advocating 'united action' on the part of the Communist Parties and the socialist countries. ...But this is all false. Their deeds run counter to their words. At the plenary session of the Central Committee of the CPSU in September of this year (1965 - PB, MLOB), Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, openly denounced the Communist Party of China while prating about 'unity against imperialism'...."

The new leaders of the CPSU have conducted a feverish campaign against the Chinese Communist Party. ...

The new leaders of the CPSU...take the Chinese Communist Party..as the main target of their concentrated attacks and they are trying to isolate it. ...

The new leaders of the CPSU have centred their efforts on undermining the economic base of socialism...and on setting up and developing a new system of exploitation and fostering and supporting the new bourgeoisie, thus accelerating the restoration of capitalism. ...

Because they are the political representatives of the privileged bourgeois stratum in the Soviet Union, just as Khrushchov was, the new leaders of the CPSU pursue domestic and foreign policies which are not proletarian but bourgeois, not socialist but capitalist." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "Refutation of the New Leaders of the CPSU on 'United Action'", in: "Peking Review", November 12th, 1965; p.11;17-18,19,20).

From this correct analysis, however, the Chinese leaders drew an incorrect assumption: that there had been no change in the attitude of the Soviet neo-capitalist class towards US imperialism:

"Have the new leaders of the CPSU...changed from being a force allied with US imperialism to one opposing it?"

The facts show they have not. ...

The replacement of Khrushchov by these new leaders has been merely a change of personalities in the revisionist dynasty." (ibid.; p.13,19).

Clearly the Chinese leaders had not yet realised that there had been a re-orientation of Soviet foreign policy in relation to US imperialism, but that the Soviet revisionists - far from seeking to include the People's Republic of China in an international front against the US imperialists - had the aim of orientating this international front against both the United States and China.

Thus, by the end of 1965 the "centrist" revisionist leaderships were faced with a stern choice: either to continue to collaborate with the leadership of the Communist Party of China and to develop a full and unequivocal exposure of Soviet revisionism - so largely isolating themselves from Soviet support and (in the case of ruling parties) from Soviet "aid"; or to break off collaboration with the leadership of the Communist Party of China and move closer to the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union - so largely isolating themselves from Chinese support and (in the case of ruling parties) from Chinese aid.

As we have seen, the reorientation of Soviet foreign policy away from one in which collaboration with US imperialism was the cardinal point towards one of collaboration with the social forces opposed to US imperialism had removed the main obstacle to the second course. Furthermore, it appeared to the "centrist" revisionists that, collaborating with the Soviet Union, the Cuban "centrist" revisionists had not suffered the direct invasion of their country by the imperialists, while, collaborating with the Chinese leadership, the Indonesian "centrist" revisionist-led party had been decimated by pro-imperialist forces.

In this new situation, most of the "centrist" revisionist leaderships decided that their best interests were served by the second course. From the beginning of 1966, therefore, they began to repudiate their ideological alliance with the leadership of the Communist Party of China and to move closer to the Soviet re-

revisionists.

The Vietnamese "centrist" revisionists, in a special position, did not reorientate their foreign policy fully into this second phase. While virtually ceasing their criticism of Soviet revisionism, they relied on their war of national liberation against US imperialism to convince the Chinese leaders of their genuine anti-imperialist attitude. They thus gave full support to the Soviet revisionists, and to the Chinese leadership both before and after the counter-revolutionary "cultural revolution" of 1966-68, and were able to obtain a certain amount of "aid" both from the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China:

"The Soviet Union - the first socialist state, established following the October Revolution - has performed a great heroic work in the half-century of its existence, acting in the interests of the socialist camp, of the working class movement, of all working people and of the peoples of oppressed countries.

We are grateful to the Soviet Union for the very great contribution it has made to our struggle with American imperialism." (Interview with Pham Van Dong, Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, in: "New Times", June 18th, 1969; p.10).

"In the cause of socialist revolution, the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people have turned 'poor and blank' China into a mighty socialist country.

The Vietnam Workers' Party and the Vietnamese people sincerely wish that the Chinese people, armed with Marxism-Leninism, Mao tse-Tung's thought, will, under the illumination of this Congress of the Communist Party of China, achieve still greater and all-round successes in socialist construction in China.

We take this opportunity to express our sincere and profound thanks to the Communist Party of China and the fraternal Chinese people for their extremely valuable support and assistance." (Message of Greetings from the Central Committee of the Vietnam Workers' Party to the "Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China", in "Peking Review", April 11th, 1969; p.15,16).

THE SOVIET-CHINESE INTER-CAPITALIST CONTRADICTION

The tremendous development of national liberation movements in the colonial-type countries of the world in recent years has rendered the domination and exploitation of under-developed countries by the developed capitalist powers much more difficult to bring about and maintain. Furthermore, the number of developed capitalist powers competing for the exploitation of the working people of the world has increased in recent years as a result of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union by the modern revisionists and the transformation of China from a semi-colonial country into an independent capitalist power.

In the present period of the general crisis of capitalism, therefore, international contradictions between capitalist classes in different countries, and between alliances of such capitalist classes, have greatly increased.

In particular, Soviet neo-imperialism** finds itself in an extremely difficult position with regard to the expansion of its present inadequate spheres of influence. The greatest obstacle to the resolution of the problems of Soviet neo-imperialism is the Chinese capitalist class, which not only stands territorially in the way of Soviet expansion into Asia but competes with the Soviet neo-imperialists for hegemony over the colonial-type countries of the world which are emerging from domination by the established imperialist powers.

Thus, the most acute inter-capitalist contradiction in the world at the present time - one which has already erupted into bloody frontier fighting - is that between the two "new recruits" to the world's capitalist classes - the Soviet capitalist class and the Chinese capitalist class. Since 1966 the "ideological dispute" between the leaders of these two powers has sunk to the level of mere demagogic propaganda by which each side strives to mobilise its own working people for a coming major clash while trying to stir up the working people of the other side against their leaders.

At present the Soviet Union is superior to the People's Republic of China in its level of industrial development and technology; it has a larger stockpile of nuclear weapons, a larger capacity for producing these weapons, and more and better means of delivering them; it has more armoured vehicles, a better communication system, a larger navy and air force.

But with every year that passes the superiority of the Soviet Union in relation to China in these respects decreases. Therefore, if war is to come between the Soviet Union and China - and there is no other means of settling fundamental inter-capitalist conflicts - it is to the advantage of the Soviet neo-imperialists that it should come sooner rather than later.

It is clear from Soviet military writings that the Soviet war plans in relation to China are for a massive, pre-emptive "blitzkrieg" against the Chinese missile bases, nuclear plants and principal centres of population, together with the large-scale destruction of China's food supplies by means of chemical and biological weapons and the speedy occupation of the main areas of Inner Mongolia and North China, including Peking. Following the success of this "blitzkrieg", a new right revisionist leadership of the Chinese party and state would be set up in the

**In so far as an individual country is concerned, Lenin defined imperialism or monopoly-capitalism as the stage of development of capitalism

"in which the domination of monopolies and finance capital has established itself; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance." (V.I.Lenin: "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" in: "Selected Works", Vol.5; London 1935; p.81).

and he defined state monopoly capitalism as the stage of development of imperialism or monopoly capitalism in which

"the state...is becoming merged more and more with the all-powerful capitalist combines." (V.I.Lenin: Preface to the First Edition of the "The State and Revolution" in: "Selected Works", Vol7; London; 1946; p.5).

It is clear that the social system which now exists in the Soviet Union is that form of imperialism or monopoly capitalism which Marxist-Leninists call state monopoly capitalism, although this social system has been brought into being not by forward development from competitive capitalism but by retrogressive, counter-revolutionary development from socialism.

capital, a leadership with which the Soviet government would be pleased to sign an armistice - and hope that this would be recognised by the remains of the Chinese people.

The Chinese military strategy, on the other hand, is based on the one factor in respect of which China is superior to the Soviet Union - that of manpower. The Chinese General Staff accepts that a Soviet "blitzkrieg" could be initially effective but they point out that even if the Soviet assault annihilates 300 million of China's people, the population remaining would still give to China a manpower superiority of three to one. The Chinese strategy of "people's war" thus regards the Soviet "blitzkrieg" merely as the opening phase of a war that might well last a hundred years; it is based on the stockpiling of food, the mobilisation of the entire people to participate in active fighting, the enticement of the enemy forces deep into China's vast territory and their destruction in "hand to hand" fighting in which the Soviet superiority in war technology would be nullified. In keeping with this strategy, an elaborate system of H-bomb-proof defence units has been constructed in each military area, each unit self-sufficient and capable of continuing to function as a fighting base even if all communication with the centre has been cut off. The Chinese General Staff believe that this military strategy would result, as in the case of the attempt of the Japanese imperialists to wage a similar "blitzkrieg" against a weaker China, in the ultimate defeat of the Soviet Union.

THE NEW SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

The new Soviet foreign policy, as it has been developed since October 1964, is based on the following principal aims:

- 1) to make all preparations for a speedy military victory over China, and so open the way to the establishment of a new sphere of influence for the Soviet neo-capitalist class in Asia;
- 2) to collaborate with monopoly capitalist and capitalist classes (or sections of those classes) of developed capitalist countries under the yoke of US imperialism in so far as these wish to free themselves from US domination, and to place the "international communist movement" at their disposal in mobilising the working people to assist them in this struggle;
- 3) as a result of the application of point 2, in Western Europe, to build up a "European Collective Security Bloc" of European states which will control the West German imperialists (who present the main threat to the Soviet-dominated bloc of states from the west) in order to establish security for their forces along their western border (as well as economic support) and so enable the Soviet General Staff to concentrate the major part of their military strength against China;
- 4) as a result of the application of point 2 in Asia, to build up an "Asian Collective Security Bloc" of states which have a strong conflict of interest with the Chinese capitalist class (in particular, Japan and India) to assist the Soviet Union actively in its war with China at the price of a share in the expected booty;
- 5) to strive to keep the United States neutral in the war with China by avoiding a direct confrontation between the USSR and the USA - by permitting the struggles against US imperialism in the monopoly capitalist and capitalist countries at present under US domination to be carried out by social forces within those countries and by permitting the states under the control of "centrist" revisionists - Cuba,

the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea - to undertake tasks likely to involve direct confrontation with the United States (e.g., the expulsion of US forces from South Korea and South Vietnam, the organization of armed liberation struggles in colonial-type countries within the US sphere of interest, especially in the area where US imperialism has shown itself to be most sensitive: Latin America);

6) now that the main objection of the "centrist" revisionists to the foreign policy of the Soviet revisionists (namely, Khrushchovite collaboration with US imperialism as the cardinal point of that policy) has been removed, to align the "centrist" revisionist parties with the "international communist movement" as a semi-independent "left wing", among the functions of which would be:

(a) to stimulate armed national liberation struggle in semi-colonial countries within the US sphere of influence and so to press the comprador-capitalist and feudal landowner classes in these countries to save themselves by transferring their semi-colonial status (on which their wealth and power depends) from dependence on the US imperialists to dependence on the Soviet neo-capitalists;

(b) to provide an international "left" revisionist political apparatus to serve the interests of international capital among circles of working people among whom right revisionism has lost its influence (a particularly important function in view of the inevitable disintegration of the Chinese "left" revisionist parties and groups in the new world situation);

(c) to provide an organising centre in countries where the "communist parties" are dominated by (pro-US imperialist) ultra-revisionist leaderships (e.g. in Romania, Yugoslavia, Italy, Belgium, Britain, Australia, Norway, Sweden, Spain and Switzerland) for the reorganisation of these parties on the basis of "orthodox" right revisionism.

THE "EUROPEAN COLLECTIVE SECURITY" SCHEME

The basic aim of Soviet foreign policy in relation to Western Europe is to build up a "European Collective Security Bloc" of European states designed to achieve the following long-term ends:

1) to place West German imperialism, which constitutes the main challenge to the hegemony of the Soviet Union within the proposed European bloc as well as a potential military threat to the security of the Soviet Union, under a form of collective control of the imperialist states of Europe beneath the cloak of which the hegemony of the Soviet Union over West German imperialism and its military apparatus of force would be guaranteed;

2) to promote the hegemony of the Soviet Union in an all-European bloc of imperialist and neo-capitalist states which are in contradiction with US imperialism.

The immediate aim of the scheme is to provide security for the Soviet Union along its western border (as well as economic support) and so enable it to concentrate the major part of its military strength against China.

It was with this aim that in July 1966 the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee, meeting in Bucarest put forward its plan for "European unity" in the form of a "Declaration for Strengthening Peace and Security in Europe". The main outlines of this plan were reaffirmed in the "Appeal of the Warsaw Treaty States to all European Countries" issued by the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative

Committee from its meeting in Budapest in March 1969.

The Soviet revisionists' scheme for "European unity" differs from that put forward by certain imperialist groups in Western Europe (discussed in the May-June 1969 issue of RED FRONT - P.B., MLOB) in three fundamental ways:

Firstly, it aims to embrace all European states and not merely those of Western Europe:

"There are the countries of the Atlantic bloc, the states affiliated with the defensive Warsaw Treaty Organisation, the unaligned nations, and, finally, the countries that have declared for perpetual neutrality. But this does not mean that they have no common interests. Indeed, the success of an all-European conference will be ensured only if all the countries of the continent take part." (Editorial, "European Security", in: "New Times", April 2nd, 1969; p.2).

Secondly, it aims to place restrictions on the military power and expansionist capacity of West German imperialism, with the effect of making the Soviet Union (and not the Federal German Republic, as in the Western imperialists' scheme) the dominant power in Europe:

"Among the principal conditions for European security are the inviolability of existing European frontiers, including the Oder and Neisse frontier and that between the GDR and the FRG, and renunciation by the FRG of its claim to represent the whole German people and of the possession of nuclear weapons in any form. West Berlin has a special status and does not belong to West Germany." (Appeal of the Warsaw Treaty States to All European Countries, in: "New Times", March 26th, 1969; p.3).

Thirdly, it aims to win for the Soviet neo-imperialists a stake in key sections of the economies, and a share in the exploitation of the working classes, of the West European countries, while giving to the West European imperialists in exchange a stake in key sections of the economies, and a share in the exploitation of the working classes, of the East European countries:

"A firm European security system would make it objectively possible and indeed necessary to undertake big joint power, transport, water and air conservancy, and public health projects having an immediate bearing on the welfare of the population of the entire continent. Such common endeavors could and should become the foundation of European cooperation." (Appeal of the Warsaw Treaty States to All European Countries", in: "New Times", March 26th, 1969; p.2).

"There is no doubt whatsoever that if agreement were reached on questions of collective security in Europe, a favourable atmosphere would also be created for mutually beneficial cooperation on the broadest scale among nations with different social systems, for fuller use of the benefits of the international division of labour, for the development of specialisation and cooperation in production, and for an exchange of achievements in the fields of science, technology and culture." (N.Patolichef: "Closer Economic Ties Will Mean Greater Security in Europe", in: "Soviet News", December 23rd, 1969; p.146).

The proposals of the Soviet revisionists have aroused a positive response from the imperialists and capitalists of a number of Western European states, particularly those of the smaller states such as Finland, Belgium and Switzerland. It has also received sympathetic interest even from a section of the West German imperialists, who see the entry of German goods and capital into Eastern Europe as the price which the Soviet neo-imperialist class are prepared to pay for security

on their western flank. The split in the West German "Grand Coalition" reflects the split in the West German ruling class on the issue of eastward expansion by war (the Strauss-Kiesinger faction) or by penetration through cooperation (the Brandt faction). The election of Brandt as Chancellor, his subsequent recognition (at least in words) of the existence of two German states, his offer to negotiate with Poland and the Soviet Union, the West German government's signature to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty - all these reflect the dominance (at least for the moment) of what the Soviet revisionists are pleased to call the "reasonable section" of West German monopoly capital.

The Romanian ultra-revisionists support the "European Collective Security Scheme" for their own reasons, seeing in it a means of developing their wished-for collaboration with the West European imperialists in a manner which can hardly bring down the wrath of the Soviet revisionists upon them. But to give them support in their desire to break free from Soviet domination, they are exerting the strongest pressure for the invitation of that "European power", the United States, to the planned "European Security Conference."

THE "ASIAN COLLECTIVE SECURITY" SCHEME

At the "International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties" held in Moscow in June 1969, Soviet revisionist leader Brezhnev declared:

"The course of events is also putting on the agenda the task of creating a system of collective security in Asia". (L.I. Brezhnev: "Speech at International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969;" Prague; 1969; p.171).

The aim of the Soviet revisionists in Asia is to form military alliances with states which have strong contradictions with the People's Republic of China - above all, that is to say, with Japan and India - in order to achieve the objective that these states may actively participate alongside the Soviet Union in its planned war with China.

a) The developing Moscow-Tokyo Axis

The expansionist plans of the Japanese imperialists have, for geographical reasons, changed little since General Baron Tanaka presented his notorious "Memorial" to the Emperor in 1927. As the Baron put it:

"Divine Providence wishes me to assist Your Majesty in ushering in a new era in the Far East, and to develop a new Continental Empire." (Cited in: J. Deva: "Japan's Kampf"; London; 1942; p.146).

Despite the great changes in Asia since 1927, the Japanese imperialists regard as more valid than ever the famous precept of the "Tanaka Memorial":

"In order to conquer the world, we must first conquer China." (Cited in: J. Deva: *ibid.*; p.148).

Since both the Japanese and the Soviet neo-imperialists have a common interest in the conquest of China, the Soviet revisionists are working to cement this common aim into a military alliance. While the Japanese revisionists help the Japanese imperialists by mobilising the working people of Japan to assist them to free Japan from the yoke of US imperialism, the Soviet revisionists are offering them markets and a share in the exploitation of the Siberian workers new, and a "sphere of influence" on the mainland of Asia after "military victory."

When Japanese Foreign Minister Shiina visited Moscow in January 1966, a five-year trade agreement between the two countries to the value of \$2,250 million was signed, together with an agreement for an air service between Moscow and Tokyo over Siberia.

When the Soviet Foreign Minister, Gromyko, visited Japan in July 1966 for talks with Prime Minister Sato and Foreign Minister Shiina, the communique stated that the two governments had agreed to arrange regular consultations "on international problems in the solution of which both countries are interested. ... The development of friendly and good-neighbourly relations between Japan and the Soviet Union will greatly contribute to the safeguarding of peace and security in Asia."

According to Peking, following the visit of the new Japanese Foreign Minister, Miki, to the Soviet Union in the summer of 1967,

"the Japanese reactionaries gradually changed their emphasis in military deployment from Hokkaido, which is near the Soviet Union, to Kyushu, which is near China." ("Renegade Features of Soviet Revisionists Once Again Exposed", in: "Peking Review", December 27th, 1968; p.21).

At the beginning of 1969, the Soviet First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, Semichastnov, said that Soviet-Japanese trade had increased from 25 million roubles in 1958 to 500 million roubles in 1968. He said:

"A number of Japanese firms conducting the liveliest trade with Soviet organisations have been permitted to open up offices in the Soviet Union. ...

In 1965 it was agreed to set up the Soviet-Japanese and Japanese-Soviet committees for business cooperation... to examine current problems relating to the expansion of trade and economic relations, such as the production of goods for which the demand is greatest and openings for participation by Japanese firms in developing certain branches of Siberian and Far East industry turning out goods in which Japanese firms are interested." ("Soviet-Japanese Business Contacts", in: "New Times", January 22nd, 1969; p.21).

And in January 1969 Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin told the Japanese newspaper "Mainichi" that in the opinion of the Soviet government the time had come to extend Soviet-Japanese economic and technical cooperation into political cooperation:

"Opportunities for further improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations now exist in the sphere of trade, economic contacts, scientific and technical cooperation and cultural exchanges. In our opinion, there could also be political cooperation, in particular on some international questions of mutual interest." ("Premier Kosygin's Replies to a Japanese Newspaper", in "New Times", January 13th, 1969; p.2).

b) The developing Moscow-Delhi axis

The contradiction between the Indian capitalist class and the People's Republic of China which caused violent frontier fighting in October 1962, has become no less acute since the Chinese capitalist class launched their counter-revolutionary "cultural revolution" - as is shown by the bloody frontier incidents in the Sino-Sikkim border in September 1967.

The Soviet revisionists are doing everything in their power to make use of the Sino-Indian contradiction to assist them in their plans for war with China.

At the time of the visit of Indian Prime Minister Shastri with Minister of External Affairs, Swaran Singh to Moscow in May 1965, the joint communique stated:

"Following an exchange of views, the Soviet Union expressed willingness to continue economic and technical cooperation during India's Fourth Five-year Plan, and specifically by the construction of certain enterprises of the ferrous and non-ferrous metal industry, the ore-mining and oil industries, and power engineering, in the training of highly skilled personnel, and in the development of sea-fishing. In this connection the Soviet Union will send to India this year Soviet experts. . . ."

The two sides...agreed on the desirability of increasing trade between the Soviet Union and India by approximately 100% by 1970 as compared with the level reached in 1964. For this purpose they agreed on the advisability of concluding a long-term agreement on trade for five years, which would make it possible, parallel with the expansion of trade, to develop certain branches of industry in the Soviet Union and India in the interests of both countries."

In September 1965 the Indian Defence Minister Chavan announced that the Soviet Union had agreed to supply submarines to India.

On the visit of the new Indian Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, to Moscow in 1966, the joint statement reported that important new industries had been established in India's state sector with Soviet aid, e.g., heavy engineering, oil and instrument making, and noted:

"the identity or closeness of the viewpoints of the two states on a broad range of international questions."

Mrs. Gandhi took advantage of a Kremlin banquet to attack China as "a major Asian power" which had "rejected peaceful co-existence."

In February 1967 an agreement for Soviet aid in Indian space research was signed, together with a protocol to the Soviet-Indian shipping agreement of 1956 providing for increased shipping services between the two countries to cope with the increased trade.

In January 1968, and again in June, the Pakistani government informed Moscow of its concern at the supply of Soviet military equipment to India, including more than 100 supersonic jet fighter bombers, more than 400 tanks, and some heavy guns. And Pakistani official sources stated in February 1968 that India itself was producing military equipment worth 1,500 million rupees a year, including more than 360 tanks, from 26 ordnance factories and state sector undertakings, in addition to the 3 Soviet-financed complexes for assembling supersonic MIG-21s.

According to Peking:

"A naval agreement was signed between the Soviet revisionists and Indian reactionaries in February last year (1968 - PB, MLOB). The deal was secretly clinched to avoid condemnation by the people of the world. Under this agreement, the Soviet revisionists promised to supply warships to the Indian reactionaries in exchange for the right to use a number of naval bases in India." ("Soviet Revisionist 'Gunboat Policy': Attempt to Build up Naval Supremacy.", in: "Peking Review", June 27, 1969; p.17).

In the last few years India has become the biggest market and investment outlet for the Soviet neo-capitalist class in South-East Asia, and the Indian economy has become increasingly dependent upon Moscow:

"Over 60 industrial and other projects have been built, are under construction or are planned for development (in India - PB, MLOB), with Soviet assistance. ... These enterprises now contribute 30% of India's steel and about 50% of the extracted oil and account for 35% of oil refining capacity." (I. Remirsky: "Moscow and Delhi" in: "New Times", February 5th, 1969; p.10).

But the Soviet neo-imperialists are interested not only in the exploitation of India's workers and peasants, but in securing India as a military ally. That is why, while the United States had up to the beginning of 1969 granted India military "aid" totalling 340 million dollars, the Soviet revisionists had given India about 1,000 million dollars in military "aid" in the same period.

SOVIET AND "CENTRIST" REVISIONIST POLICY IN RELATION TO LATIN AMERICA

The most acute contradiction between the Cuban "centrist" revisionists and the Soviet revisionists is based on their differing policies in relation to Latin America.

The revisionists in the leadership of most of the "communist parties" of Latin America have - both during the Khrushchovite and during the post-Khrushchovite period - consistently opposed the organisation of armed national liberation struggle against US imperialism and its comprador-capitalist and feudal land-owning allies within the Latin American countries - as indeed they did so oppose it in Cuba.

This policy was clearly expressed by Luis Corvalan, the general secretary of the right revisionist-led Communist Party of Chile in an article in "World Marxist Review" in 1963"

"In upholding the peaceful way our Party aims at solving the tasks of the revolution without civil war or armed uprising." (L. Corvalan: "The Peaceful Way - a Form of Revolution", in: "World Marxist Review", December 1963; p.6).

In the post-Khrushchovite period, in the situation where the economic strength of the US imperialists is declining relative to that of the Soviet neo-imperialists and where the economic position of even the comprador capitalists of the Latin American countries dependent upon US imperialism is suffering in consequence, this policy has developed into one of collaborating with the national bourgeoisies of the various countries to mobilise the mass pressure of the working people against US imperialism. At the same time, the Soviet revisionists have offered "aid" to the regime of comprador capitalist and feudal landowning classes in such a way as to offer them, in effect, the choice of losing their wealth and power in a national-democratic revolution or of saving these, at least for the time being, by transferring (as the result of a coup) their country's semi-colonial status (on which this wealth and power depends) from one of dependence on the US imperialists to one of dependence on the Soviet neo-imperialists.

This policy had recently had some success in Peru. As Jorge del Prado, general secretary of the right-revisionist-led Peruvian Communist Party told the international meeting in Moscow in June 1969:

"After the military coup last October, Peru entered a special, crucial and difficult phase. Its most significant feature is the opposition to US Imperialism displayed not only by our people, but also, for the first time, by our government.

Nationalisation of oil, Peru's main power source, expropriation of the stocks and shares of the oil refineries, the industrial complex and the commercial agencies of the International Petroleum Company, a Standard Oil branch, coupled with the exaction of \$690 million which International Petroleum owed Peru - all this signified the end to imperialist oil monopoly and its conversion into a state monopoly, which was followed by the establishment of diplomatic and trading relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. ...

Recently, two important political actions took place: a) Nelson Rockefeller, President Nixon's emissary, was officially refused entry into our country, this contributing greatly to the failure of the provocative tour on a continental scale, and b) the US military missions, which tied Peru's armed forces to the Pentagon and were actually a support base for imperialist armed intervention against the liberation struggle in our country, were expelled." (J. del Prado: "Speech at International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow 1969"; Prague; 1969; p.147).

Such is the Soviet policy towards the countries of Latin America. But the Cuban capitalist class has a somewhat different aim - to lead genuine national-democratic revolutions in those countries in order to place in power, as in Cuba, the national bourgeoisies and then to bring them into semi-colonial relations with the Soviet Union - not directly and on equal terms with Cuba, but in the form of a bloc in which Cuba is recognised as the leading state and in which the Cuban capitalist class plays the role, so to speak, of a new comprador bourgeoisie for the whole of Latin America. The "centrist" revisionists of Cuba see this potential bloc also as a regional military alliance which can considerably strengthen their vulnerable position in relation to US imperialism.

As long as it is kept within controlled limits, the Soviet revisionists see in the "leftist" appeal of "Castroism" a useful aid to their policies, in that it faces the comprador capitalists and feudal landowners with a real, organised threat of losing all in a national-democratic revolution and so increases the attraction to them of the conservative alternative offered by Moscow. Nevertheless, the ideological dispute between Castroism and Soviet revisionism on the question of "armed struggle" in Latin America is not an artificial one; it represents, as we have seen, a real contradiction between the interests of the Cuban national capitalists and the Soviet neo-capitalists.

Staking Cuba's claim for leadership of the emerging Latin American part of the "Third World", the Cuban revisionists are fond of pointing out that Cuba has qualities fitting her for such leadership possessed by no other "socialist" country:

"That something which speaks to them in Spanish, in their own language, and which explains in a clear form what they have to do to achieve happiness, is called the Cuban revolution.: (E.Guevara: Article in "Revolucion", March 25th, 1963).

"The Cuban revolution established the first socialist country in America and has made the first Marxist-Leninist revolution in the Spanish language." (B.Roca: Article in "El Mundo", October 14, 1964).

The Castroite theory of the technique of national-democratic revolution, based pragmatically on the experience of the Cuban revolution, was elaborated by Guevará in his book "Guerilla Warfare", published in 1960. In his first sentence, the author says that "the armed victory of the Cuban people" was "a modifier (modificador) of old dogmas about the conduct of the popular masses of Latin America, and has clearly demonstrated the capacity of the people to free themselves from a government that oppressed them by means of guerilla warfare." (E.Guevara: "La Guerra de Guerrillas", Havana, 1960; p.11).

The essentials of the theory are set forth in the second sentence: "We consider that these are the three fundamental contributions which the Cuban revolution has made to the mechanics of the revolutionary movements in America:

- 1) Popular forces can win a war against the army.
- 2) It is not always necessary to wait for all the conditions for a revolution to exist; the insurrectional focal point (foco) (i.e., the small guerilla force - PB, MLOB) can create them.
- 3) In underdeveloped America, the countryside must be fundamentally the locals of the armed struggle." (E.Guevara: ibid.; p.11).

The Latin American "revolutionary organisations" gathered in Havana in 1967 for the Conference of the Organisation of Latin American Solidarity (OLAS) adopted the principles of national-democratic revolution elaborated by the Castroites:

"In every country where armed struggle exists, the guerilla movement is the vanguard, even though it may be composed of men of different political ideologies. ...

The Cuban Revolution... constitutes the vanguard in the anti-imperialist movement of Latin America." (Declaration and Resolutions of the OLAS Conference, in: "Granma", September 17, 1967; p.5).

In other words, Castroism is basically Maoism without a disciplined party. Maoism emphasises the necessity of a disciplined vanguard party to mobilise the masses in "people's war" - a party masquerading as a "Marxist-Leninist Party of the working class" but one which in reality represents the interests of the national bourgeoisie:

Castroism presents the vanguard role in the revolution as being played by the "foco" of petit-bourgeois guerilla leaders "of different political ideologies" - a vanguard which also represents the interests of the national bourgeoisie. Both have as their aim the victory of the national-democratic revolution resulting in the placing in power of the national bourgeoisie, but Maoism is the theory of such a revolution in a country where the reactionary forces are strong and well-organised so that the organised mobilisation of the masses is necessary for victory, while Castroism is the theory of such a revolution in a country where the reactionary forces are weak and disorganised so that the organised mobilisation of the masses is not necessary for victory.

Thus, the small guerilla force established under Guevara in Bolivia at the end of 1966 was the opening of the campaign by the Cuban capitalist class to fulfill its role as "the vanguard of the revolution" in Latin America. Its aim was to initiate the national-democratic revolution not merely in Bolivia, but throughout the continent.

But by October 1967 Guevara's force, having failed to win significant support from the Bolivian workers and peasants, was largely destroyed and its leader killed by US-trained anti-guerilla forces. Its destruction provided for serious revolutionaries the political lesson that the ruling classes of other countries were not likely to permit to recur the exceptional conditions which enabled the Cuban revolution to be successful on the basis of the (later-developed) theories of Castroism. But this political lesson was rejected by Castro, who placed the blame for the setback to the dreams of the Cuban capitalist class for hegemony over Latin America on: firstly, the opposition of the leaderships of the right revisionist "communist parties" on the continent, and, secondly, the "aid" given by the Soviet revisionists to the ruling oligarchies of the Latin American states.

As Castro thundered before the destruction of Guevara's guerilla force:

"Whoever helps these oligarchies which are fighting the guerillas is...also helping to suppress the revolution." (F.Castro: Speech of March 14th, 1967).

In his speech of August 1968 supporting the military intervention of the Warsaw Treaty states in Czechoslovakia, Castro declared:

"We have disagreed with, been displeased at, and protested against the fact that these same countries (of the Warsaw Pact - PB, MLOB) have been drawing closer economically, culturally and politically to the oligarchic governments of Latin America, which are not merely reactionary governments and exploiters of their peoples, but also shameless accomplices in the imperialist aggressions against Cuba. ...

We ask ourselves if that policy...will come to an end....

When we supported the guerillas over and above the rightist leadership of Venezuela, when, for the same reason, we supported the Guatemalan guerillas against the treachery and scheming of the rightist leadership in Guatemala, when we backed the Bolivian guerillas against the schemes and betrayal of the rightist leadership in Bolivia, ...we were accused of being adventurers, of interfering in the affairs of other countries, of interfering in the affairs of other Parties....

I wonder whether or not the Parties of those countries, in line with the decision made in Czechoslovakia, will cease to support those rightist groups that betray the revolutionary movement in Latin America." (F.Castro: Speech of August 23rd, 1968, in: "Granma", August 25th, 1968; p.4).

THE NEW CHINESE FOREIGN POLICY

The leaders of the People's Republic of China are well aware of the aims of the Soviet revisionists! "Asian Collective Security System." An article entitled "Another Step in New Tsars' Expansion in Asia" declares!

"Soviet revisionist social-imperialism has taken such pains to throw together an 'Asian collective security system' in order to extend its aggressive position in Asia." (Another Step in New Tsars' Expansion in Asia, in: "Peking Review", September 7th, 1969; p.20).

Another article entitled "Kremlin's New Tsars Rig Up Anti-China Encirclement" says:

"The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has in the last few years poured large reinforcements into the Sino-Soviet border areas and repeatedly created provocative border incidents. At the same time it has turned Mongolia into a big military base by massing troops there and deploying them along the Chinese-Mongolian border. In the name of military "aid" it has provided the Mongolian revisionist clique with large quantities of military hardware and modern weapons and equipment and despatched large numbers of military "advisers" to directly control that clique's armed forces.

For the purpose of organising a ring around China, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique...has moved heaven and earth to foster and gang up with Japanese militarism, which it hopes can be turned into an important part of this encirclement ring. ...

To rig up an anti-China encirclement,...the Soviet revisionist renegade clique...have put big stakes on the Indian reactionaries, making India an important link in their joint encirclement racket." (Kremlin's New Tsars Rig up Anti-China Encirclement", in: "Peking Review", April 4th, 1969; p.26).

Naturally, therefore, the Chinese "left" revisionist leaders are attempting to build up their own system of military alliances with states the ruling classes of which are in contradiction with some or all of the states within the Soviet "collective security scheme" which are in process of development, i.e., particularly with states the rulers of which are in contradiction with India, Japan and/or the Soviet Union itself.

Their principal efforts in this direction are directed at present towards:

- 1) Pakistan;
- 2) Albania, Romania and Yugoslavia; and
- 3) the United States of America.

a) The Peking-Karachi Axis

The Pakistani ruling class, which rules by means of a military dictatorship, has had since the partition of the Indian sub-continent by the British imperialists a strong contradiction with the Indian capitalist class, a contradiction which makes the present relations between Pakistan and India one which is regarded on both sides as no more than an armed truce between wars.

In the spring of 1968 Indian Minister of External Affairs Swaran Singh told the Lok Sabha (House of the People) that China was known to have supplied Pakistan since September 1965 with complete equipment for 2 infantry divisions, about 250 tanks, 120 MIG aircraft, two squadrons of Ilyushin - 28 bombers, a large number of pieces of artillery, vehicles and large quantities of ammunition for tanks and aircraft. China, he asserted, had also extended financial assistance to Pakistan running into "hundreds of millions of dollars" since 1965, mainly for the purchase of military equipment and stores, and had assisted in setting up ordnance factories in Pakistan.

In September 1968, against the official protests of the Indian government, a new road was opened connecting Gilgit in Kashmir with Sinkiang.

In November 1968 the Chinese government welcomed a "Pakistan Armed Forces Goodwill Mission", headed by General Yahya Khan, commander-in-chief of the Pakistan army and later - following the ousting of Ayub Khan in March 1969 - President of Pakistan. At a banquet during the visit, General Huang Yung-sheng referred pointedly to the threat from

"the Indian reactionaries who have repeatedly invaded the territories of China and Pakistan and are threatening the security of our two countries," ("Pakistan Armed Forces Goodwill Delegation Visits China", in: "Peking Review", November 15th, 1968; p.4).

In December 1968 a new agreement for "economic and technical cooperation" was signed between the two states, by which China granted to the Pakistan government an interest-free loan of 17,585,000 pounds for the purchase of "equipment".

In July 1969 another "Goodwill Delegation" led by Air Marshall Nur Khan, visited Peking. During its visit, Prime Minister Chou En-lai said:

"The Chinese government will, as always, firmly support the Pakistan people in their struggle against foreign aggression." (Chou En-lai: Speech of July 16th, 1969, in: "Peking Review", July 25th, 1969; p.9).

b) The Peking-Tirana Axis

The leaders of the Albania Party of Labour were among the first Marxist-Leninists to begin the public exposure of the treachery of the modern revisionists. Furthermore, resisting all the pressure and intrigues of the Soviet revisionists, they kept unwaveringly to a policy of genuine socialist construction in Albania.

It was natural and correct, therefore, that from 1960 to 1966 the leadership of the Albania Party of Labour should ally itself with the leadership of the Communist Party of China, in which Marxist-Leninists were then in the ascendancy.

When the "cultural revolution" began in China in the summer of 1966, it is clear from the several months' delay before official Albanian comment on it was forthcoming, that there were serious differences within the Central Committee of the Albania Party of Labour on the analysis of this event. It is also clear from the subsequent history that a majority of the leadership failed to recognise the counter-revolutionary character of the Chinese "cultural revolution" - as, indeed, did Marxist-Leninists in most countries, including those in the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain.

As a result of this incorrect analysis, however, the correct alliance between the leadership of the People's Republic of Albania and that of the People's Republic of China that had existed prior to the counter-revolutionary "cultural revolution" was continued as an alliance between the leadership of the People's Republic of Albania and the military dictatorship established on behalf of the Chinese capitalist class - which carried on, demagogically, the same "Marxist-Leninist" and "anti-revisionist" phraseology correctly used by the ousted Marxist-Leninists, but now emptied of all scientific content.

In consequence, the Chinese capitalist class was able to transform the genuine aid given by the People's Republic of China to Albania prior to 1966 into a spurious "aid" designed to bring about the dependence of the People's Republic of Albania upon Peking.

In December 1968 this process was carried a stage further by the signing of a military alliance between Albania and China, under the terms of which China was granted military and naval bases in Albania. As Albanian Prime Minister Shehu said during the visit to Tirana for this purpose of a Chinese official delegation:

"We are particularly glad that at the head of the Chinese delegation is Comrade Huang Yung-sheng, Chief of the General Staff of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. Let all Albania's external enemies...know that the friend-

ship between Albania and China finds its expression in fraternal international relations not only in the ideological, political and economic fields but also in the military field." (Mehmet Shehu: Speech of December 2nd, 1968, in: "Peking Review", December 13th, 1968; p.9).

The further development of Albanian foreign policy in recent months, together with Sino-Romanian, Sino-Yugoslav and Sino-US relations, will be discussed in a later section of this Report.

THE NEW UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

1) In Europe

As a result of the declining economic and military strength of US imperialism in relation to that of the imperialist powers of continental Europe, the US imperialists are faced with the fact that, unless special measures are taken, they are likely in the near future to lose most if not all of their bases in Western Europe - apart from fascist Spain, where the agreement for the use of Spanish bases was renewed for a further period in June 1969 at a higher "rent".

In these circumstances, the US imperialists are concentrating their efforts to retain a foothold in Europe particularly in the Balkans, a region which is most suitable strategically as a military bridgehead directed at the Soviet-dominated bloc of states.

a) The Washington-Athens Axis

The ruling circles of the fascist dictatorship set up in Greece by the "colonels' coup" of April 1967 are aware that its continued existence depends on the support of US imperialism. As a result, this reactionary regime forms one of Washington's most stable allies in Europe.

At the NATO Council meeting in Reykjavic it was the Greek delegation which was most insistent on the need for reinforcing the military presence of NATO in the Mediterranean and which welcomed most strongly the NATO Council's decision to set up a "multi-national naval force" as an appendage to the US Sixth Fleet.

American senator Stuart Symington put the American position clearly in a letter published recently in the "Guardian":

"Except for Greece, it would appear that there are few if any Mediterranean ports left into which the Sixth Fleet can visit without trouble and, if it is necessary, to maintain our fleet in that inland sea. I think this is a major reason for trying to maintain stability in the country in question." (S.Symington: Letter published in the "Guardian", November 27th, 1969; p.3).

The fact that the Western European imperialists are diverting their "parliamentary democracies" in anti-United States directions, while the fascist dictatorships in Spain and Greece provide more reliable allies of the United States has indicated clearly to the US imperialists the nature of the "special measures" mentioned above which are required to maintain US domination in other countries. "The Observer" of December 7th, 1969 publishes a photostat of a secret letter from the Director-General of the Greek Foreign Ministry, Kottakis, to the Greek Ambassador in Rome, Poupouras, which reveals:

"a planned military coup in Italy by a group of extreme right-wingers" and Army officers - with the encouragement and assistance of the Greek regime and its Premier, ex-colonel George Papadopoulos. ...

Our most intensive organisational effort must begin with the Italian land army, whose officers agree that the methods used by the Greek Armed Forces gave satisfactory results and should therefore be adopted as the basis for their own action". ("Greek Premier Plots Army Coup in Italy", in: "The Observer", December 7th, 1969; p.1,2).

b) the Washington-Belgrade Axis

Since 1948 the Yugoslav revisionist leaders have been increasingly transforming their country into a dependent semi-colony of the United States.

"Yugoslavia has degenerated into a US imperialist dependency. ...

According to incomplete statistics, from the conclusion of World War II to January 1965 the United States and other imperialist powers extended to the Tito clique 'aid' totalling some US \$5,460 million, of which more than 60 per cent, or about \$3,500 million was US 'aid'. ...

The notes exchanged between Yugoslavia and the United States in 1951 concerning the 'Agreement Relating to Mutual Defence Association' stipulated that US Government officials have the 'freedom...without restriction' to observe and supervise the receipt and distribution in Yugoslavia of US military aid material and have 'full access to communication and information facilities'. ...

The 'Agreement Regarding Military Assistance' signed between Yugoslavia and the United States in 1951 stipulated that Yugoslavia should 'make the full contribution...to the development and maintenance of the defensive strength of the free world' and should be ready to provide troops...Under this agreement the military mission sent by the United States was to directly supervise the training of Yugoslav troops. ...

In 1954 Yugoslavia concluded a 'Treaty of Alliance, Political Cooperation and Mutual Assistance' with Greece and Turkey, both members of NATO. The treaty provided for military and diplomatic coordination among the three countries, thus making Yugoslavia a virtual member of the US-controlled military bloc." (Editorial Depts. of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi": "Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?"; Peking; 1963' p.24,25).

c) The Developing Washington-Bucarest Axis

The Romanina ultra-revisionists, who wish to detach their country from the Soviet-dominated bloc of states, look for support primarily to US imperialism - especially since the recent change in the policy of the West German imperialists (already referred to) has been less favourable to their interests.

The invitation to Nixon to make an official visit to Romania in August 1969, and the effusive official welcome organised for this leading representative of US imperialism, were but the most blatant example of the developing Washington-Bucarest Axis. The joint communique issued at the time of Nixon's visit paid tribute to

"the spirit of cordiality, sincerity and mutual respect which characterised the talks,"

and declared that

"no direct controversial issues"

existed between US imperialism and "socialist" Romania. The communique also reported agreement on the establishment of an American library in Romania and of a Romanian library in the United States, on the need to "develop and diversify" the economic relations between the two countries, and on the opening of negotiations for the conclusion of a US-Romanian consular convention and a civil aviation agreement.

A few days after Nixon's visit to Bucarest, Romania and Israel - US imperialism's puppet state in the Middle East - raised their legations to the level of embassies, in protest against which Syria, Iraq and the Sudan broke off diplomatic relations with Romania and the United Arab Republic recalled its Ambassador to Romania.

At the same time as developing relations of collaboration with Washington, the Romanian ultra-revisionists have not neglected to reaffirm similar relations with the potential ally of the US imperialists in the Far East - the People's Republic of China. As the message of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Romania to the "9th Congress of the Communist Party of China" expressed it:

"We are convinced that the relations between the Communist Party of Romania and the Communist Party of China and the warm and friendly relations and many-sided cooperation between the Socialist Republic of Romania and the People's Republic of China will continue to develop." (Message of Greetings from the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, in: "Peking Review", April 11th, 1969; p.16).

d) The Pressure for a new 'Balkan Entente'

In recent months the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour (like the leadership of the Communist Party of China) has ceased its ideological exposure of Yugoslav revisionism and has, in fact, been implying that the Yugoslav revisionist and Romanian ultra-revisionist leaders (as well as the Czechoslovak ultra-revisionists prior to their removal from positions of influence following the military intervention of August 1968) are - in so far as they maintain a consistent anti-Soviet stand - "progressive defenders of the national independence of their countries" and therefore to be supported.

Immediately after the Czechoslovak crisis, for example, the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour presented as the main crime of the Dubcek ultra-revisionist clique not its attempt to bring Czechoslovakia within the orbit of the Western imperialist powers, but its failure to organise armed resistance to the invading troops of the Warsaw Treaty states:

"The traitorous Czechoslovak revisionist leadership headed by Alexander Dubcek, which was hell-bent on the road of betrayal of the interests of the Czechoslovak people, and was terrified by the aggressor troops, capitulated in the most shameful way, calling on the Czechoslovak people and their army not to put up any resistance at all in defence of their homeland and against the invading foreign troops.

The Central Committee of the Albanian Party of Labour and the Government of the People's Republic of Albania most resolutely condemn and denounce the betrayal and capitalation of the Czechoslovak revisionist leadership."

(Statement of CC of A.P.L. and the Council of Ministers of Albania in: "Peking Review", August 30th, 1968; p.9).

More recently still, under the pressure of the Chinese revisionists the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour has made it clear that it is prepared

to bring the People's Republic of Albania into an alliance with the Romanian ultra-revisionists and the Yugoslav revisionists directed against the Soviet Union.

"In the present situation, when the Soviet revisionists have unsheathed their sword and threaten with armed intervention those countries which do not submit to their diktat, the Romanian people are justified in jealously guarding their freedom and independence. ...

Despite the divergencies of an ideological character which we have with the Romanian Party and State leadership on many issues, the Albanian people and their Party of Labour firmly back the just resistance of the fraternal Romanian people and the Romanian working class against the aggressive intentions of the Soviet chauvinists and their followers, against any blackmail or provocation, overt or covert, which the leaders of the Soviet Union might resort to in order to subjugate Romania. ...

The political and ideological demarcation line separating us from the present Yugoslav leadership is by now well known. But the Albanian people, strictly abiding by their principles and their long-standing, freedom-loving, progressive and anti-imperialist traditions, will support without hesitation, as they have done in the past, the resistance of the peoples of Yugoslavia to aggression." (Editorial: "Military Pressure: Basis of the Political Blackmail of the Soviet Revisionists", in: "Zuri i Popullit", organ of the CC of the Albanian Party of Labour, April 11th, 1969).

The formation of such a new "Balkan Entente" could serve only the interests of US imperialism - giving it an extensive sphere of influence and bridgehead in the Balkans which, taken together with Greece, would surround revisionist-led Bulgaria.

One of the aims of US imperialism is to obtain from the People's Republic of China as part of a marriage settlement yet to be negotiated, the transfer of the People's Republic of Albania into the sphere of influence of the United States by means of this projected "Balkan Entente"

A positive factor in this situation, however, is that - despite these serious errors in the field of foreign policy - there have been no indications that the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour is even considering the type of "economic reforms" which reflected the victory of revisionism in the other socialist countries of Europe and which presaged the restoration in those countries of state capitalist relations of production. As long as this internal situation remains unchanged - as long, that is, as the People's Republic of Albania maintains its state of the dictatorship of the working class and its socialist relations of production - these mistakes in foreign policy are not irreversible. If the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour corrects these mistakes in time, it is yet possible for the People's Republic of Albania to shake off its fatal alliance with the military dictatorship of the Chinese capitalist class and to retain its independence and socialist society - indeed, in such circumstances, it is still possible for the Albanian Party of Labour to play an extremely important role in the rebuilding of an international Marxist-Leninist movement. If the Albanian leadership fails to correct these errors in time, however, the Albanian people face the inevitable loss, not only of their socialist gains, but of their cherished and long-fought for independence.

2) In Asia

At his press conference in Guam on July 25th, 1969 Nixon declared that the United States was geographically a "Pacific power" and would "continue to play a significant role" in Asia.

As we have seen, Soviet foreign policy is directed towards the formation of a military alliance with Japan and India directed primarily against China. But the formation of this alliance necessitates Japan and India first breaking free of domination by US imperialism. Thus, the process of forming this alliance necessarily accentuates the conflict of interest between the Indian capitalists and the Japanese imperialists on the one hand and the US imperialists on the other, thus in itself giving the US imperialists a certain common interest with the enemies of the developing Moscow-Tokyo-New Delhi triangle - above all a certain common interest with the People's Republic of China.

Although Soviet foreign policy is directed towards the avoidance of any immediate direct confrontation with the United States, with the aim of encouraging US neutrality (or, at least, non-participation) in the war which the Soviet Union is planning with China, it is clear that the US imperialists could not afford to sit idly by and watch the whole of continental Eurasia brought under the hegemony of the Soviet Union. The logic of events, therefore, is compelling the United States to take steps to assist China in its war with the Soviet Union - if necessary by direct military intervention.

This new and intensified stage of development of the general crisis of capitalism is thus leading inevitably towards yet another global war for the redivision of the world between two vast imperialist groups - dominated respectively by United States imperialism and Soviet neo-imperialism.

Both Soviet and American leaders are well aware that world developments are impelling the Soviet Union and the United States towards a military collision. At the press conference of July 25th, 1969, already referred to, Nixon said:

"Over all, there was the great potential conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, the East-West conflict between the two super-powers."

And in an article published in June 1969, Marshal Krylov, the commander of the Soviet Strategic Missile Forces, described the USA as

"preparing for a surprise attack on the Soviet Union. The American imperialists ... are actively preparing for a new world war, ... to commit the most terrible crime before which all their past bloody deeds pale into insignificance - they are preparing to plunge mankind into a nuclear missile war." (Cited in: "The Guardian", November 19th, 1969; p.3).

It is, incidentally, the drive towards a Third World War by forces beyond their control that is impelling the leaders of the powers to explore the possibility of elaborating, in their mutual interest, a set of "Queensberry rules" for the conduct of the war which will serve to protect each other's capitalist property from destruction.

On July 18th, 1968 the chief Soviet delegate to the 18-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva submitted a memorandum proposing the international banning of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the limitation and subsequent reduction of the means of delivery of strategic nuclear weapons.

On November 25th, 1969 US President Nixon announced that the United States would renounce all methods of biological warfare and destroy all existing stocks of these weapons; that the United States would renounce the first use of chemical weapons; that the Geneva Protocol of 1925 (which prohibits the use in warfare of "asphyxiating, poisonous and other gases") would be presented to the US Senate for ratification; and that the United States associated itself with the principles of the British draft convention aimed at banning all methods of biological and chemical warfare.

The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) represent the first step in the direction of bringing about the banning by mutual consent of methods of warfare which, in a future global conflict, would cause irreparable damage to the capitalist property of the warring powers.

Returning to the subject of Sino-US relations, it must be recalled that as long ago as 1944 the American diplomat John Paton Davies, junior, was reporting to Washington that the faction of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Mao Tse-tung was "more Nationalist than Communist" and that Mao Tse-tung himself was "a Chinese Ramsay MacDonald" who could be useful to the United States.

(Memorandum by Foreign Service Officers in China, 1943-45"; in: "United States Relations with China (White Paper)", Annex 47; Washington; 1949; p.564-76).

And in his report of April 17th, 1954, Major General Patrick J. Hurley, Roosevelt's personal representative in China, noted:

"Molotov said at the former conference that the Chinese Communists are not in fact Communists at all. Their objective is to obtain what they look upon as necessary and just reformations in China." ("United States Relations with China (White Paper)"; ibid.; p.94-95).

Since the victory of the clique headed by Mao Tse-tung in the counter-revolutionary "cultural revolution", therefore, moves by the US imperialists towards a rapprochement with the Chinese military dictatorship have gathered speed.

In March 1969, 2,000 persons - senators, political writers, professors - assembled at the Hilton Hotel in New York, having paid \$45 apiece to attend the first conference of the "National Committee on US-China Relations". Almost at the same time the "Association for Asian Studies" brought together some 2,000 "China experts" to discuss rapprochement with Peking.

As Gus Hall, the general secretary of the revisionist-led Communist Party of the United States of America, told the international meeting in June 1969:

"For years there has been a well-organised high power political group of some of the most reactionary imperialist forces - called the 'China Lobby'. It has been the organising and ideological centre for the US policies of aggression in the Far East. This most reactionary force has now undertaken the drive, both in the open and behind the scenes, to bring about a working relationship between the US and the People's Republic of China. This is a well-financed drive, supported by some of the most aggressive monopoly circles in the heartland of world imperialism. ... Their aim is to try to use the People's Republic of China in its anti-Soviet plans." (G. Hall: Speech to "International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow 1969"; Prague; 1969; p.438).

While public opinion is being prepared for a switch in US policy towards China, semi-secret contacts between the two governments are proceeding, not only through the ambassadorial meetings in Warsaw, but in other ways. On February 18th, 1969 the State department press officer, William McGloskey, admitted that the United States kept in touch with Peking through Hong Kong, and the February 1969 issue of "Atlantic" carried an article by James Thompson, junior, a former State Department and White House expert on Asian affairs, foreseeing the possibility in the not distant future of a meeting between the US President and Chou En-lai.

On February 18th, 1969 US Secretary of State William Rogers stated that the US Ambassador in Warsaw had been instructed to ask the Chinese government to consider "an agreement on peaceful coexistence". According to the American press, such an agreement would follow the ending of the war in Vietnam and a "gesture" by the US government on the question of Taiwan. The agreement would recognize the mainland of South-East Asia (except for India, South Korea, Malaysia and Singapore) as "a Chinese sphere of influence", and India, South Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, the Philippines, Okinawa, Japan, Australia and New Zealand as "an American sphere of influence." ("New York Times", January 31st, 1969).

And in July 1969 the US government relaxed the restrictions on travel to and trade with China which had been in force since 1950.

On the Chinese side, the moves towards a rapprochement with United States imperialism are necessarily more discreet, since open moves in that direction necessitate dropping the "left" mask which the Chinese revisionists found so valuable in their counter-revolutionary "cultural revolution." However, it is worthy of note that the proposal for a Chinese-US agreement on peaceful coexistence came from Peking.

Already in recent months the official Chinese propaganda has made it increasingly clear that the Soviet revisionists and not the US imperialists were "Enemy No.1" of the People's Republic of China. Of the 24,000 words in Lin Piao's report to the "9th Congress of the Communist Party of China" in April 1969, 7.5% were devoted to criticism of the US imperialists and 45% to criticism of the Soviet revisionists. Whereas in July 1968, the Chinese leadership was saying:

"The enormous counter-revolutionary collaboration between US imperialism and the Soviet revisionist renegade clique is becoming more and more undisguised." ("Renmin Ribao" Commentator: "Another Big Exposure of US-Soviet Counter-Revolutionary Collaboration", in: "Peking Review", July 12th, 1968;p.5),

in September 1969 they were beginning to refer to:

"the strife between US imperialism and Soviet revisionism for hegemony in Asia." (An Chun-tao: "Another Step in the New Tsars' Expansion in Asia", in: "Peking Review", September 7th, 1969; p.20).

The foreign press, however, is under no illusions about what General Hontoy, writing in "Le Soir" in January 1969 calls:

"a reorientation...of Chinese foreign policy. This outstretched hand towards Washington could mark a truce with the USA. ...The enemy which appears the most dangerous for China is the USSR." (General Hontoy, writing in: "Le Soir", January 31st, 1969);

and in the following month the "New York Times" noted:

"Chen Yi (Chinese Foreign Minister - PB, MLOB)...has more than once cited old bonds of friendship between the Chinese and the American people and has implied a belief that once the Vietnamese war ends this tradition could again become important." (Article in "New York Times", February 2nd, 1969).

The reorientation of Chinese foreign policy towards a rapprochement with US imperialism has already been reflected in the policies of the Maoist puppet parties and groups in various countries, which face the impossible task of trying to appear ultra-revolutionary while placing their organisations at the service of a developing alliance between Chinese revisionism and US imperialism.

During 1968 most of these parties and groups made the "discovery" that the Vietnamese leadership was revisionist, representing the interests of the Vietnamese national capitalist class. They drew the incorrect conclusion from this, however, that the Vietnamese leaders must, therefore, be "traitors to the Vietnamese national liberation struggle" and had entered the Paris peace talks with the aim of betraying their country to the US imperialists:

"Negotiations over Vietnam have become the ugly fact of life. ...

Though People's War has beaten the US military machine in Vietnam, the negotiations process is turning this victory into a defeat for the revolutionary forces in Vietnam and in the world. ...

US imperialism, with the cooperation of the Soviet Union and the north Vietnamese leaders, will use negotiations to achieve its goal of keeping troop concentrations based in Vietnam, ...

Why should the Vietnamese leaders allow the US to shore up its position in Vietnam?" (Editorial: "Ugly Negotiations and US Political Gimmicks", in: "Progressive Labor", organ of the US Maoist "Progressive Labor Party", June 1968; p.8,9).

This line is one which objectively assists the US imperialists, one which serves to confuse the growing movement of solidarity in all countries - not least the United States itself - for solidarity with the Vietnamese national liberation movement, for what is the use of striving to build solidarity with a movement that is led by "traitors" to that movement?

In August 1969 the largest Maoist party in the United States, the Progressive Labor Party, completely rejected the fundamental Marxist-Leninist concept that the working people in all countries must support national liberation movements in the colonial-type countries in favour of the trotskyite slogan for such countries of "socialism now."

"In the past...we were confused by the concept of the two-stage struggle which claimed that first there is the battle for national liberation, and then communists transform it to the battle for socialism. ...

It is wrong for communists to advocate a two-stage struggle. ...

When communists work in a nationalistic movement, or national liberation movement as they are sometimes called, they must put forward the goal of socialism. ...

Communists cannot advocate anything else but socialism." (Editorial: "Revolutionaries Must Fight Nationalism", in: "Progressive Labor", August 1969; p.7,8,9,12).

In the new world situation the degeneration of the Maoist parties and groups into mutually hostile micro-groups of trotskyite-type disruptors serving the interest of the developing alliance between Chinese revisionism and US imperialism, is clearly proceeding rapidly. The Chinese capitalist class has, however, always regarded these "Marxist-Leninist" parties and groups as expendable.

As an alternative to seeing their parties or groups degenerate in this way, some of the Maoist leaderships may choose to repudiate Maoism and bring their parties or groups into the camp of "centrist" revisionism.

To sum up, as a result of the intensified operation of the law of uneven development of capitalism, in the present period of the general crisis of capitalism, the world situation is leading inevitably towards yet another global war for the redivision of the world - this time between two vast imperialist groups - dominated respectively by United States imperialism and Soviet neo-imperialism. As this process of polarisation develops, the imperialist powers of Western Europe, Japanese imperialism and India are tending to move towards the Soviet pole, while China, Albania, Pakistan and those neo-capitalist states of Eastern Europe which have broken free (or will have broken free) from Soviet domination are tending to move towards the US pole.

Of course, both the United States imperialists on the one hand and the Western European imperialists on the other dream of manoeuvring their respective partners, China and the Soviet Union, into actual hostilities, in which they are not directly involved, in the hope that China and the Soviet Union might eliminate each other as great powers and so be broken up for the benefit of the imperialist powers who have remained outside the conflict. But the fate of all similar attempts on the part of imperialist states in the past to instigate wars of any considerable dimensions but to remain outside the sphere of hostilities while benefitting from them, strongly indicates that any such attempt in the case of a future war of global proportions, fought under infinitely more intense conditions of conflict (both militarily and politically) which prevail today, would be doomed to certain failure.

PART FOUR

In this fourth and final part of the Report, we wish to analyse the situation within the "international communist movement" and, in particular, the role of "centrist" revisionism within that movement.

THE "REUNIFICATION" OF THE "INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT"

In the period before the communist parties of the world fell victim to the cancer of revisionism, in the days when these parties based themselves on Marxism-Leninism, the international communist movement - especially during the period of existence of the Communist International - exhibited an international cohesion, unity and solidarity which reflected the fact that each national party represented the interests of the working class of its country, interests which are common to the working class of every country.

In the present period, when the overwhelming majority of "communist parties" are dominated by revisionism - which is the perversion of Marxism-Leninism to make it serve the interests of the capitalist class - the "international communist movement" (if it can still be called that) exhibits, even from the standpoint of the revisionists themselves, a state of extreme and unprecedented disunity, reflecting the contradictions between the interests of the various national capitalist classes and even between the interests of different sections of the same national capitalist class.

This disunity not only lowers the prestige of the Soviet revisionists, for whom the claim is made that they are "the heirs of great Lenin", but means that the "international communist movement" cannot effectively serve the foreign policy of the Soviet neo-imperialists.

An important task which the Soviet revisionists have set themselves, therefore - albeit a task which by its nature is impossible to fulfil - is that of "re-establishing the unity of the international communist movement" on the basis of "orthodox", i.e., Soviet revisionism.

The "International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties", mooted many years ago by Khrushchov to set the seal on the "reunification of the international communist movement," finally took place in Moscow in June 1969 under the auspices of the Soviet revisionists - but revealed a greater disunity than ever.

The difficulties of the Soviet revisionists in establishing a common line did not come primarily, however, from the "centrist" revisionists. Although the Communist Party of Japan, the Workers' Party of Korea and the Workers' Party of Vietnam did not participate in the meeting, of these only the Communist Party of Japan rejected the idea of holding the meeting:

"The fact that 75 parties were represented at the Meeting is, undoubtedly, of great significance, especially considering the reasons that prevented some of the parties from attending. The only parties which rejected the idea of holding the Meeting were the parties of China, Albania, New Zealand, the Netherlands and Japan." (R.Guyot: "The International Meeting - a Big Success for the World Communist Movement", in: "World Marxist Review" view", October 1969; p.6).

The "centrist" revisionist-led Communist Party of Cuba sent an observer to the meeting who expressed agreement with the principal formulation adopted and described the documents before the meeting as "a considerable step forward":

"Our Communist Party is in full accord with the analysis of the nature of imperialism in the Main Document under discussion. ...

The Communist Party of Cuba also agrees with the exposure of the special role played by US imperialism. ...

We express complete agreement with the task set in the Document for the working class and all the anti-imperialist forces, 'to curb the aggressors and liberate mankind from imperialism' ...

We also agree with the Document that 'the world socialist system is the decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle'. ... The general trend of the Document is a considerable step forward. ...

Also we give our backing to the proposition in the Document according to which the policy of coexistence 'does not imply either the preservation of the social and political status quo, or a weakening of the ideological struggle', and that 'mass action against imperialism is a condition for implementing the policy of peaceful coexistence'.

As we see it, these formulations in the Document, like the basic propositions in the Appeal in Defence of Peace, were indispensable. ...

Our Party is in accord with the idea that 'the main effort should be directed towards the prohibition of nuclear weapons; nuclear energy should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.'" (C.R.Rodriguez: Member of Secretariat, Communist Party of Cuba: "Speech at International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow 1969"; Prague; 1969; p.303,304,305,307).

We have seen in earlier sections of this Report that the reorientation of Soviet foreign policy in 1964 away from one in which the cardinal point was collaboration with US imperialism removed the main objection of the "centrist" revisionists to the policy of the Soviet revisionists, and that, as a result, the parties of the "centrist" revisionist camp have been moving since 1966 closer to the camp of Soviet revisionism.

What, then, are the issues which still divide the "centrist" revisionists from the Soviet revisionists?

Firstly, the issue of Soviet aid to the Latin American semi-colonial regimes:

"The establishment and expansion of diplomatic relations by Latin American governments with socialist countries, coupled with pronouncements of possible changes in the position of these governments toward Cuba, do not necessarily represent an earnest policy of repulsing US imperialism, but a mere manoeuvre to win time in the face of difficulties, to deceive and mislead the masses. That is why we stand for a more thorough exposure of bourgeois reformism as a tool used by the imperialists to maintain their domination in countries of the Third World." (C.R.Rodriguez, Member of Secretariat, Communist Party of Cuba: *ibid.*; p.305).

To this criticism, which could hardly have been phrased more tactfully, Brezhnev replied in behalf of the Soviet revisionists that Soviet policy towards the Latin American semi-colonial states would continue unchanged:

"We are extending our ties with the states of Latin America where resistance to imperialist dictation and to foreign monopoly oppression is stiffening." (L.I.Brezhnev, General Secretary, Communist Party of the Soviet Union; *ibid.*; p.170).

Secondly, the issue of the opposition of most of the leaderships of the "communist parties" of Latin America to armed national liberation struggle:

"We consider as not quite precise the general formulation in the Document according to which in our region 'the Communist and Workers' Parties stand in the van of the democratic forces and are the standard bearers of the anti-imperialist struggle...'

We should be insincere before this Meeting if we did not say that, in our view, this picture does not conform to the actual situation in some of the Communist Parties of Latin America." (C.R.Rodriguez, Member of Secretariat, Communist Party of Cuba: *ibid.*; p.304).

On this issue, the Soviet revisionists took the line that it was up to the "communist party" of each Latin American country concerned to decide for itself whether to support or oppose armed national liberation struggle. In other words, the Soviet revisionists made it clear that if supporters of Castroism were able to bring about a change in the policy of a Latin American "communist party" in favour of support for armed national liberation struggle, this would not be unacceptable to the Soviet revisionists:

"The policy of peaceful coexistence does not contradict the right of any oppressed people to fight for its liberation by any means it considers necessary - armed or peaceful! ..."

There is no leading centre of the international communist movement. ...

Each Party...fully independently elaborates its own policy, determines the directions, forms and methods of struggle, and, depending on the circumstances, chooses the peaceful or non-peaceful way of transition to socialism, and also the forms and methods of building socialism in its own country." ("Main Document adopted at International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow 1969"; Prague; 1969; 1969; p.31,36-37).

Thirdly, and most important, is the issue of the role allotted to the "centrist" revisionist parties of Cuba, Korea and Vietnam of directly confronting US imperialism where the Soviet revisionists do not wish to do so - a role which leaves Cuba, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam dangerously vulnerable.

Castro spoke on behalf of the "centrist" revisionist leaderships of all three states when, in giving the approval of the Cuban leadership to the military intervention of the Warsaw Treaty states in Czechoslovakia, he asked:

"Will Warsaw Pact divisions also be sent to Vietnam if the Yankee imperialists step up their aggression against that country and the people of Vietnam request that aid? Will they send the divisions of the Warsaw Pact to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea if the Yankee imperialists attack that country? Will they send the divisions of the Warsaw Pact to Cuba if the Yankee imperialists attack our country, or even in the case of the threat of a Yankee imperialist attack on our country, if our country requests it?" (F.Castro: Speech of August 23rd, 1968, in: "Granma", August 25th, 1968; p.1).

The unwillingness of the Soviet revisionists to give a definite affirmative answer to these questions did not prevent the representative of Cuban "centrist" revisionism from declaring at the international meeting in June 1969 that, even if the Soviet Union was not fully the ally of Cuba, Cuba would always be the ally of the Soviet Union:

"The Communist Party of Cuba holds that in the struggle of the peoples against imperialism the Soviet Union plays the role of main bastion. ...

That is why we declare from this rostrum: Cuba will always without hesitation take the side of the Soviet Union in any decisive confrontation - as in the case of Soviet action against the danger of any country being torn away from the socialist system as a result of imperialist manoeuvres, so in the case of provocations and aggressions against the Soviet people, wherever these may originate." (C.R.Rodriguez, Member of Secretariat, Communist Party of Cuba: ibid.; p.308-309).

THE PROPOSAL FOR A "SMALL STATE BLOC"

Faced with the fact of their vulnerable position in relation to US imperialism, the "centrist" revisionists of Cuba, Korea and Vietnam are endeavouring to build their own system of alliances - composed of "small states" like themselves who cannot rely for the protection of their independence on any forces but their own.

In October 1968 the leader of the Workers' Party of Korea, Kim Il Sung, published an article in "Tricontinental", the organ of the Organisation of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, entitled "The Great Anti-Imperialist Revolutionary Cause of the Asian, African and Latin American Peoples is Invincible". In this article Kim Il Sung says:

"When many countries, though small, pool their strength to fight imperialism, the peoples will be able to beat the enemy however strong he may be, with a decisively overwhelming force. The peoples of the countries making revolution should join efforts to tear off left and right arms from US imperialism, tear off its left and right legs and behead it eventually everywhere it stretches out its crooked hands of aggression. ...

We small nations should unite and counter the strategy of US imperialism to swallow us one by one, each chopping off its head and limbs. Such, it can be said, is the strategy of struggle for small countries to defeat US imperialism." (Cited from: "Radio Pyongyang", Number 10 (38), 1969; p.1).

The formation of such a bloc directed against US imperialism composed of small states in direct confrontation with US imperialism has great advantages for the Soviet Union, which may accord it moral and material support without becoming directly involved. The "centrist", "anti-revisionist" position of the leaderships of the parties of Cuba, Vietnam and Korea has the additional advantage that, so long as the Chinese "left" revisionists choose to maintain their "Marxist-Leninist", "anti-imperialist" mask, these leaderships may demand and obtain a certain amount of aid from the People's Republic of China, thus strengthening the position of the Soviet Union's allies at the expense of her most dangerous enemy.

The ruling capitalist class of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the most industrialised of the states with "centrist" revisionist leaderships, is making a particular bid for hegemony in this projected bloc of small states. In September 1969, for example, in the initiative of the Korean leaders, an agreement was signed between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Cuba whereby the former state will render aid to Cuba for the establishment of a steel industry capable of making the country self-sufficient in steel. ("Granma," September 21st, 1969; p.7).

The North Korean capitalist class is also offering to the capitalists of the small states which it is desired to bring into the projected bloc the theories elaborated by Kim Il Sung and other Korean revisionists to secure "socialist enthusiasm on the part of the working class" without abolishing capitalism. A new book on this subject published in many languages is Kim Il Sung's "On Further Developing the Dae-an Work System" (Pyongyang: 1969). A publicity pamphlet for the book says that the system is based on:

"the principle of the mass line that those who direct production draw up the plans through discussion with the workers, the actual producers, and induce the producers to regard the plans as their own. ...

The Dae-an work system is a scientifically-motivated system of work providing the possibilities of ensuring coordination and mobility in the direction of production, managing and operating the economy most rationally and effectively to meet the requirements of modern production." (Publicity Pamphlet for: Kim Il Sung: "On Further Developing the Dae-an Work System"; Pyongyang; 1969; p.4,5).

Apart from such theories of "worker participation in industrial management", which are now being developed (without the "Marxist-Leninist" label) in most capitalist countries, the Korean "centrist" revisionists are also offering a rival personality cult to that of the Chinese "left" revisionists, which personality cult attained a certain success in a number of colonial-type countries. A full-page advertisement in the leading British capitalist newspaper "The Times" informs us, around a large portrait of Kim Il Sung, that

"General Kim Il Sung has consistently led the Korean revolution to victory, taking upon himself the destiny of the fatherland and nation."

He is:

"the Sun of the Nation"...

"the Great Leader of the 40 million Korean people"...

"the Iron-Willed Brilliant Commander"...

"the Saviour of the Revolution"

"His outstanding leadership and lofty virtues"

make him

"THE HERO OF THE 20TH CENTURY!"

and obviously outstandingly qualified to lead the national bourgeoisies of colonial-type countries in their struggle to free themselves from the yoke of imperialism!

It is clear, then, that the Soviet revisionists have accepted the "centrist" revisionist-led parties as a semi-independent "left-wing" of the "international communist movement" which serves their interests, and that this role has been accepted (if under protest) by the "centrist" revisionist-led parties themselves.

It follows that the main obstacle to the reunification of the "international communist movement" by the Soviet revisionists (it is envisaged that the problem of the Communist Party of China will be solved by a Soviet military victory) is the attitude of the ultra-revisionist-led parties - both in former socialist countries such as Romania and in certain established capitalist countries.

ULTRA-REVISIONISM IN THE ESTABLISHED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

From 1965 onwards the leaderships of the majority of the "communist parties" in the established capitalist countries reorientated their policies into line with that of the Soviet revisionists - that is, they placed their parties at the disposal of those sections of the capitalist classes of their countries which sought, in their own interests, to free their countries from the yoke of US imperialism.

However, the leaderships of a number of such "communist parties" - notably those of Australia, Belgium, Britain, Italy, Norway, San Marino, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland - did not accept the change of master and orientation, but continued to serve by their policies those sections of the capitalist classes of their countries which favoured continued collaboration with and dependence on US imperialism. Thus, the leaderships of these parties, which continued the fundamental orientation of the Khrushchov period, found themselves aligned closely with the ultra-revisionists of the Eastern European countries, who represent the interests of those sections of the capitalist classes of their countries which wish to free themselves from Soviet domination and place their countries in a position of collaboration with and dependence on US imperialism.

Furthermore, most of the leaderships of these parties in the capitalist countries had adopted a concept of "socialism" based on multi-party "parliamentary democracy" - the type of "socialism" favoured by the ultra-revisionists of Eastern Europe:

"In a Socialist Britain ... the Labour Party and the Communist Party, working together for their socialist aim, are the working class political organisations on which the success of the change to socialism primarily depends. At the same time the right of other political parties to maintain their organisations, party publications and propaganda, and to take part in elections, will be maintained." ("The British Road to Socialism", Programme of the Communist Party of Great Britain; London; 1958; p.21,23).

"We consider that it is possible and necessary not only to advance towards socialism but also build socialist society with the assistance of other political forces, organisations and parties; we consider that in the conditions obtaining in our country the hegemony of the working class must be realised within a militant front, a bloc of ruling forces, in a pluralistic and democratic political system." (E. Berlinguer, Deputy General Secretary, Italian Communist Party": Speech at International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow 1969"; Prague; 1969; p.381).

"According to our vision of socialism, a multi-party system and the cooperation of diverse parties having a socialist orientation are one of the characteristics due to the peculiarities of the Spanish revolution." (S. Carillo, General Secretary Communist Party of Spain; *ibid.*; p.363).

Thus, the leaderships of these "communist parties" found themselves very close to the political and ideological positions of the ultra-revisionists of Eastern Europe, and in a similar state of contradiction with the Soviet revisionists. For this reason they may be regarded as the ultra-revisionists of the established capitalist countries.

In 1968 most of the ultra-revisionist leaderships of both Eastern Europe and the established capitalist countries supported the programme of the ultra-revisionist Dubcek clique in Czechoslovakia and denounced the military intervention of the Warsaw Treaty states:

"We say openly that the August 1968 intervention in Czechoslovakia was wrong. ... We say the continued presence of troops is wrong." (L. Aarons, National Secretary, Communist Party of Australia: *ibid.*; p.130).

"The momentous decision of the five socialist states to intervene militarily in Czechoslovakia profoundly affected every Communist Party. We said it was wrong. ...

We are convinced that the problems which arose were closely connected with the further development of socialist democracy frustrated by the deformations under Novotny.

The January 1968 Plenum took decisions to overcome this, which we all welcomed." (J. Gollan, General Secretary, Communist Party of Great Britain: *ibid.*; p.491).

"It is on this concept (of inviolable sovereignty - PB, MLOB)... that we base our... attitude to the Czechoslovak events: from solidarity with the new course started in January 1968 to the serious disagreement with the entry into Czechoslovakia of the troops of the five Warsaw Treaty countries." (E. Berlinguer, Deputy General Secretary, Italian Communist Party; *ibid.*; p. 388-389).

"We cannot approve the action of the five Warsaw Treaty countries in relation to the Czechoslovak Socialist republic." (J. Lechleiter, Secretary, Central Committee, Swiss Party of Labour: *ibid.* p.346).

The line on Czechoslovakia taken by the ultra-revisionist leaderships in the established capitalist countries corresponded closely to that taken by the ultra-revisionist leadership of the Romanian Communist Party. A joint statement issued on August 21st, 1968 by the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, the State Council and the Romanian Government described the military intervention in Czechoslovakia as

"a flagrant violation of the national sovereignty of a fraternal Socialist state."

The developing international alignment between the ultra-revisionists, the US imperialists and the Chinese capitalist class is reflected in the similar denunciations of the military intervention in Czechoslovakia made by the two latter. A statement by Johnson on August 21st, 1968 declared:

"The Soviet Union and its allies have invaded a defenceless country to stamp out a resurgence of ordinary human freedom."

And Premier Chou En-lai said at the Romanian Embassy in Peking on August 23rd, 1968 that the Soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia was

"the most barefaced and most typical specimen of fascist power politics played by the Soviet revisionist clique of renegades and scabs against its so-called allies. ...

It is exactly the same as Hitler of the past in his aggression against Czechoslovakia." (Chou En-lai: Speech of August 23rd, 1968 in "Peking Review", Supplement, August 23rd, 1968; p.III).

The developing alignment between the pro-US imperialist ultra-revisionists and the Chinese capitalist class is also illustrated by the support expressed by the ultra-revisionist delegations to the June 1969 international meeting for the People's Republic of China;

"We have proposed an amendment to the Document, which would state our support for the restoration to the People's Republic of China of its territory of Taiwan." (L.Aarons: General Secretary, Communist Party of Australia; "Speech at International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow 1969"; Prague: 1969; p.130).

"We will insist on the government taking steps to secure the recognition of China and its admission to the UN as a fully fledged member." (M.Drumaux, Chairman, Communist Party of Belgium: *ibid.*; p.459).

"People's China exercises a strong influence on the world situation. That is why we hold that efforts must be applied to understand the objective demands behind the changes that have occurred in China and in Chinese policy....

It is evident that any efforts in this direction have to take full account of the objective requirements of the development of the Chinese economy and Chinese society, and China's role in the world.

The policy of peaceful coexistence and the struggle against imperialism also require China's positive contribution. ...

The question of restoring the Chinese People's Republic to its place and role in the United Nations is also an urgent one." (E.Berlinguer, Deputy General Secretary, Italian Communist Party; *ibid.*; p.385,386).

"The struggle should be waged for the following objectives: ..."

reinstatement of People's China in its rights of a great power in the U.N.O." (E. Gasperoni, General Secretary, San Marino Communist Party: *ibid.*; p.631).

At the international meeting in June 1969, the ultra-revisionist delegations expressed their objections to those sections of the draft documents which strongly indicted US imperialism. Since it was hardly tactically possible for them to confess that their objections stemmed from their wish to continue policies based on collaboration with US imperialism, these objections were couched in vague and hypocritical terms. On the other hand, they fully supported Section 3 of the draft of the main document, which, as a concession to their point of view, carried forward Khrushchovite formulations such as:

"The main direction of united action of the anti-imperialist forces remains the struggle against war, for world peace." (Draft of Section 3 of the Main Document, cited by C.R. Rodriguez, observer from the Communist Party of Cuba: *ibid.*; p.306).

"Our leadership has endorsed in principle the Third Section of the Document. ...

We re-submit the proposal that this part of the Document should be separated from the rest, so that all Parties could sign it. ...

The Australian Communist Party cannot sign the document as a whole, since it cannot accept some principles as stated. ...

The Document... does not make a deep and objective analysis of some new features of the present stage of the complicated process of social development. ...

The Document does not face up to theoretical and policy questions." (L. Aarons, National Secretary, Communist Party of Australia: *ibid.*; p.126, 127, 129).

"We agree with the platform of action set out in Section Three of the Draft Document, apart from the reservations over some formulations. ...

In respect of the other sections of the Document, we have, on the contrary, put forward, and continue to put forward objections.

It is not only a question of partial objections to this or that formulation. It is also and specifically a question of our objection relating to the very structure of the Document. ...

We are in serious doubt about the scientific character of some aspects of the analysis contained in the Document. In style, the Document is more frequently couched in invocatory, propagandist rather than analytical terms, and this makes it impossible to catch the great novelty, wealth and complexity of the processes of development. ...

For all these reasons, we have proposed that the Meeting should adopt a Document consisting of the introductory part and the programme of action set forth in Section Three. ... The line approved by our C.C. allows us to back only that part of the Document which outlines our common action programme." (E. Berlinguer, Deputy General Secretary, Italian Communist Party: *ibid.*; p.391-92).

"We hold that the draft of the Main Document does not quite fit the framework of the agreement reached among the Parties in Budapest. ...

The analysis of imperialism at the present stage, as set out in the draft, ... is watered down by excessive detail. Furthermore, the first two sections contain points of a conflicting nature. ...

As we see it, it is best to leave out the first two sections." (E. Larsen, Chairman, Communist Party of Norway: *ibid.*; p.276,277).

"I agree with the comrades who suggested that the Main Document deal with the questions on which we hold common views, leaving aside questions on which views differ." (E. Ceausescu, General Secretary, Central Committee, Romanian Communist Party: *ibid.*; p.264).

"Our Party as represented by its Central Committee has thoroughly studied the Main Document of our Meeting. In our humble opinion, this Document ought to have been made more understandable to the working classes. As we see it, some points of it ought to have been formulated more profoundly.

We fully agree with Section Three of the Document." (E. Gasperoni, General Secretary, San Marino Communist Party: *ibid.*; p.631).

"The Document submitted to the Meeting, in our view far transcends the limits set by the agenda and diverts from it. ...

Also, it is our belief that the circulated Document contains substantial deficiencies in elucidating and analysing the world situation." (L. Werner, Deputy Chairman, Left Party - Communists of Sweden: *ibid.*; p.447).

"Our Party would have preferred a shorter and more propaganda-orientated document with the accent on practical anti-imperialist action, similar to what we have in Section Three. We also think that some of the formulations are too general." (J. Lechleiter, Secretary, Central Committee, Swiss Party of Labour: *ibid.*; p.347).

Some ultra-revisionist delegations found the Main Document acceptable to them "as a basis for discussion" but one which they would not accept as binding on their parties:

"The Main Document does not fully satisfy us. ... However, the text is acceptable as a basis for discussion that in no way handicaps the political work or the autonomy of any Party." (M. Drumaux, Chairman, Communist Party of Belgium: *ibid.*; p.461).

"As regards the Main Document, delegates are no doubt aware that our Executive Committee will take the final decision on our attitude after we return." (J. Gollan, General Secretary, Communist Party of Great Britain: *ibid.*; p.490).

"The Executive Committee is unable to give its assent to the document as a whole, since on some matters it has reservations. ... Despite these criticisms the Executive Committee accepts the document as a valuable basis for discussing the problems of our time." (Statement of Executive Committee, Communist Party of Great Britain, on International Communist Conference, in: "Marxism Today", August 1969; p.225).

"We think the Document under discussion has...shortcomings. ...

Our Party has made serious reservations on some points. ...

The Document is not presented as a 'programmatic charter' or a 'general line' for the Communist Parties. ...

At present unity can only be achieved on the terms of complete independence of the Parties in shaping their policy line. ...

We wish to stress with the best of intentions but also with the utmost frankness that... the world communist movement is not governed by the principle of democratic centralism. In our movement, fundamental problems cannot be solved by voting nor by a majority vote. ...

Our Party... is not prepared ever to be a minority." (S. Carrillo, General Secretary, Communist Party of Spain: "Speech at International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow 1969"; Prague; 1969; p.365,366-67).

THE (REORGANISED) COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM ENTERS THE "CENTRIST" REVISIONIST CAMP

At the end of Part Three of this Report we said:

As an alternative to seeing their parties or groups degenerate in this way, some of the maoist leaderships may choose to repudiate Maoism and bring their parties or groups into the camp of "centrist" revisionism."

The recent history of the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium provided a significant example of this tendency.

Following its repudiation of Chinese "left" revisionism and its re-analysis of the "cultural revolution" as a counter-revolutionary attack on the Chinese working class, the Communist Party of Belgium was congratulated on its stand by the Political Bureau of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium accepted the proposal of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain that talks should take place between representatives of the two Organisations. As a result a meeting was held between representatives of the two Central Committees in November 1968, and a further meeting between a representative of the Central Committee of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain and representatives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium in May 1969.

The Political Bureau of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain had been somewhat concerned at the fact that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium had apparently felt it unnecessary to issue any statement of explanation or self-criticism on the abrupt change of their line from full support of the Chinese "cultural revolution" to outright opposition.

We were also concerned at the fact that the Communist Party of Belgium continued to recognise the Communist Party of Cuba, the Workers' Party of Korea and the Workers' Party of Vietnam as "Marxist-Leninist Parties", and Cuba, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam as "socialist states":

"The People's Democratic Republic of Korea, Cuba and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam continue to win victories in the building of socialism". (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", March 21st, 1969; p.1).

We were even more concerned at the fact that the Communist Party of Belgium continued unchanged its policy of calling for "national independence" for Belgian imperialism:

"This struggle for national independence (in Belgium - PB, MLOB) forms an integral part of the class struggle." (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", April 11th, 1969).

On the latter two issues, the Political Bureau of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain made known to the Communist Party of Belgium its disagreement with these policies.

Nevertheless, the leadership of the Communist Party of Belgium expressed its desire to cooperate in the building of an international Marxist-Leninist movement. In view of the urgency with which we regarded this task, we therefore proposed that, in order to establish the international nucleus of such a movement, a meeting should be held as soon as possible to which should be invited all parties and groups calling themselves Marxist-Leninist which had repudiated both Soviet right revisionism and Chinese "left" revisionism. At that time, such parties and groups known to us existed in the United States, Britain, Belgium, France and Italy. The American Communist Movement endorsed the principle of such a meeting and authorised the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain to act as its proxy at the meeting.

The leadership of the Communist Party of Belgium wished that the meeting, with which it expressed agreement, should take place in Brussels, to which the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain was pleased to agree, and asked that the Political Bureau of the MLOB should prepare the draft documents for the meeting.

The Political Bureau of the MLOB prepared these draft documents on the basis of issues on which, to the best of our knowledge, there was agreement among the organisations due to participate in the meeting, hoping that differences would be resolved in due course as a result of joint consultations and coordinated activity.

On July 3rd, 1969, however - some three weeks before the international meeting was due to take place - the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium, Jacques Grippa, wrote to the MLOB declaring that all the draft documents for the meeting, including the draft agenda, were unacceptable to them, that it was very doubtful whether the delegations of the French and Italian groups (with which the Communist Party of Belgium had been in touch for some time) would attend, and that it was the view of the CPB that the meeting should take the form of an informal, unpublicised discussion without any agenda. The letter, in fact, deprecated the whole conception of an international meeting of the character which had been agreed to, saying:

"We fear that it would produce an important misunderstanding as to the range and significance of this first meeting, which, we must be aware, is so limited in numbers of participants (and in the geographical area which it covers) that it cannot be truly regarded as representative of the Marxist-Leninist forces in the world. ...

In calling in some way for other Parties, organisations and/or persons to rally to a document put out by us, we could do more harm than good, making it more difficult for the Marxist-Leninist forces to show themselves in the world and to unite with us, in placing before them a fait accompli which could alienate them." (Letter of Secretary of CC of CPB to MLOB, July 3rd, 1969).

Taking this letter in conjunction with the discussions held with representatives of the Communist Party of Belgium, the Political Bureau of the MLOB drew the conclusion that the reference in the letter to "Marxist-Leninist forces in the world" not participating in the meeting was a reference to the "centrist" revisionist-led parties of Cuba, Korea and Vietnam, and that the leadership of the Communist Party of Belgium had broken with Chinese "left" revisionism not in order to take the path of Marxism-Leninism but, for purely opportunist reasons, to align the party with the "centrist" revisionist camp in the service of the Soviet revisionists.

This conclusion has been confirmed by later events.

In 1967, "La Voix du Peuple", organ of the Communist Party of Belgium, was stating correctly in large headlines:

"THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS HAVE ALREADY RESTORED CAPITALISM IN THE SOVIET UNION." ("La Voix du Peuple", March 24th, 1967; p.17; also: March 31st, 1967; p.19).

and was saying as recently as March 1969:

"The Khrushchovite and post Khrushchovite cliques have succeeded in usurping the leadership of the party and of power, proceeding in this great country to the restoration of capitalism." (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", March 21st, 1969; p.1).

But by November 1969 "La Voix du Peuple" was saying:

"Since the fall of Khrushchov, which constituted victory for Marxism-Leninism, and in the context of accentuated class struggle, positive signs of revolutionary rectification have shown themselves...."

We proudly affirm our solidarity with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. ...

In the Soviet Union, the signs of revolutionary rectification go hand in hand with new socialist victories which we salute with joy." (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", November 7th, 1969; p.1).

In March 1969 "La Voix du Peuple" was saying correctly:

"We witness the sharpening of the contradictions between leading groups of different countries under the revisionist yoke even to the point where they lead to the invasion of Czechoslovakia and to an armed confrontation on the Sino-Soviet border, with a nauseating emission of chauvinist propaganda on both sides. ..."

It is in this context that one must understand the present Sino-Soviet conflict. It is above all an inter-revisionist collision where each of the protagonists...presses degeneration to the point of great power chauvinism." (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", March 21st, 1969; p.1).

But by August 1969 "La Voix du Peuple" was saying:

"The working class (of Czechoslovakia - PB, MLOB) has shown by its actions (on which the bourgeois press is silent) its will to defend its socialist conquests, its support for the present leaders of Czechoslovakia and its solidarity with the Soviet Union, whose aid contributed at the time to defeat the counter-revolution."

They (i.e., the Chinese 'left' revisionists - PB, MLOB) go so far as to compare to the Hitlerite occupation the aid of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to the peoples of Czechoslovakia to help fight the counter-revolution."

One must add that their (i.e., the Chinese 'left' revisionists - PB, MLOB) provocations on the river Amur and on the frontier of Soviet Kazakhstan, provocations which are a manifestation of their great power chauvinism, play the game of US imperialism". (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", August 29th, 1969; p.1).

REUNIFYING THE SPLIT REVISIONIST-LED PARTIES

One aspect of the task of trying to bring about the reunification of the "international communist movement" is that of reunifying the split parties in countries such as India and Belgium, where "centrist" revisionist parties came into being in opposition to the older revisionist parties.

In India, where the (old) Communist Party of India reorientated its political line after 1964 in accordance with the new foreign policy of the Soviet revisionists, there is no fundamental political barrier to reunification, and the "centrist" revisionist-led Communist Party of India (Marxist) is, in fact, referred to by the Soviet revisionists as

"the parallel Communist Party". (P.Shastitko: "Political Struggles in India, in: "New Times", August 20th, 1969; p.5).

"The Party Congress (of February 1968 - PB, MLOB), therefore, gave the clarion call for unity in action with the CPI (Marxist), for persisting in patient efforts to restore the unity of the Communist movement in India." (M.Sen: "The Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of India", in: "World Marxist Review", May 1968; p.43).

"The three main points on which the split took place in the communist movement in our country in 1964 are to a large extent resolved by history...."

In their recent document of May 1969, the statement of the CPI (M) Politbureau on the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of China, they totally repudiate the ideological and political positions of the Maoist leadership as being anti-Marxist-Leninist." (R.Rao: "Political Perspectives in India" in: "Marxism Today", November 1969; p.345, 346).

It is clear that there are no major political barriers preventing the reunification of the right revisionist-led Communist Party of India and the "centrist" revisionist-led Communist Party of India (Marxist).

In Belgium, on the other hand, the leadership of the old right-revisionist Communist Party carries on in practice the ultra-revisionist pro-US imperialist policy of the Khrushchov period. While supporting the concept of a "European security scheme" it stands for a special "independent" and "neutral" role for Belgium within this scheme:

"On March 30th last the Central Committee of our Party passed a resolution... for seeking a status of active neutrality and security for the Belgian state.

Speaking of active neutrality, we consider it urgent for Belgium to adopt an independent foreign policy of its own." (M. Drumaux, Chairman, Communist Party of Belgium: "Speech at International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow, 1969"; Prague, 1969; p.458).

The content of the Belgian ultra-revisionists' concept of "active neutrality" was made clear in an article published after the international meeting:

"After all, a European system of collective security can only be set up with the guarantee of the United States and in return for certain guarantees given to these same United States by the countries of Europe as a whole, headed by the Soviet Union." (J. Blume: "After the Moscow Conference: Belgium and Active Neutrality" cited in: "La Voix du Peuple", November 14th, 1969; p.1).

In this situation, the role of the leadership of the "centrist" revisionist-led party is to secure the reunification of the party on the basis of "orthodox" revisionism by means of the isolation of the ultra-revisionist leadership of the old party and its exclusion from the reunification process.

"We know that the theories of Jean Blume (one of the ultra-revisionist leaders of the old party - PB, MLOB) are far from being shared by the rank and file and even by certain cadres of the revisionist party of Belgium. ...

To them we say that we are ready for unity. ...

We are determined to work for the re-establishment of the unity of all true communists on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. In Belgium, such unity must have particularly as its objective the strengthening of the People's United Front, the programme of which includes the struggle for... national independence." ("The Belgian Khrushchovites and 'Active Neutrality'" in: "La Voix du Peuple", November 14th, 1969; p.4).

"REORGANISATION" OF THE ULTRA-REVISIONIST-LED PARTIES

In countries such as Britain, where the "communist party" is led by ultra-revisionists but there is no "centrist" revisionist-led party to perform the task undertaken by the (reorganised) Communist Party in Belgium, the Soviet and "centrist" revisionists are using to perform this task such loose Castroite organisations as the "Tri-continental Committee."

In the first issue of its journal, "Partisan", the Tricontinental Committee in Britain is described as

"a broad, non-sectarian action front. ..."

Its aims, which are fully in accord with the aims and objectives of OSPAAAL (The Organisation of Solidarity of the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America) are to oppose US imperialism both in Europe and the Three Continents, by whatever means are demanded by each situation. ...

In practice, this means organising action in solidarity with the oppressed peoples of the Three Continents, America and Europe in their struggle against imperialism. It means the organisation of contacts with revolutionary movements and progressive forces all over the world." (Editorial in "Partisan"; undated, but c. October 1969).

One of the "revolutionary movements" to which publicity is given in "Partisan" is the so-called "National Liberation Movement of West Germany", the function of which is to mobilise the working people behind that section of West German monopoly capital which wishes to break free from the yoke of US imperialism. An "important official" of this organisation told the Tricontinental Committee:

"Many CP members are also members of our organisation. But it must be made clear that some of the communist parties of the West are to some extent not quite fulfilling their vanguard role. This is shown by their practice, for example in choosing their tactics for the fight against imperialism and in assessing the international situation.

Unfortunately, the practice of some of the Communist Parties in the West also shows that the bourgeoisie has succeeded in putting some of their agents into the top ranks of the parties.

The Communist Parties of the Western European countries cannot fight US imperialism on their own. For this reason, we have to create a broad front of all progressive elements in our countries, including that part of the bourgeoisie that is anti-American." (Interview with the National Liberation Movement of West Germany, in: "Partisan", No. 1, undated, but c. October 1969; p. 23).

But one of the important practical functions of the Tricontinental Committee is not described in their journal. This is to make contact with, and act as a loose organising centre for dissident "orthodox" revisionist members, branches and district committees of the ultra-revisionist-led Communist Party of Great Britain with a view to the reconstitution of the party on the basis of "orthodox", i.e., pro-Soviet, revisionism - either by the ousting of the ultra-revisionist leaders or, if that should prove impossible, by the formation of a new party.

It is hoped that such a party, reconstituted with a part at least of the "left" mask of "centrist" revisionism, will attract also members of the disintegrating Maoist groups and parties.

CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this Report has been to demonstrate the character of "centrist" revisionism and that it has now become a semi-independent "left-wing" of the "international communist movement" which serves the interests of the Soviet neo-imperialists.

A further aim of this Report has been to demonstrate that to the frustration, exploitation and suffering which capitalism and imperialism bring to the working people each day of their lives must be added the indictment that the various capitalist, neo-capitalist and imperialist states are now in process of actively preparing and lining up for a new division of the world, for a new world war which would bring death to hundreds of millions of working people in every land.

While all these alignments are not yet fixed, such a war is, by the nature of capitalism and imperialism, inevitable unless capitalism and imperialism are destroyed by the revolutionary action of the working people, led by the working class.

But capitalism and imperialism cannot be destroyed unless the working class in each country is led by a Marxist-Leninist vanguard Party.

It is clear from this and earlier reports that, by means of various trends of revisionism - all of which pervert Marxism-Leninism to the service of the capitalist class - the enemies of the working class, the warmongers and exploiters of the world, have succeeded in virtually destroying the international communist movement, which once fulfilled the role of vanguard of the international working class movement.

This grave situation makes the speedy rebuilding of the international Marxist-Leninist movement, free of all revisionist trends, an urgent, life-and-death issue for everyone who claims allegiance to Marxism-Leninism.

If mankind is to be freed from the shadow of the approaching Third World War, fought with instruments of destruction which can only make the horrors of the two previous world wars pale into insignificance, this task must be begun, not in a decade, not in a year, but NOW!

SUMMARY

The main conclusions of this Report may be summarised as follows:

- 1) From about 1962 the leaderships of certain important communist parties (such as the Communist Party of Japan, the Communist Party of Indonesia, the Workers' Party of Vietnam, the Workers' Party of Korea and the Communist Party of Cuba) took up a "centrist" position which appeared to be intermediate between Marxism-Leninism and right revisionism; that is, they took up a position which (while not fully in accord with Marxism-Leninism) was critical of Soviet revisionism and (in the first years of the "Great Debate") was close to the position of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, in which Marxist-Leninists were then in the ascendancy.
- 2) Analysis of the programmes of these communist parties establishes that they were, without exception, revisionist-led.
- 3) The reason for the leaderships of these parties taking up a "centrist" position was, therefore, not that they had moved to a Marxist-Leninist position, but that they represented the interests of capitalist classes, or sections of capitalist classes, which were in strong contradiction with United States imperialism and so found unacceptable the foreign policy of the Soviet revisionists (the cardinal point of which was, in the Khrushchov era, collaboration with US imperialism).
- 4) In the second phase of its development, from the beginning of 1966, "centrist" revisionism, in general, broke away from its ideological alliance with the leadership of the Communist Party of China and moved closer to Soviet revisionism. The primary cause of this was the major reorientation in Soviet foreign policy which began in the autumn of 1964, a reorientation which reflected the decline in the economic and military strength of US imperialism in relation to that of the imperialist powers of continental Europe and Japan. As a result of this changed world situation, the new ruling class of Soviet state capitalists jettisoned the Khrushchov policy of making collaboration with US imperialism the cornerstone of its foreign policy and began to reorientate this foreign policy towards collaboration with all those capitalist classes and strata which were in contradiction with US imperialism. This change of Soviet foreign policy removed the main objection of the "centrist" revisionists to collaboration with the Soviet revisionists.

5) In the present period of the general crisis of capitalism, international contradictions between capitalist classes in different countries, and between alliances of such capitalist classes, have greatly increased. This situation is leading inevitably towards yet another global war for the redivision of the world - this time between two vast imperialist groups dominated respectively by United States imperialism and Soviet neo-imperialism. As this process of polarisation develops, the imperialist powers of Western Europe, Japanese imperialism and India are beginning to move towards the Soviet pole, while China, Albania, Pakistan and those neo-capitalist states of Eastern Europe which have broken (or will have broken free) from Soviet domination are beginning to move towards the US pole.

6) In order to achieve their international aims, the Soviet imperialists desire to break the influence of the pro-US imperialist ultra-revisionist leaderships which lead a number of "communist parties" and so reunify the "international communist movement" on the basis of "orthodox" revisionism in order to make it serve as an instrument of Soviet policy. The role of "centrist" revisionism in the second phase of its development is to act as a semi-independent "left-wing" of the "international communist movement" which can serve the interests of the Soviet revisionists among circles where they themselves have become too discredited.

7) A future imperialist world war, which is even now at an embryonic stage of preparation, would almost certainly destroy the world capitalist system. But it would also bring such mass slaughter and suffering to the working people of the world as would make the two previous world wars pale almost into insignificance. Since the continuation of imperialism makes such a world war inevitable, the task of the working people of all countries is to destroy imperialism prior to the outbreak of such a war; or, if this should not be possible, to snuff it out at its onset by transforming the imperialist world war into civil war against the imperialists.

8) Since the working people cannot carry through a socialist revolution in any country without the leadership of Marxist-Leninist vanguard parties of the working class and a Marxist-Leninist International, the task of rebuilding the international Marxist-Leninist movement is a vitally urgent one for the fate of mankind.

Adopted by unanimous decision, December 18, 1969. Central Committee Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain.