

OPEN LETTER TO THE COMMUNIST  
WORKERS' LEAGUE OF BRITAIN (M. L.)

(In March 1976 the MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN received the first of a series of communications from the COMMUNIST WORKERS' LEAGUE OF BRITAIN (M.L.) inviting it to participate in measures to establish a united Marxist-Leninist organisation in Britain. Similar invitations from the CWLB(M.L.) were received by other groups and organisations in what has come to be known as the "anti-revisionist movement". In view of the great importance of the issues raised in this correspondence, the MLOB has decided to issue its reply in the form of an Open Letter.)

.....

Dear Comrades,

The MLOB acknowledges receipt of your letter of 14.3.76, sent to a number of parties and organisations of the left, concerning the convening of a series of meetings aimed at the ultimate establishment of a united Marxist-Leninist organisation in Britain.

As you will doubtless be aware, the MLOB's immediate successor, the Action Centre for Marxist-Leninist Unity, was formed in 1965 with the aim of preparing for the convening of a Conference of Marxist-Leninist Unity. This Conference was, in fact, held on September 9-10, 1967, and it was at this Conference that the MLOB was founded.

Prior to 1965, those Comrades who had come together to form the Action Centre for Marxist-Leninist Unity had all played a leading role in the Committee to Defeat Revisionism, for Communist Unity headed by Cde. Michael McCreery, whose formative work on the criticism of modern revisionism, and in elaborating some of the principles on which a Marxist-Leninist party should be based, you have acknowledged in your literature.

It will be clear, therefore, that the MLOB has some not inconsiderable experience in the struggle against modern revisionism and for the establishment of a united nucleus of a future vanguard party of the working class based on scientific Marxist-Leninist principles. It is this experience which prompts us, not merely to express in words our wholehearted support for the aim of advancing the unity of all those in Britain who call themselves Marxist-Leninists and who aspire to a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary practice, but also to point out that unity can be achieved not simply by intoning the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism by rote in order to show one's "hatred" of modern revisionism and one's "faithfulness" to Marxism-Leninism (in themselves, such declarations can have no more than purely pious, genuflectory significance), but only by making a concrete and many-sided analysis of the complex, developing reality of contemporary capitalism, of the new mode of operation of its fundamental laws of motion, of the new forms of crisis which are now maturing with increasing speed and thoroughness. In our view the documents issued by your group not only fail even to embark upon these fundamental theoretical tasks; more than this, for all their conscious (one might almost say self-conscious) good intentions, what these platitudes achieve above all else is to throw down a pious and dogmatic smokescreen composed of classical Leninist precepts debased by the very splendour of their isolation from any concrete analysis of contemporary capitalist reality and thus reduced to the level of mere "abstract principles", in order to provide a threadbare cover for the theoretical and programmatic bankruptcy which so obviously lurks behind your high-sounding proposals.

Before any fruitful basis for discussing, much less agreeing upon, the organisational questions attending the achievement of unity between Marxist-Leninists (such as would be embraced by a series of meetings of the kind envisaged in your circular letter), a clear theoretical position must be

hammered out reflecting an analysis of the new features in the development of the capitalist world system which have emerged during the three decades or so since the end of World War Two. Not even the most impressive and high-sounding of organisational proposals can compensate for this failing; and conversely, the failure to make such an analysis the essential basis for the achievement of organisational unity is, in our view, the surest sign of an attempt to achieve a false unity through the development of Marxism-Leninism into hollow dogma and organisational bombast.

It is, above all, the view of the MLOB that no principled basis for unity between Marxist-Leninists can be achieved without a serious, objective and frank discussion of the problem of Chinese "left" revisionism and the role of the revisionist "Thought of Mao Tse-tung". The true role and character of the reactionary social and class forces whose fundamental interests are represented by this metaphysical ideology - an ideology having as its basic method "the resolution of contradictions" - has suffered increasing exposure over the past 3 years or more as a consequence of the emergence into the full daylight of historical clarity of the previously carefully disguised alliance between the Chinese Party and state and US imperialism. This major strategic cornerstone of US imperialist policy was provided initially by Mao Tse-tung and his faction in 1966 when they succeeded in their aim of smashing the Communist Party of China and the working class and progressive movement and replacing them by political instruments more directly amenable to control by the Chinese national capitalist class.

At that time, these counter-revolutionary aims could only be carried through under cover of the most shameless and rabid pseudo-revolutionary, pseudo-Marxist demagogy. But today, under the less colourful but more programmatically down-to-earth leadership of Hua Kuo-feng, the strategic, long-term interests of US imperialism are pursued with scant regard for the niceties of tactical concealment - presumably in the, in our view mistaken, belief that the appeal of the metaphysical "Thought of Mao Tse-tung" retains today its demagogic power to bewitch and to cloud the intellectual judgment of the working people of the world to as great a degree as at any time in the past.

Since Marxist-Leninist truth and the objective and subjective needs of the struggle to establish a true Marxist-Leninist vanguard nucleus in Britain, as throughout the world, have as one of their indispensable preconditions the clearest possible exposure of the revisionist "Thought of Mao Tse-tung", we have decided to issue this reply in the form of an Open Letter. We hope that you, comrades in the CWLB(ML), will have the basic theoretical honesty and conviction to reply to this Open Letter and in this way join in the inception of the serious and far-reaching debate on the problem of Chinese "left" revisionism and the "Thought of Mao Tse-tung" which has become so chronically overdue and which is now vitally necessary if one of the most disruptive and ideologically mystifying of all the many barriers standing in the way of the achievement of principled unity between Marxist-Leninists is to be removed; but, frankly, we doubt that our hopes in this regard will be fulfilled.

Since one of the most characteristic features in the development of the capitalist world system since the end of World War Two has been the unprecedented growth on a world-wide scale of national-democratic revolutionary movements in the colonial-type countries aimed at achieving the liberation of the developing nation from the yoke of imperialism and the securing of basic national and democratic rights and liberties, it is fitting that an outline of the salient theoretical questions which must underline any attempt at a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the contemporary stage of development of the capitalist world system should begin with :-

- 1) an elementary outline of the mode of development of capitalism and capitalist relations, of classes and the class struggle and the formation of political parties and mass movements representing the interests of these classes in the concrete conditions of colonialism;

2)  
3)  
4)

The Na

tions  
have b  
imperi  
catch  
begin  
integr

the ma  
society  
of the  
more p  
status  
profits  
not mea  
than pr  
were in

externa  
soil, a  
organic  
initial  
of tran  
(electr  
develop  
to the  
capital  
scale m  
exploit  
economy

ground  
overlor  
tion ou  
Thus th  
in carr  
compet  
surplus  
develop  
independ  
is the  
of the  
include  
Leninis

- 2) an elementary exposition of the basic political and strategic principles developed by Marxism-Leninism for the carrying through to victory of the socialist revolution in a colonial-type country;
- 3) a critique of "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung" as the most influential and pervasive of the various nationalist ideologies developed by the national capitalist class of a colonial-type country for the purpose of holding the revolutionary process at the stage of completion of the national-democratic revolution and preventing its uninterrupted transition to the socialist revolution;
- 4) a critique of "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung" as a variant of modern revisionism which seeks to harness a suitably vulgarised and falsified "Marxism-Leninism" to the revolutionary tasks and class aspirations of a national capitalist class of a colonial-type country.

#### The National-Democratic Revolutionary Process in a Colonial Country

In relation to a colonial-type country, whereas the economic foundations of capitalism will have been laid and a proletariat of varying size will have been brought into being as a consequence of the penetration of foreign imperialist capital into the country, the political superstructure needs to catch up with this development of the economic base before capitalism can begin to develop organically and spontaneously to produce, in the end, a viable, integrated and self-expanding capitalist system.

Before the superstructure can catch up with the base in this way, however, the main obstacle to the development of an organic, spontaneous capitalist society must be removed, and that obstacle is colonialism - i.e., the domination of the given area by a more developed and hence economically and militarily more powerful imperialist power, and the reduction of the given area to the status of producer of cheap raw materials, labour power and source of super-profits. (Incidentally, when Lenin coined the term "super-profit", he did not mean that such profits were "super" in the sense of being bigger, larger than profits obtained from metropolitan sources; he merely meant that they were in addition to, over and above, profits from indigenous sources).

As imperialist investment proceeds, a point is reached at which this externally implanted and nourished capitalism takes root in the new colonial soil, so to speak, and begins to spawn in its own right, spontaneously and organically. Thus there spring up both a proletariat in the cities - the result initially of colonial-type investment in such essential installations as means of transport and communication (harbours, railways, roads etc.), power (electricity generation) and so on; and a national capitalist class, which develops on the basis of the urban petty bourgeoisie and which gains strength to the extent that the imperialist overlord is compelled to permit small-scale capitalist development in those subsidiary branches of the economy (small-scale manufacture, petty trading and so on) which it is not worth its while to exploit itself, but which are still necessary to the development of the economy as a whole.

This national bourgeoisie, however, has to struggle for every inch of ground it can gain in the economy and society at large, because the imperialist overlord naturally sucks the lions share of the wealth accruing from exploitation out of the country, leaving very little for the small national capitalists. Thus the national capitalist class encounters at this stage serious difficulties in carrying through the primitive accumulation of capital, since it has to compete with the infinitely more powerful imperialists in order to win any surplus value for itself. This, in its turn, provides the incentive for the development of a revolutionary movement of national liberation and national independence. In that revolution, the natural ally of the national bourgeoisie is the working class - the class which also stands to gain from the elimination of the foreign imperialists. Such an alliance of class forces - it also includes the petty bourgeoisie of town and country - is termed by Marxist-Leninists an Anti-Imperialist United Front.

Now a further important aspect of these anti-imperialist struggles and anti-imperialist united fronts is that, in the period following after World War One, they were taking place and being formed in the general context of a world-wide crisis of capitalism, in which the conditions for successful proletarian-socialist revolutions were maturing. The victory of the proletarian forces in the largest single country in the world, Russia, and the subsequent establishment of vanguard proletarian parties based on scientific theory, Marxism-Leninism, meant that the proletarian socialist revolution could begin to expand on a world-wide scale, whilst the existence of the Soviet Union, the bastion of socialism, meant that a central, world-unifying and clarifying centre had come into being which could then function as the solid rock of support for the struggles and aspirations of toiling and oppressed working people everywhere.

In their international, world-wide significance, therefore, the content of the national democratic movements and revolutions was such that they formed a potential detachment of the forces of the world proletarian socialist revolution, since their struggle was directed against the main enemy, world imperialism. This status was revealed in the fact that an important element in the totality of forces participating in these national-democratic revolutions was the working class led by a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party. If that working class, in a given colonial-type country and in a given national-democratic struggle, could succeed in winning the leading role in that struggle from the national bourgeoisie, then the objective preconditions would be created for the transition from a merely national (or bourgeois)- democratic to a socialist revolution.

Now, of course, it is in the nature of things that the national bourgeoisie and its representatives will also come up against this fundamental clash of interest and begin to prepare for it. Thus a struggle develops within the anti-imperialist united front, a struggle between its two main class constituents, the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie - a struggle the aim of which is to determine which of these two classes is to lead the revolution and is to entrain the intermediate class, the petty bourgeoisie (in an under-developed colonial-type country always the largest and most numerous single class) behind it in the fulfilment of its particular class aim. Should the working class win that struggle, the subjective as well as the objective conditions for the uninterrupted transition of the national democratic into the socialist revolution will be created. Otherwise, and should the national bourgeoisie succeed in retaining the leading role, the revolutionary process will remain at the stage of completion of the national democratic revolution, and a form of national capitalist society will be formed, will consolidate itself and begin to develop.

However, the national bourgeoisie cannot carry the national democratic revolution through unaided, by means solely of its own numerically rather small class forces. It needs the working class as the source from which to draw the "NCOs" and "officers" of its anti-imperialist peasant army. Above all, it needs the mobilising power, the force of conviction and enlightenment, the analytical and persuasive power, the sheer charismatic force of Marxism if it is to succeed in winning over the working class to its side. But, of course, such "Marxism" will need to be expunged of any genuine scientific content, will need to be suitably vulgarised and adulterated through the addition of nationalist and crude national irridentist ideas and slogans, and in this way made to serve the class interests, not of the working class, but of the national bourgeoisie. The national democratic revolution can in this way be won in the name of the urban proletariat (which is falsely portrayed as having held the leading position in the anti-imperialist united front) and a social perspective embarked on in the name of socialism, whereas what is really being built is a state capitalist system.

#### Maoism as the Blueprint for the Concealed Rule of the National Capitalist Class

Just such an in reality nationalist and falsely Marxist ideology is that of Mao Tse-tung, and with its help it is possible for the national bourgeoisie

to hold the revolutionary process at the stage of completion of the national democratic revolution and prevent - in the name of proletarian revolution, in the name of the democratic dictatorship of the workers and poor peasants - the uninterrupted transition of the national-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution.

However, it is precisely this transition that the science of Marxism-Leninism is all about. It is not a theory for the winning of the bourgeois democratic revolution in underdeveloped countries, but for leading the proletariat to win the socialist revolution (after, of course, and as the uninterrupted sequel to, the winning of the national democratic revolution).

It was an aspect of this fundamental question of the strategy and tactics of the proletarian-socialist revolution in a large but socially backward and underdeveloped country that formed the precise cause of the difference between Lenin and the Bolsheviks on the one hand and the Mensheviks on the other in the period of the preparation for the socialist revolution in Tsarist Russia. It was also the cause of the differences between Stalin and Bukharin 20 years later.

So let us now summarise, as briefly and as clearly as we can, just what the main strategic elements in the revolutionary process laid down by Mao are. They are as follows:-

- 1) an anti-imperialist united front is formed, consisting of
  - a) the working class;
  - b) the urban petty bourgeoisie;
  - c) the rural petty bourgeoisie (peasantry);
  - d) the national bourgeoisie (national capitalist class).
- 2) this "block of four classes" pursues and finally wins the national democratic revolution - not the socialist revolution.
- 3) as a consequence of the victory of the national democratic revolution, foreign imperialism is ousted from the country and the comprador bourgeoisie, the representative of foreign imperialism (Chiang Kai-shek) is deprived of all power, its holdings being nationalised. These holdings are mainly in heavy industry (engineering, steel, shipyards, power generation, railways, shipping) and include banking - in other words, the so-called "commanding heights of the economy". In the China of 1949, heavy industry accounted for some 38 per cent of the total value of all industrial undertakings.
- 4) the holdings of the national bourgeoisie - some 62 per cent of all industrial enterprises - were reorganised under joint state-private boards, in which ownership of 50 per cent of the shares was vested in the state, whilst 50 per cent remained in the hands of the private capitalist group concerned. A guaranteed 5 per cent per annum interest is paid to the private capitalist on his 50 per cent of the shares, but it has never been stated officially whether this 5 per cent interest operates on the value of the shares at the time of the takeover by the joint state-private boards, or whether the interest is paid on the market value of shares at any given time. The significance of this will be made clear later.
- 5) the period then ensuing after the victory of the national democratic revolution is designated by maoist revisionism as a period of socialist construction, and the perspective put forward for this transformation is

the adoption of a political constitution which guarantees full democratic rights and liberties, not only to the working class and the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie, but also - as one of the four classes making up the "block of four" - to the national bourgeoisie, which is allowed to publish its own newspapers and other media, to organise its own political parties and other organisations (three of these have functioned since 1949 and still function today in spite of - more accurately because of - the "cultural revolution"), and to have deputies representing them on the National People's Consultative Conference. With this political constitution,

the perspective is put forward and applied of "socialist transformation" through the "gradual remoulding of the national bourgeoisie to accept socialism", and the "construction of socialism" proceeds peacefully and harmoniously through cooperation between the two polar classes which, in reality, are in conflict with one another in a capitalist society, the working class and the national capitalist class.

Now, firstly, as regards the economic foundations of this system. If the 5 per cent interest accruing to private capitalist groups is paid on the value of shares at the time of takeover by the joint state private board, then, as the total value of the enterprises increases as a result of investment and development, the yield accruing to the national capitalist group concerned would have remained stationary. This would have resulted in the complete withering away of the national capitalist class within a period, at the very most, of ten years. Since, however, we are told today that the national capitalist class still exists - indeed, that it is flourishing along with and alongside the other three classes, one of the accusations levelled against the Liu Shao-chi leadership having been that it had attempted to "change the production relations" by getting rid of the national capitalist class and their 5 per cent interest payments - we can only assume that the 5 per cent interest is paid on the market value of shares at any given moment. This, in its turn, means that the 50 per cent share by the state is nothing more nor less than a state-administered redevelopment and reinvestment fund, compulsory for all capitalists - in other words, state capitalism.

The fact is that, in an economically backward, former colonial-type country like China, the only way in which a viable capitalist economy can be built under the prevailing conditions of intense competition and struggle with the developed imperialist powers, particularly the US, is by means of the most thorough and rigid state control, in which the state enforces investment and development upon each individual capitalist in the name of - and in the interests of - the national capitalist class as a whole. The political superstructure best suited to this state capitalist base is, of course, that in which a false perspective of "socialism" is presented as pie in the sky in order to delude the workers and peasants, who have a long and glorious history of revolutionary struggle for their freedom behind them, into believing that these state capitalist relations are the "socialism" for the construction of which it is right and proper that they should make sacrifices and work hard. In this way the stage is set for entraining the masses of workers and peasants into accepting the leading role of the national bourgeoisie (whose representatives dominate the party and state apparatus in just the same way as they do in the Soviet Union) into working hard to carry through primitive accumulation for the national capitalist class, and so, on that basis, to build a new state capitalist system in China. This kind of ideological deception is not substantially different in character from the deceptive perspectives of "socialism" achieved through a never-ending perspective of illusory reformism by means of which the reformist labour leaders in Britain deceive the British working class.

As for the political superstructure of China, Mao's much-vaunted "New Democracy", this, as we have seen, is based on the illusory concept of the "gradual, peaceful remoulding of the Chinese national capitalist class to accept and work for socialism". But this, of course, is both objectively impossible (otherwise one of the great socialist leaders of this century would have been Lord Nuffield) and in direct, flat contradiction with the most fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism does not have to be reduced to the level of a sterile dogma for it to have certain fundamental principles, which are true throughout the period of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to communism. If one agrees that it is possible for the capitalist class of any country voluntarily to accept and work for socialism, then one's place is in the labour-reformist or social-democratic party, not in the Communist Party - and, indeed, this formula of Mao's flatly contradicts the very clear

stater  
of sci  
callin  
only a  
use of  
of the  
puttin  
before  
there  
anxious  
Mao le  
centre  
So we  
leader  
develop  
Maicism

Firs  
alongsi  
role in  
1960, i  
brought  
which i  
are not  
veiled  
party",  
leaders  
minorit  
as the  
ites) a  
Korean,  
between  
than th  
dispute  
took th  
publish  
nationa  
nine ed  
CPC as  
was fir  
with th  
"Commit  
MLOB in

Wha  
of thos  
revisio  
nationa  
Khrushc  
support  
Histori  
on the  
a numbe  
for the  
the vol  
theoret  
basical  
polemic

The  
between  
of Marx

statements on this most fundamental of questions made by all the great pioneers of scientific socialism, by Marx, by Engels, by Lenin and by Stalin. A party calling itself a communist party which adopts such a programme can be considered only as a revisionist party. To be quite logical about the matter, what is the use of waxing indignant over the obvious and open revisionism and opportunism of the CPSU leaders, whilst helping to maintain the myth that Mao - who was putting forward and had already won the CPC to a revisionist position 16 years before the 20th Congress of the CPSU, is a great Marxist-Leninist? Obviously, there must be some explanation for the fact that numbers of honest comrades, anxious to work for a socialist future and sincere in their belief that the Mao leadership represents the same steadfast, incorruptible Marxist-Leninist centre that Lenin's or Stalin's leadership once did, can be misled in this way. So we will now attempt an examination of the role played by the CPC and its leadership in the struggle against Soviet modern revisionism in the light of developments within the CPC leadership itself.

#### Maoism and the Great Debate in the International Communist Movement

Firstly, it must be remembered that the CPC began to emerge as taking - alongside the Albanian Party of Labour under Enver Hoxha - a leading international role in exposing the revisionism of the Khrushchev leadership of the CPSU during 1960, it having been in that year that the International Department of the CPC brought out its now famous pamphlet "Long Live Leninism". In that pamphlet, which is quite excellent from almost every point of view - the Soviet revisionists are not named as such, the formula having been adopted of referring to them in a veiled way as "a certain party", "certain people in the leadership of a certain party", and so on. Nevertheless, the pamphlet began to win for the CPC and its leadership as a whole the growing enthusiasm and loyalty of an increasing minority of comrades in the communist parties of the western countries, as well as the undying hatred of the revisionist leaderships of the CPSU (the Khrushchevites) as well as of other revisionist parties. Yet others, like the North Korean, North Vietnamese and the Japanese, took up a centrist position somewhere between the CPC and the CPSU, but on the whole stood more towards the former than the latter. In the course of the next three years up to July 1963, the dispute between the two parties came out more and more into the open and finally took the form of a fully undisguised, name-calling polemic. When the CPC published its open letter of June 1963 - the "Proposal Concerning the International Line of the Communist Movement" - and followed this up with a series of nine editorials in the CPC's theoretical journal "Honqui", the reputation of the CPC as the international leading centre of the struggle against modern revisionism was firmly established and anti-revisionist groups and organisations in agreement with the CPC's position began to spring up in every country - among them the "Committee to Defeat Revisionism, for Communist Unity" (the forerunner of the MLOB in Britain).

What was not immediately recognised amidst all the euphoria and enthusiasm of those early battles, however, was that prior to 1959 (the very first anti-revisionist pamphlets had been published by the CPC in that year) the international line of the CPC had been in full support of the positions developed by Khrushchev and his leadership at and after the 20th Congress of the CPSU. This support was expressed above all in two statements issued by the CPC: "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" (1956) and "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" (1957). In a number of subsidiary statements and articles, the CPC reiterated its support for the Khrushchev line right up to as late as November 1958. What explains the volte-face from support for Soviet modern revisionism to an insightful, theoretically developed, hard-hitting and, from the scientific point of view, basically correct, exposure of it and inception of a devastating critical polemic against it just a few months later, in April 1959?

The answer lies in the events which had taken place inside the CPC leadership between 1957 and 1959 - events which amounted to a struggle between the forces of Marxism-Leninism and the forces of modern revisionism.

In October 1956, the counter-revolution had taken place in Hungary. This had been the direct sequel to and result of Khrushchev's attacks on Stalin and on Marxism-Leninism at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, which had taken place just a month or so earlier. This had the effect, in China, of encouraging the national bourgeoisie into the belief that, in the event of similar outbreaks and uprisings occurring in China, US imperialism - probably acting, as they thought, through the medium of the United Nations, its international agency - would intervene clandestinely in China in the same way as it had organised, financed and otherwise encouraged the counter-revolutionary forces under Nagy in Hungary - in which event it would be able to dispense with the "socialist" disguise afforded by maoist revisionism and come out as openly supporting "the free world" under US imperialism.

As for Mao, true to his role as the representative of the national bourgeoisie in China, he responded to these counter-revolutionary events by giving every encouragement to the national bourgeoisie in its new advantageous position and hampering the CPC as much as possible in its work of combating the growth of counter-revolutionary incidents in the countryside and in the country at large. To begin with, he delivered his well-known speech "Let a Hundred Flowers Blossom, a Hundred Schools of Thought Contend", as part of the wider defence of the national bourgeoisie contained in the document "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People". This document was nothing more nor less than the green light to the national bourgeoisie to intensify its propaganda against socialism and the CPC, since it placed the blame for the counter-revolutionary events and incidents not on the shoulders of the national bourgeoisie, where it rightly belonged, but, taking his cue from Khrushchev and his attacks on Stalin, Mao blamed "excessive harshness and a bureaucratic style of work" on the part of the CPC rank and file and cadres. On this basis he was able to obtain the adoption of a policy of "liberal reforms" for the national bourgeoisie as a result of which it was given even further liberties and freedoms in Chinese society, an increased representation in the National People's Consultative Conference for the deputies of its three parties and enhanced rights to propagate its class cause in society at large. At the same time as these measures to strengthen its role and position were taken in relation to the national bourgeoisie, measures were adopted simultaneously to weaken the role and position of the CPC and the working class. To begin with, no less than 300,000 rank and file activists and party functionaries at all levels were removed from their positions and prevented from doing any mass work whatsoever. Those who protested against this were simply expelled from the party. This resulted in the Party's cadre force in the countryside amongst the still backward and private enterprise-orientated peasantry being crippled to the point of complete extinction, thus giving the reactionary propaganda of the national bourgeois parties, the "Kuomintang Democratic Committee" and other organisations, virtually a free hand in the countryside.

In fact, the whole episode of the 300,000 cadres and "Let a Hundred Flowers Blossom, etc.", reminds one irresistibly of the position adopted by Bukharin in the Soviet Union after 1935 - that of relaxing the dictatorship of the proletariat, granting an enlarged measure of freedom to the peasants and the remnants of the kulak class and generally permitting a greater leeway for spontaneous development which, in the conditions of a backward, mainly agricultural country like China or the Soviet Union, in which the largest single class is the peasantry, means inevitably capitalist development. At that time, Bukharin was opposed and halted in his tracks by Stalin. In China, that role was fulfilled by others, who will shortly be named.

Thus Maoism had come to mean, as an unashamed philosophy for the development of capitalism in China:

- a) the nationalisation of all industrial and commercial holdings owned and controlled by the comprador bourgeoisie - some 38 per cent of all industry in China (1949 figures);

- This  
lin  
ken  
ouraging  
out-  
ng, as  
al  
ad  
forces  
h the  
nly
- b) the reorganisation of the remainder of industrial and commercial holdings, those held by the national bourgeoisie, into joint state-private boards, under which the national capitalist class retains direct control over 50% of its shares, the other 50% being held by the state, which pays a fixed (but also guaranteed) 5% interest on them.

In this was set up what amounts to a central, state-controlled fund for reinvestment, re-financing and development - a state investment and development bank, in fact, to which each capitalist enterprise was compelled to contribute 50% of its holdings. Such an institution formed, and still acts today as, an indispensable economic tool promoting the process of capital accumulation in the teeth of the tremendous difficulties posed by the attempt to industrialise a vast and economically backward rural hinterland. Indeed, the only viable alternative would be common ownership of industry by the state (i.e., socialism) and the establishment of machinery for implementing centralised state control and planning of all economic indices - i.e. a Gosplan. But the instrument chosen by the Mao programme was an instrument for capitalist, not socialist development.

- s by  
tageous  
ting  
the  
t a  
of the  
the  
nothing  
sify  
for the  
om  
ad a  
adres.  
l  
even  
ntation  
s three  
at large.  
were  
mul-  
ass. To  
tion-  
m doing  
e  
ed  
g the  
ng  
the  
Flowers  
harin  
he  
d the  
or  
agri-  
ngle  
t time,  
role  
velopment  
and  
Industry
- c) the adoption of an ideological-political programme for "remoulding the ideology and outlook of the national bourgeoisie to accept socialism". It was here that the false dialectics of "unity-criticism-unity" were brought to bear - this high-flown principle which sounds as if it were intended to relate to the raising of the level of revolutionary praxis of a scientific revolutionary party and movement of the proletariat, but which in reality was applied as a pseudo-theoretical "Marxist" disguise concealing the permanent incorporation of the national capitalist class into the structure of classes and political system in China. In fact, as the subsequent development so clearly shows, far from being a "weak, indecisive remnant of a class", as the Mao-inspired legend would have had us all believe, the national bourgeoisie held and exercised actual hegemony in the PRC from its very foundation in 1949 through its control of the CPC, the commanding position which it held in the state apparatus (which, it must be remembered, also gave it effective control of the nationalised sector of industry) and its direct control of the joint state-private boards. No wonder it proved relatively easy to "remould the ideology" of a capitalist class to accept a "socialism" which, far from progressively cutting down and whittling away its power, actually consolidates, extends and entrenches that power!
- d) the adoption of a political constitution which accords to the national bourgeoisie the freedom to promote its class interest and propagate its cause through
- i) the right to organise and maintain its own political parties, of which three have existed in the PRG since its foundation and continue to function actively to this day;
  - ii) the right to organise and maintain its own newspapers, journals, publishing houses, and other media of information and propaganda.

Thus it was not only Khrushchev, the architect of Soviet revisionism of the right, but Mao Tse-tung, the architect of Chinese revisionism of the "left", who was first and foremost an exponent of

- i) a peaceful transition to socialism;
- ii) a state of the whole people.

The illusion that, in the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism and its advocacy of a "peaceful transition to socialism" it was the Mao doctrine of "armed struggle" and "armed insurrection" which provided the most persuasive and definitive example of the alternative revolutionary transition to socialism is shattered when it is seen that, in fact, the advocacy of "armed struggle" applied, in the Mao perspective, firmly to the national democratic revolution and not to the socialist revolution. For the transition to the socialist revolution - which Leninist strategy and tactics, conforming with materialist

dialectics, envisages as following uninterruptedly from the bourgeois democratic or national democratic revolution - is in the Mao prescription the liberal perspective of the "gradual remoulding of the national bourgeoisie to accept socialism". These are the manipulative and deeply demagogic techniques by means of which Maoist "left" revisionism forged for itself the theoretical tools it needed for holding the revolutionary process at the stage of completion of the national democratic revolution and preventing its uninterrupted transition to the - in class terms, necessarily violent - socialist revolution.

As for the "state of the whole people", we need only to quote from any basic text of Mao not only to find a crystal clear and categorical statement that the new democratic state is precisely such a "state of the whole people", but also the even more controversial, if hardly so clearly expressed, view that the national bourgeoisie can play a revolutionary role in the socialist revolution:

"Ours is a people's democratic dictatorship. ...

Who is to exercise this dictatorship? Naturally, it must be the working class and the entire people led by it. Dictatorship does not apply in the ranks of the people. The people cannot possibly exercise dictatorship over themselves; nor must one section of them oppress another section." (Mao Tse-tung: "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People"; Peking; 1964; p. 4,5)

"It is the desire of the Communist Party, also its policy, to exist side by side with the democratic parties for a long time to come. ...

Mutual supervision among the various parties has also been a long-established fact. ... Mutual supervision, which is obviously not a one-sided matter, means that the Communist Party should exercise supervision over the democratic parties, and that the democratic parties should exercise supervision over the Communist Party." (ibid.; p.44)

"Why should the democratic parties of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie be allowed to exist side by side with the party of the working class over a long period of time? Because we have no reason not to adopt the policy of long-term coexistence with all the democratic parties which are truly devoted to the task of uniting the people for the cause of socialism. .. (ibid.; p.43,44)

Thus Mao hopes to pull the wool over the eyes of less experienced comrades who might be unable to tell the difference between materialist dialectics and an eclectic pottage which seeks to equate "the rule of the whole people" with socialism, and which suggests that an imaginary "dictatorship" exercised by "the whole people" - a contradiction in terms - is new democratic China's equivalent of and substitute for the dictatorship of the proletariat affected by those crude and inelegant Russians under J.V. Stalin.

The text of "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" is based on a speech delivered by Mao in 1957, at a time when the People's Republic of China was being shaken by counterrevolutionary disturbances organised by the national bourgeoisie (which is so weak, so vacillating, so unorganised) in a bid - in the event a successful one, thanks largely to those selfsame proposals for "peacefully resolving contradictions amongst the people" contained in that speech - to obtain for itself a wider measure of political representation in the National People's Consultative Congress (a short while later this was actually acceded to in the form of "mutual supervision") and enlarged economic freedoms. To have referred to the national bourgeoisie as "weak, vacillating and incapable of acting decisively in its own class interest" when it had acted, not merely decisively but with unprovoked violence in a number of major cities of China would therefore have been impolitic and tactless, to say the least.

Mao therefore dishonestly suppressed that characterisation in the text of "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People", and this could have been one of the factors responsible for the delay of 12 months which

elapsed between the delivery of the speech and its publication. There is, indeed, no doubt that publication of the official text had been held up in order that the more blatantly revisionist and anti-Marxist-Leninist statements could be covered over and disguised as much as possible.

By April 1957, a change was beginning to take place in the class alignments in China. In particular, a section of the national bourgeoisie began to have doubts about the longer-term suitability of Mao's foreign policy of co-operation with the Khrushchev leadership in the Soviet Union. They recognised, correctly, that Khrushchev was acting completely in line with the interests of US imperialism, and decided that the Mao policy, if persisted in, would culminate in the alignment of China behind US imperialism - a policy which in very fact China has come to adopt today, since Nixon's pioneering visit to Peking and the subsequent ousting of Lin Piao. By the spring of 1959, this section of the national bourgeoisie had gained the majority within its class, and it consequently began to look around for forces within the CPC with which it could ally itself.

#### The Struggle Between Marxism-Leninism and Revisionism Sharpens

Now it so happened that there had begun to develop inside the top leadership of the CPC, and in particular in the International Department of the Central Committee, a group on whom the role of Khrushchev revisionism since the 20th Congress had had an extremely illuminating and educative effect. This group had come out of the infant Chinese working class movement. One of them, Liu Shao-chi, had been a miners' leader organising trade unions during the dark days of Chiang Kai-shek's blueshirts. He was very soon joined by a few others, more particularly the leading theoretician and Secretary of the Peking District of the Party and member of the International Department, Peng Chen. Others who joined them were the able propagandist An Wen and the philosopher and theoretician, Chou Yang. They began to make a study of Marxism-Leninism, to apply that study to the history of the Chinese revolution in general and to the role of Mao Tse-tung in particular. By the spring of 1959, they had come to the conclusion that Mao's doctrine and perspectives of "new democracy" were revisionist in content and designed to provide the framework for the construction of a state capitalist society rather than a socialist one in China.

Thus there arose a new class alliance, more progressive than the old one, because for the first time since 1933-34 the small industrial working class of China was taking an active initiative to make itself once again, for the first time since 1926 (when the first phase of the national democratic revolution, when it was led by the working class, was drowned in blood by Chiang Kai-shek's thugs on behalf of the comprador bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism), the leading force in the completion of the national-democratic revolution and its successful transformation into a socialist revolution. This alliance was between the working class, the urban petty-bourgeoisie and peasantry and a narrower section of the national bourgeoisie which was opposed to the alliance with US imperialism to which the Mao policy had led, just as previously it had led to a subjective alignment with Soviet revisionism (rapidly becoming Soviet neo-imperialism). We now know that this wider stratum of the national bourgeoisie whose interests Mao had represented had stood in a relationship of alliance with a section of the comprador bourgeoisie whose holdings Mao had protected from nationalisation between 1949 and 1953 (the period during which nationalisation of other comprador holdings was carried through and the joint state-private boards were set up). As for that different section of the national bourgeoisie which formed the other wing in the Mao alliance, this was comprised of that section whose interests were in general dependent upon and subordinate to US imperialism.

The first fruit of the growing awareness on the part of those elements in the leadership of the CPC (mainly concentrated in the International Department of the Central Committee and in the Peking Party Committee) who had begun to

unquestioning support now came over to the side of the developing Marxist-Leninists headed by Comrades Liu Shao-chi and Peng Chen. In May of that year, the position was considered to be sufficiently serious as to warrant an extraordinary meeting of the Central Committee, which was held in the provincial town of Lushan. At that meeting, Mao was removed from his position as President of the Republic, this being taken over by Liu Shao-chi. In fact, Mao was effectively banished at this meeting from all further participation in the political life and activities of the CPC and the Republic - and, indeed, nothing more was to issue either from his pen or his mouth from that day onwards. The official ground given at that time for his "relinquishing" the post of President was that he "wished to devote himself to theoretical work". If there had been any truth in this, one could anticipate with some degree of certainty that some published work would have resulted from that retirement, the announcement of which was blazoned forth with all the weight of the Republic's publicity media behind it. But, in fact, from that day forth Mao was silent - proving thereby that the grounds officially stated for his "retirement" were not the real ones.

The inescapable conclusion to which the above is leading, with unanswerable and relentless logic is, surely, quite clear. What was the date at which Mao was removed from his official position as President of the Republic, and from what date was he forced to give up all his party posts and all participation in public life, to retire to his private villa in the suburbs of Shanghai? It was in May, 1959, at that Extraordinary meeting of the Central Committee held in Lushan. And when, from what date, did the CPC begin to fulfil its magnificent role in the analysis and exposure of modern revisionism? From approximately August of the same year, i.e. from the moment that Mao was out of the way. Prior to May 1959, the international line of the CPC had been one of unconditional support for the Khrushchev revisionists and for the revisionist programme put forward at the 20th Congress of the CPSU. Furthermore, it is patently obvious that Mao had absolutely nothing to do with the drafting of the famous nine editorials published in Hongqi (Red Flag) and Renmin Ribao (People's Daily). In fact, they were drafted in the main by Peng Chen, the Secretary of the Peking Party Committee and Head of the International Department of the CPC.

After the removal of Mao, the Marxist-Leninists in the leadership of the CPC did not restrict their activity to the vigorous prosecution of the struggle against modern revisionism. They also began to prepare at long last for the long-delayed carrying through of the socialist revolution - a delay which had been brought about primarily through Mao's "left" revisionist theory of "new democracy" and "steady progress towards socialism" through "peaceful remoulding of the national bourgeoisie to accept socialism".

#### Mao launches one of history's greatest frauds

Towards this end, the new leadership of the CPC, in which the core of principled comrades developing towards Marxism-Leninism led by Liu Shao-chi and Peng Chen were playing the principal role, decided in the early Summer of 1965 to initiate the first preparatory steps towards the mounting of a socialist revolution. These first steps took - quite correctly - the form of a theoretical and philosophical mobilisation of the more advanced cadres and militants in the CPC and in other working class organisations (the trade unions and urban co-operatives), with the aim of inculcating in the masses of working people a clear and ineradicable understanding of the fundamental character of revisionist (i.e., reconciliationist or reformist, class-collaborationist) thought and practice. The leading comrade representing the Marxist-Leninists in this all-important field of dialectical materialist philosophy was Chou Yang, who published two works in 1965 which, in our opinion, are destined to become classics of Marxist-Leninist literature. The first of these was entitled "Fighting Tasks in the Field of Philosophy and the Social Sciences"; and the second (and perhaps the more important of the two) bore the starkly prosaic title: "One Divides into Two, Two never Combines into One".

We will not attempt to summarise these insightful and profoundly scientific

works here. Suffice it to say that they made new contributions of fundamental significance to the scientific philosophy of dialectical materialism, and were intended to mobilise party members for fulfilling their Leninist task of leading the proletariat and poor peasantry in the carrying through of the socialist revolution.

Having taken steps to mobilise the highest levels of understanding and consciousness in the working masses of China, as represented by the Party cadres and activists of the CPC (those same cadres and activists 300,000 of whom the Mao faction had attempted to remove from the political stage in late 1957, so as the better to initiate the bourgeois-democratic perspectives of "New Democracy"), the new leadership of the CPC which was developing towards Marxism-Leninism decided further to take timely and well-considered measures to mobilise the next tier down in the structure of proletarian and petty bourgeois consciousness - i.e. the broad masses in sympathy with the CPC but not actually members of it for the broad tasks of preparation for the ousting of the representatives of the national bourgeoisie from the state apparatus and the carrying through of the socialist revolution.

It was in this way that the cultural revolution was born. For it should never be forgotten that the principle of utilising a cultural revolution as a theoretical lever for mobilising the masses in preparation for transforming a national-democratic revolution uninterruptedly into a socialist revolution was first worked out theoretically and first applied in practice, not by the Mao faction in the Spring of 1966, but by the Marxist-Leninists a whole year earlier in May 1965. They termed their cultural revolution the "Socialist Cultural Revolution", and its aim was clearly to prepare and mobilise the masses for the expulsion of the representatives of the national bourgeoisie, firstly from the National People's Consultative Conference, and then from all branches of the state apparatus. Thus "New Democracy" (the alliance of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie, urban and rural, with the national bourgeoisie) would have been brought to an end and replaced by a new, narrower alliance of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie (urban and rural) alone. This would have been the basis for the establishment of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasantry as it had been in the Soviet Union under Lenin and Stalin. As the final stage, the three political parties of the national bourgeoisie would have been disbanded, thus depriving the national capitalist class of all political representation; the joint state-private boards dissolved; and all industry nationalised and so transformed into the property of the entire working class and working people through the state, which would then have become a socialist state resting on the foundation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But by tactics of unbridled, pseudo-revolutionary, pseudo-Marxist demagogy, the Mao faction successfully turned the Socialist Cultural Revolution into its opposite, into a counter-revolutionary movement aimed at the destruction of the Communist Party of China, at the dissolution of the trade unions and all genuine organisations of the working class and working people, at the smashing of the new democratic state in order to replace it, not by a socialist state, the instrument of power of the working class and working people, but by a reactionary dictatorship exercised by a rump of revisionist hacks and sychophants who are utterly subservient to the interests of the developing Chinese national capitalist class. During this bitter class battle, like tens of thousands of lesser-known but equally heroic cadres and fighters in the CPC, Peng Chen was murdered by the "Red Guards", the lumpen and petty bourgeois elements unleashed by the Mao faction and its controlling armed forces in a reign of terror to smash up every stick and stone of the indigenous working class base in China. I will not go into details of this unprecedentedly reactionary tidal wave of destruction - they are known through the details already outlined in the MLOB's Report on the Situation in the People's Republic of China.

#### Alignment with US Imperialism

After the elimination of the Liu Shao-chi - Peng Chen leadership, the road lay clear for the manoeuvring of China back onto the path of integration with

the imperialist countries of the capitalist world system. As Soviet neo-imperialism began increasingly, after 1966, to look eastwards in order to find a solution to its growing internal contradictions and need for overseas spheres of influence, and the threat to China's security from this source became more and more pronounced, a section of the national bourgeoisie began to emerge which favoured the policy of developing an alliance with US imperialism as the best means of offsetting to some degree the threats from Soviet neo-imperialism. However, before any political steps to bring about such a violent change in the foreign policy of China could be encompassed, it was first of all necessary to discredit, isolate and finally destroy altogether the faction of "left" demagogy headed by Lin Piao and Chiang Ching, the activities and propagandistic excesses of which had been so essential a means of covering up the elimination of the Liu Shao-chi - Peng Chen leadership in 1966-67, and which objectively was opposed to US imperialism. Accordingly, Lin Piao, who had been hailed in the most effusive terms as Mao's successor, was encouraged under pressure of framed-up charges to flee the country in a military aircraft, and then shot down and killed over the Gobi Desert. With his removal the right revisionist faction in the leadership of the CPC felt their position to be sufficiently strengthened and that of the "left" sufficiently weakened, as to enable them to take the first steps towards the conclusion of a viable working alliance with US imperialism.

Thus, from the death of Lin Piao in 1971, up to the death of Mao and the exposure of the "Gang of Four", an uneasy interregnum set in; the main content of which, however, was the putting in motion of policy measures to make effective the Sino-US alliance. With Mao's death, the need to maintain the cover of "anti-imperialism", was felt to have passed, and the occasion was thus taken as an opportunity to take further massive steps towards an openly right-revisionist policy serving directly the interests of Chinese state capitalism.

So today, after the "Cultural Revolution", the demise of the "heir apparent, Lin Piao", and the unmasking of the "Gang of Four", all power has been concentrated in the hands of the army, who rule on behalf of the national capitalist class - an armed force which has occupied every important factory or enterprise in order to ensure, at virtual gunpoint, that the tempo of labour is drastically - indeed murderously - speeded up and hours of work lengthened almost to the limits of human endurance. This, of course, is not in order to serve "socialist construction", as the Maoist propaganda machine states, but in order to facilitate and promote the primitive accumulation of Chinese national capital which, in the arduous and disadvantageous international conditions imposed by a world market dominated by infinitely more powerful and developed imperialist powers, particularly the US, can only fulfil capitalist accumulation and reproduction through the most ruthless centralised state planning and control. As for the joint state-private boards, these have, of course, been retained in the now "socialist" post-cultural revolution China - they also are necessary as an economic instrument for promoting primitive accumulation. In short, China is a state-capitalist country, basically of the same type as that of the Soviet Union, but with a very different class structure and state apparatus.

### Conclusion

The entire development of the international relationships and foreign policy of the People's Republic of China since the "triumph" of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" shows that a typical inter-capitalist struggle for supremacy has developed, and is still developing, between Soviet neo-imperialism and Chinese state-capitalism (which has not yet reached an imperialist stage in its development, but which will do so within 10-12 years at the present rate of economic development if the working class and working people of China do not intervene to bring this development to an end through a successful socialist revolution - an unlikely eventuality indeed, in the absence of a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party to lead them). In a capitalist world market which is completely dominated by the long-established and entrenched imperialist powers (the US and the West European powers), there are only two directions in which Soviet neo-imperialism can expand - and, having reached, since approximately 1968, its imperialist stage of development (viz. the invasion of Czechoslovakia) it must

expand or suffer a chaotic intensification of its social and class antagonisms, in the same way as this is already happening, at a higher and later stage of development, in the case of the established imperialist powers. These two avenues of expansion are:

- a) by successfully taking over and absorbing into its (qualitatively different) framework of neo-colonial domination and exploitation the colonial holdings of the long-established imperialist powers, as and when these neo-colonies and semi-colonies successfully cast off the yoke of colonial subservience to these powers - in particular, US imperialism - through the carrying through of victorious national-democratic revolutions. It was in this way that Cuba, for instance, was absorbed into the neo-colonial framework of Soviet neo-imperialism. The Soviet neo-imperialists entertained the same hope vis-a-vis Chile, and have long attempted to lure the national bourgeoisie of Egypt into such a relationship and away from subservience to US imperialism.
- b) by means of a war against China and the ensuing subjugation of the People's Republic of China and its incorporation into the Soviet neo-colonial system.

Of these two, it is the latter which increasingly promises both the quicker and the larger imperialist booty. To win, one by one, from the developed, established imperialist countries the colonial holdings which they already possess, through the expedient of rendering support to a national liberation movement in order to place the new independent state, set up after the victory of the national democratic revolution, in a position of indebtedness to the Soviet Union - the method applied in relation to Cuba and Vietnam - may be very astute, but it is a process which is both protracted, costly and dangerous, the latter on account of the risk of provoking a world war with US imperialism. Consequently, a growing lobby of opinion amongst the neo-imperialist ruling class of the Soviet Union favours a war solution, to be engineered on some suitable pretext, as a quick way out for Soviet neo-imperialism's market problems.

As for the Chinese side in this developing inter-capitalist (and increasingly inter-imperialist) contradiction, it is precisely because of the threat it faces from Soviet neo-imperialism that Chinese state capitalism decided in 1972 to enter into and to promote an active alliance with US imperialism. Have you ever wondered why Lin Piao, who had been widely and clamorously publicised as the successor of the great Chairman himself, his "most trusted comrade-in-arms", was finally compelled, along with his supporters, to flee the country? The reason was that Lin Piao had, since the murder of Peng Chen and the incarceration of Liu Shao-chi, come to represent that section of the national capitalist class whose interests were opposed to US imperialism. He and his faction accordingly attempted to carry through a coup d'etat and to oust the Mao faction from power - unsuccessfully, as it turned out. What more striking truth could one require of the state-capitalist nature of People's China or of the revisionist - one might almost say social-fascist - character of its ruling party, the "Communist Party of China", and of the inter-imperialist character of its foreign relations?

These are the milestones marking the road to the consolidation of the power of the national bourgeoisie and the elimination of the last vestiges of the power of the working class and poor peasantry in China. They are also the events and policy measures which have proved up to the hilt the fundamental correctness of the analysis made in the MLOB Report. Gone now is every shred of justification for maintaining the myth of "Mao Tse-tung Thought", the "Lenin of our Era"; gone is every remaining shred of evidence that China is a "socialist country"; gone is every remaining shred of evidence that the reconstituted rump of the CPC is a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party of the Chinese working class and poor peasantry. Yet not a single one of the groups and organisations calling themselves Marxist-Leninist has been able to summon that modicum of respect for

scientific truth as to face up to these developments or to exercise even the most elementary self-criticism in seeking to evaluate critically their past errors: their craven opportunism, their grovelling at the feet of the most corrupt demagoguery ever perpetrated in the name of "socialism"; their abject, disgusting fear of losing a seemingly powerful ally. Most of all they fear being faced with the need to continue the "fight against modern revisionism" alone and without the support, "moral" or financial, of a powerful "socialist" base. Marxism-Leninism has, indeed, scant need of such "fighters for principle" as these!

In sending you this letter, we are only too well aware of the powerful motives which compel you to retain your allegiance to the facile emotive appeal exerted by "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung". For so long as there remains a single shred of false Marxism adhering to it, for so long as its shallow abuse of dialectical-materialist phraseology may succeed in lending to the essentially mechanical-determinist ideology of the national capitalist class of China the false aura of scientific objectivity, for so long will the metaphysical character of "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung" link up with your own emotively based ideological needs and, in providing that heaven-sent manna of "For the people, with the people, by the people", ensure that the national bourgeoisies of the developing and emerging countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America succeed in entraining an as yet but immature and inexperienced proletariat and left forces behind them in their struggle to halt the uninterrupted transition to socialist revolution. For so long as there remains, as an inevitable outcome of this, the sanction to strut and posture in the motley plumage of the false Marxism and real nationalist demagoguery of "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung" as a means of avoiding in practice the responsibility - one which any genuine Marxist-Leninist would strive to discharge as his most elementary duty - of making a profound analysis, on the basis of scientific theory, of the new features in the development of capitalism which have emerged since the end of World War Two and on this basis of building a genuine Marxist-Leninist vanguard party of the working class and a genuine revolutionary mass front, a Red Front - for just so long will you continue to place the unearned kudos of "international support" before real cadre work to build the Marxist-Leninist vanguard on the foundation of scientific enlightenment, conviction and truth.

Imperialism's crisis of absolute retraction is already well advanced. The dangers this poses for the British working class, as for the workers of other developed countries in Europe and throughout the world, are immense. For at least 30 years, the British working class has been leaderless, at the mercy of the long-range strategic plans of its irreconcilable enemy, monopoly capital. The eleventh hour for the forging of Marxist-Leninist unity on the basis of a scientific analysis of the contemporary capitalist reality is soon to strike. If these fundamental theoretical and programmatic tasks are not solved, and solved soon, monopoly capital will find no barrier standing between it and a solution to the crisis of absolute retraction in the imposition of a fully-developed corporate state, and this in its turn would be but the antechamber to a terrorist fascist dictatorship. Whilst these portentous and fundamental issues are nearing their objective maturity, you, through your craven opportunism and philistine, egotistical concern to prove that you know the letter, but nothing of the method, of Marxism-Leninism, are objectively assisting in the disruption of the work to forge real Marxist-Leninist unity based on scientific principle and the founding of a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party based on a scientific programme of advance.

We hope you will rein in at the brink and join with us in these fundamental theoretical and strategic tasks. That is why we have taken the trouble to address this Open Letter to you. But, honestly, we doubt that you will.

MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION  
OF BRITAIN

September 1977