

# Liberation

September, '68

- \* *Principal Contradiction*
- \* *Premier Chou En-lai's Speech*
- \* *Total Bankruptcy of Soviet  
Modern Revisionism*
- \* *In Hitler's Footsteps*
- \* *Problems Ahead For  
Vietnam*
- \* *Is India Really Independent ?*
- \* *Nuclear Fraud of U.S. and  
Soviet Union*
- \* *People's War—Weapon of  
Indonesian People*

## LIBERATION

Principal Contradiction And Principal Aspect of A Contradiction— <i>Mao Tse-tung</i>	... 3
<b>Note :</b>	
— <i>They Follow In Hitler's Footsteps</i>	... 12
Problems Ahead For Vietnam — <i>Anna Louise Strong</i>	... 17
Imperialism And Its Asian Deputies — <i>Broadsheet</i>	... 31
Is India Really Independent ?— <i>S. Guna</i>	... 35
Comrade Mao Tse-tung's Teachings on People's War Is the Indonesian People's Powerful Weapon	... 54
A Nuclear Fraud Jointly Hatched By The U.S. And The Soviet Union — <i>Commentator, Renmin Ribao</i>	... 62
Nuclear Blackmail Broken— <i>Broadsheet</i>	... 66
U.S.-Soviet Conspiracy to Strangle Arab People's Struggle	... 71
Premier Chou En-lai Denounces Soviet Aggression	... 77
Total Bankruptcy of Soviet Modern Revisionism — <i>People's Daily</i>	... 81

Editor-in-Chief :  
Sushital Ray Choudhury

Quotations From

CHAIRMAN MAO TSE-TUNG

*Weapons are an important factor in war but not the decisive factor; it is people, not things, that are decisive. The contest of strength is not only a contest of military and economic power, but also a contest of human power and morale. Military and economic power is necessarily wielded by people.*

\* \* \*

*Once the correct ideas characteristic of the advanced class are grasped by the masses, these ideas turn into a material force which changes society and changes the world.*

## The Principal Contradiction and The Principal Aspect of A Contradiction

—Mao Tse-tung

**T**HERE are still two points in the problem of the particularity of contradiction which must be singled out for analysis, namely, the principal contradiction and the principal aspect of a contradiction.

There are many contradictions in the process of development of a complex thing, and one of them is necessarily the principal contradiction whose existence and development determine or influence the existence and development of the other contradictions.

For instance, in capitalist society the two forces in contradiction, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, form the principal contradiction. The other contradictions, such as those between the remnant feudal class and the bourgeoisie, between the peasant petty bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie, between the proletariat and the peasant petty bourgeoisie, between the non-monopoly capitalist and the monopoly capitalist, between bourgeois democracy and bourgeois

---

This is Section IV of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's great philosophical work "On Contradiction". Chairman Mao has shown here how the question of finding the principal contradiction in semi-colonial semi-feudal China was solved. Though written in connection with the Chinese Revolution, the brilliant method used by Chairman Mao in solving the question of principal contradiction in old China perfectly holds good for present-day India, which, like old China, is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. We firmly believe that a thorough study of Chairman Mao's works, and in particular this work, will immensely help our comrades to grasp correctly the realities of the Indian situation.

fascism, among the capitalist countries and between imperialism and the colonies, are all determined or influenced by this principal contradiction.

In a semi-colonial country such as China, the relationship between the principal contradiction and the non-principal contradiction presents a complicated picture.

When imperialism launches a war of aggression against such a country, all its various classes, except for some traitors, can temporarily unite in a national war against imperialism. At such a time, the contradiction between imperialism and the country concerned becomes the principal contradiction, while all the contradictions among the various classes within the country (including what was the principal contradiction, between the feudal system and the great masses of the people) are temporarily relegated to a secondary and subordinate position. So it was in China in the Opium War of 1840, the Sino-Japanese War of 1894 and the Xi Ho Tuan War of 1900, and so it is now in the present Sino-Japanese War.

But in another situation, the contradictions change position. When imperialism carries on its oppression not by war, but by milder means—political, economic and cultural—the ruling classes in semi-colonial countries capitulate to imperialism, and the two form an alliance for the joint oppression of the masses of the people. At such a time, the masses often resort to civil war against the alliance of imperialism and the feudal classes, while imperialism often employs indirect methods rather than direct action in helping the reactionaries in the semi-colonial countries to oppress the people, and thus the internal contradictions become particularly sharp. This is what happened in China in the Revolutionary War of 1911, the Revolutionary War of 1924-27, and the ten years of Agrarian Revolutionary War after 1927. Wars among the various reactionary ruling groups in the semi-colonial countries, e.g., the wars among the warlords in China, fall into the same category.

When a revolutionary civil war develops to the point of threatening the very existence of imperialism and its running dogs, the domestic reactionaries, imperialism often adopts other methods in order to maintain its rule; it either tries to split the revolutionary front from within or sends armed forces to help the domestic reactionaries directly. At such a time, foreign imperialism and domestic reaction stand quite openly at one pole while the masses of the people stand at the other pole, thus forming the principal contradiction which determines or influences the development of the other contradictions. The assistance given by various capitalist countries to the Russian reactionaries after the October Revolution is an example of armed intervention. Chiang Kai-shek's betrayal in 1927 is an example of splitting the revolutionary front.

But whatever happens, there is no doubt at all that at every stage in the development of a process, there is only one principal contradiction which plays the leading role.

Hence, if in any process there are a number of contradictions, one of them must be the principal contradiction playing the leading and decisive role, while the rest occupy a secondary and subordinate position. Therefore, in studying any complex process in which there are two or more contradictions, we must devote every effort to finding its principal contradiction. Once the principal contradiction is grasped, all problems can be readily solved. This is the method Marx taught us in his study of capitalist society. Likewise Lenin and Stalin taught us this method when they studied imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism and when they studied the Soviet economy. There are thousands of scholars and men of action who do not understand it, and the result is that, lost in a fog, they are unable to get to the heart of a problem and naturally cannot find a way to resolve its contradictions.

As we have said, one must not treat all the contradictions in a process as being equal but must distinguish between

the principal and the secondary contradictions, and pay special attention to grasping the principal one. But, in any given contradiction, whether principal or secondary, should the two contradictory aspects be treated as equal? Again, no. In any contradiction the development of the contradictory aspects is uneven. Sometimes they seem to be in equilibrium, which is however only temporary and relative, while unevenness is basic. Of the two contradictory aspects, one must be principal and the other secondary. The principal aspect is the one playing the leading role in the contradiction. The nature of a thing is determined mainly by the principal aspect of a contradiction, the aspect which has gained the dominant position.

But this situation is not static; the principal and the non-principal aspects of a contradiction transform themselves into each other and the nature of the thing changes accordingly. In a given process or at a given stage in the development of a contradiction, A is the principal aspect and B is the non-principal aspect; at another stage or in another process the roles are reversed—a change determined by the extent of the increase or decrease in the force of each aspect in its struggle against the other in the course of the development of a thing.

We often speak of "the new superseding the old." The supersession of the old by the new is a general, eternal and inviolable law of the universe. The transformation of one thing into another, through leaps of different forms in accordance with its essence and external conditions—this is the process of the new superseding the old. In each thing there is contradiction between its new and its old aspects, and this gives rise to a series of struggles with many twists and turns. As a result of these struggles, the new aspect changes from being minor to being major and rises to predominance, while the old aspect changes from being major to being minor and gradually dies out. And the moment the new aspect gains dominance over the

old, the old thing changes qualitatively into a new thing. It can thus be seen that the nature of a thing is mainly determined by the principal aspect of the contradiction, the aspect which has gained predominance. When the principal aspect which has gained predominance changes, the nature of a thing changes accordingly.

In capitalist society, capitalism has changed its position from being a subordinate force in the old feudal era to being the dominant force, and the nature of society has accordingly changed from feudal to capitalist. In the new, capitalist era, the feudal forces changed from their former dominant position to a subordinate one, gradually dying out. Such was the case, for example, in Britain and France. With the development of the productive forces, the bourgeoisie changes from being a new class playing a progressive role to being an old class playing a reactionary role, until it is finally overthrown by the proletariat and becomes a class deprived of privately owned means of production and stripped of power, when it, too, gradually dies out. The proletariat, which is much more numerous than the bourgeoisie and grows simultaneously with it but under its rule, is a new force which, initially subordinate to the bourgeoisie, gradually gains strength, becomes an independent class playing the leading role in history, and finally seizes political power and becomes the ruling class. Thereupon the nature of society changes and the old capitalist society becomes the new socialist society. This is the path already taken by the Soviet Union, a path that all other countries will inevitably take.

Look at China, for instance. Imperialism occupies the principal position in the contradiction in which China has been reduced to a semi-colony, it oppresses the Chinese people, and China has been changed from an independent country into a semi-colonial one. But this state of affairs will inevitably change; in the struggle between the two sides, the power of the Chinese people which is growing

under the leadership of the proletariat will inevitably change China from a semi-colony into an independent country, whereas imperialism will be overthrown and old China will inevitably change into New China.

The change of old China into New China also involves a change in the relation between the old feudal forces and the new popular forces within the country. The old feudal landlord class will be overthrown, and from being the ruler it will change into being the ruled; and this class, too, will gradually die out. From being the ruled the people, led by the proletariat, will become the rulers. Thereupon, the nature of Chinese society will change and the old, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society will change into a new democratic society.

Instances of such reciprocal transformation are found in our past experience. The Ching Dynasty which ruled China for nearly three hundred years was overthrown in the Revolution of 1911, and the revolutionary *Tung Meng Hui* under Sun Yat-sen's leadership was victorious for a time. In the Revolutionary War of 1924-27, the revolutionary forces of the Communist-Kuomintang alliance in the south changed from being weak to being strong and won victory in the Northern Expedition, while the Northern warlords who once ruled the roost were overthrown. In 1927, the people's forces led by the Communist Party were greatly reduced numerically under the attacks of Kuomintang reaction, but with the elimination of opportunism within their ranks they gradually grew again. In the revolutionary base areas under Communist leadership, the peasants have been transformed from being the ruled to being the rulers, while the landlords have undergone a reverse transformation. It is always so in the world, the new displacing the old, the old being superseded by the new, the old being eliminated to make way for the new, and the new emerging out of the old.

At certain times in the revolutionary struggle, the

difficulties outweigh the favourable conditions and so constitute the principal aspect of the contradiction and the favourable conditions constitute the secondary aspect. But through their efforts the revolutionaries can overcome the difficulties step by step and open up a favourable new situation; thus a difficult situation yields place to a favourable one. This is what happened after the failure of the revolution in China in 1927 and during the Long March of the Chinese Red Army. In the present Sino-Japanese War, China is again in a difficult position, but we can change this and fundamentally transform the situation as between China and Japan. Conversely, favourable conditions can be transformed into difficulty if the revolutionaries make mistakes. Thus the victory of the revolution of 1924-27 turned into defeat. The revolutionary base areas which grew up in the southern provinces after 1927 had all suffered defeat by 1934.

When we engage in study, the same holds good for the contradiction in the passage from ignorance to knowledge. At the very beginning of our study of Marxism, our ignorance of or scanty acquaintance with Marxism stands in contradiction to knowledge of Marxism. But by assiduous study, ignorance can be transformed into knowledge, scanty knowledge into substantial knowledge, and blindness in the application of Marxism into mastery of its application.

Some people think that this is not true of certain contradictions, for instance, in the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, the productive forces are the principal aspect; in the contradiction between theory and practice, practice is the principal aspect; in the contradiction between the economic base and the superstructure, the economic base is the principal aspect; and there is no change in their respective positions. This is the mechanical materialist conception, not the dialectical materialist conception. True, the productive forces, practice and the economic base generally play the principal

and decisive role; whoever denies this is not a materialist. But it must also be admitted that in certain conditions, such aspects as the relations of production, theory and the superstructure in turn manifest themselves in the principal and decisive role. When it is impossible for the productive forces to develop without a change in the relations of production, then the change in the relations of production plays the principal and decisive role. The creation and advocacy of revolutionary theory plays the principal and decisive role in those times of which Lenin said, "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement." When a task, no matter which, has to be performed but there is as yet no guiding line, method, plan or policy, the principal and decisive thing is to decide on a guiding line, method, plan or policy. When the superstructure (politics, culture, etc.) obstructs the development of the economic base, political and cultural changes become principal and decisive. Are we going against materialism when we say this? No. The reason is that while we recognize that in the general development of history the material determines the mental and social being determines social consciousness, we also—and indeed must—recognize the reaction of mental on material things, of social consciousness on social being and of the superstructure on the economic base. This does not go against materialism; on the contrary, it avoids mechanical materialism and firmly upholds dialectical materialism.

In studying the particularity of contradiction, unless we examine these two facets—the principal and the non-principal contradictions in a process, and the principal and non-principal aspects of a contradiction—that is, unless we examine the distinctive character of these two facets of contradiction, we shall get bogged down in abstractions, be unable to understand contradiction correctly and consequently be unable to find the correct method of resolving it. The distinctive character or particularity of these two

facets of contradiction represents the unevenness of the forces that are in contradiction. Nothing in this world develops absolutely evenly; we must oppose the theory of even development or the theory of equilibrium. Moreover, it is these concrete features of a contradiction and the changes in the principal and non-principal aspects of a contradiction in the course of its development that manifest the force of the new superseding the old. The study of the various states of unevenness in contradictions, of the principal and non-principal contradictions and of the principal and the non-principal aspects of a contradiction constitutes an essential method by which a revolutionary political party correctly determines its strategic and tactical policies both in political and in military affairs. All Communists must give it attention.

## NOTE

### THEY FOLLOW IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF HITLER

Thirty years ago Hitler's hordes invaded and overran Czechoslovakia. The social-fascists of today, the Soviet social-imperialists,\* have repeated Hitler's performance. On the night of August 20-21, the Soviet revisionist renegades and their lackeys—the revisionist renegades of East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria—sent their troops equipped with large numbers of aircraft, armoured cars, tank etc, to make a surprise attack on Czechoslovakia and occupy that country. This brutal, shameless, naked aggression has exposed, more than anything else, the hideous features of Soviet revisionism. It has revealed the fact that like the Hitlerite gang, like the U.S. imperialists, the Soviet revisionists are ready to trample underfoot the sovereignty of another nation in order to further their own neo-colonial interests. It has also exposed the fatal weakness, the total bankruptcy of modern revisionism. And it has made many times more acute the ever-deepening crisis in the camp of revisionism and sharpened its contradictions, which can and will be resolved only with the collapse of modern revisionism, with its complete disappearance from the stage of history.

What led the Soviet revisionists and their East European lackeys to send some 650,000 troops into Czechoslovakia? Did they do so in response to the request of

\*The word "social-imperialists" has been used by Lenin in many of his writings. By "social-imperialists" Lenin means "socialists in words and imperialists in deeds." (See "Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism," Collected Works, Volume 22, p. 285).

Czechoslovak "Party and government leaders" (as the first Tass announcement, issued three hours after the invasion, claimed) or at the request of the working people of Czechoslovakia? That the Tass statement was a blatant lie, a crude attempt at deception, is clear to everybody. And, far from inviting the invading troops, the working people of Czechoslovakia greeted them with unmistakable signs of anger and hatred. The Czech and Slovak workers, despite the instruction of the Government and Party leaders to them not to resist the invaders, went on strike on their own initiative in various cities. The working people put up resistance in Prague, Bratislava and other cities, and in the bloody clashes that occurred between them and the invading troops, either side suffered hundreds of casualties. Czech and Slovak students demonstrated in the streets of the cities with the bodies of their fallen comrades killed by Soviet soldiers, and refused to attend classes as a mark of protest. And newspapermen went underground to defy censorship imposed by the Soviet aggressors. It was the Czechoslovak revisionist traitors led by Dubcek, who tried hard to put out the fire of resistance. The Czechoslovak people responded by pulling down the portraits of the leaders who betrayed them at this hour of crisis.

Did the Soviet revisionist renegades and their lackeys rush their troops into Czechoslovakia in order to "defend" the "socialist gains", as they have claimed? The Soviet renegades, who claim to be defenders of socialism, are in actual practice its worst enemies. In the name of "a state of the entire people" they have already turned their own country into a bourgeois state; in the name of "a party of the entire people" they have already converted the CPSU into a bourgeois party. The proletarian dictatorship has been replaced by the dictatorship of the new bourgeois class. Though outwardly much of the means of production retains the form of social ownership, the economic processes and relations are more and more

dominated by capitalistic characteristics. As *Zeri-i-Popullit* wrote sometime ago, the main objective of all the economic reforms of the revisionists, from the social viewpoint, is precisely to consolidate the positions of this new bourgeoisie, enlarge its rights in administering "social" property, make it the real boss of "socialist" enterprises and create favourable conditions for it to draw ever larger profits on the basis of exploiting the working people. While, at home, the Soviet renegade clique has been replacing socialism by capitalism, its policy abroad is one of close collaboration with U.S. imperialism for joint domination of the world. As No. 1 accomplice of U.S. imperialism it is pursuing a policy of undisguised hostility towards socialist China and national liberation struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The COMECON (the Council of Mutual Economic Aid) serves as the instrument of its neo-colonial plunder of several countries of Eastern Europe and the Warsaw Pact is used as a handy weapon with which to perpetuate its military domination over them. Only Albania has been heroically resisting the Soviet renegades' attempts to destroy the "socialist gains" in that country and turn it into a neo-colony of theirs. Elsewhere—in India, Indonesia, 'Malaysia' etc.—the Soviet renegades are pursuing the same neo-colonial policy and building up friendly relations with all reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries whose hands are stained with the blood of the people. And now to cover up their monstrous crime against the Czechoslovak people the Soviet renegades would have us believe that their troops marched across Czechoslovakia in order to "defend" the "socialist gains" and to save that country from counter-revolutionaries—both domestic and foreign! Indeed, as Prime Minister Chou En-lai said, "*The Soviet revisionist clique of renegades has long degenerated into social-imperialism and social-fascism.*"

Albanian comrades correctly characterized the attitude of the Soviet revisionist chieftains towards the Dubcek clique in the following words :

"The Soviet revisionist leadership accuses the revisionist Dubcek clique of everything they themselves had done previously and on a large scale. In other words, they are telling the Dubcek clique : 'You must not have ties with the United States of America, but we should ; you must not maintain diplomatic relations with the 'Federal Republic of Germany' but we should ; you must not receive credits from the capitalists, but we should' and so on."

It is quite natural, rather inevitable, that the revisionist camp will be torn by strifes and contradictions. Only a few months ago the Budapest meeting of the world revisionists was convened by the Soviet Khrushchevites to establish their hegemony over the revisionist international and to unite their forces for attack against socialist China and Albania. But, unfortunately for them, the centrifugal tendency in the revisionist camp is too strong and so the plan failed ignominiously. Throughout Eastern Europe, the contradiction between the Soviet neo-colonists and the new bourgeoisie of the different countries is growing sharper and sharper every day. A few years ago, Rumania broke away from the Soviet orbit. At the end of the last year and in the beginning of this year, the contradiction became so acute in Czechoslovakia that the pro-Soviet Novotny clique was unceremoniously ousted from power by the pro-U.S. Dubcek clique. The Dubcek clique openly challenged the Soviet hegemony, the Warsaw Pact and the COMECON ; it declared its intention to move closer to the U. S. imperialists and the West German militarists, to receive "aid" and loan from the U.S. imperialists, and thus to bring Czechoslovakia into the U. S. orbit away from the Soviet sphere of influence. Though the Soviet social-imperialists are actively collaborating with U.S. imperialism to "contain" China and defeat the national liberation struggles and

the world revolution, of which they are so scared, they have also their contradictions with the U. S. imperialists. The threat presented by the Dubcek clique caused the Soviet renegades no little worry. If the Dubcek clique could get away with it, an uncontrollable chain reaction would start in Eastern Europe and the Soviet neo-colonial empire would hardly survive! For the first few months of this year the Soviet renegades waved both the carrot and the big stick before their erring Czechoslovak comrades.

The joint military manoeuvres of Warsaw Pact countries within the borders of Czechoslovakia and outside, the Warsaw meeting of the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union, East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria on July 14 and 15, the joint letter addressed by them to their Czechoslovak revisionist brothers which was virtually an ultimatum, more military manoeuvres, the Cierna meeting between the Soviet and Czechoslovak revisionist chieftains from July 29 to August 1 and the Bratislava talks on August 3 among the revisionist leaders of all the six countries—all these could not bring about a peaceful resolution of the contradictions driving them apart. The tireless advocates of "peaceful co-existence" and "the Tashkent Spirit" would not have anything to do with these! It seemed that threats, denunciations, army manoeuvres and ultimatums could not stop the rot that had set in. In mid-July—after receiving the joint letter from the revisionist chieftains of the five countries—the Dubcek clique openly declared that they were "not to make the slightest retreat from the path we took up in January" and insisted that the Warsaw Pact be revised so as to "guarantee equal rights to the Pact's members!"

This was the language of defiance and defiance might be catching! So, faced with the prospect of disintegration of its neo-colonial empire and of U.S. imperialism's pene-

*(Continued on page 86)*

## Problems Ahead for Vietnam

—Anna Louise Strong

Dear friends,

In the Personal Note at the end of Letter from China No. 57, I mentioned that I was going to spread the Letters over a longer period of time in order to devote more energy to other projects. Many friends have begged me, however, to write more fully on the situation in Vietnam. They wanted particularly to know how the Chinese people feel about it. Much of the material I had cut out of Letter No. 57 answers the requests, and therefore I am putting it into this supplement.

Here in Peking, the recent news from Vietnam has been received with mixed feelings. As you can imagine, the crushing defeat of the imperialist forces caused much jubilation throughout China. The people here realize, however, that the Vietnamese face the most difficult phase of the struggle in the months ahead. President Ho Chi Minh himself said: "The nearer the victory, the greater the hardships." **Chairman Mao phrased it even more aptly: "All reactionary forces on the verge of extinction invariably conduct desperate struggles." The enemy is wily; what he fails to win by military means, he tries frantically to gain by tricks and deception. The Vietnamese themselves, understandably intoxicated by successes, are more vulnerable than ever. Today they are in danger of losing what they fought so hard to secure.**

In a message last December to President Nguyen Huu Tho, Chairman Mao wrote: "Your victory once again demonstrates that a nation big or small, can defeat any enemy, however powerful, so long as it fully arouses the

Reprinted from the Supplement of "Letter from China" No 57 March 30, 1968

*See Alfred Burchett, Vietnam will  
win!*

people, firmly relies on them and wages a people's war." This statement is more profound than it might at first seem. It establishes the fact that the conflict in Vietnam is, and must continue to be, "a people's war." It is part of the revolutionary upheaval taking place in Asia, Africa and Latin America. **In other words, it is a revolution against the global counter-revolution staged by U. S. imperialism.**

When we accept the Vietnamese war as a revolution, we recognize that it is subject to immutable laws. If the laws are obeyed, the war will end in victory; if they are broken, defeat will follow. No one has ever understood these laws better than Chairman Mao Tse-tung. "If there is to be revolution," he said, "there must be a revolutionary party. Without a revolutionary party, without a party built on Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and in the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary style, it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its running dogs." Because the people of South Vietnam are "defeating imperialism and its running dogs," Comrade Mao's statement must mean that the South Vietnamese are being led by a party "built on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory."

Many friends will point out, however, that the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation "has achieved a broad union of the various sections of the people, the political parties, organizations, nationalities, religious communities and patriotic personalities." Such a union has indeed been achieved and since it was organized in 1960 it was proven highly effective. Nevertheless, among the political parties mentioned as being part of the union is one which follows faithfully the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary principles. The courageous members of this group have proven more experienced, resourceful, energetic and disciplined. Thus they have been able to exert a guiding influence on the S. V. Liberation Front as a whole. Even more important, they have forged an unbreakable bond

with the Workers Party in the northern zone, and they have dedicated themselves to the thought of Mao Tse-tung.

These facts may surprise some of my friends. It must be remembered, however, that the Vietnamese people have committed themselves irrevocably to the revolutionary goal of defeating the U. S. aggressors, defending the north and bringing about the unity of their country. The goal could not be achieved without a revolutionary party in the vanguard. To assume the vanguard role effectively, the revolutionary party must adhere strictly to Marxist-Leninist principles and unite solidly with the world-wide revolutionary struggle against imperialism.

It is the part being played by the Vietnamese people in the world-wide revolutionary struggle that is understood and appreciated the least, especially in the Western nations. History has assigned to the Vietnamese the glorious task of achieving a decisive victory over U.S. imperialism. Compromise is not possible, because it would only enable the imperialist forces to rearm. Thus the peace talks which Johnson is cynically advocating cannot, and will not, be permitted to succeed. The struggle in Vietnam will be a protracted war. The Vietnamese may seem for the moment to bear the brunt of the international resistance to imperialist aggression, but they have the wholehearted support of revolutionary peoples everywhere. The vast country of China and its 700 million people stand firmly behind Vietnam. They will not permit their little neighbor to falter. Before long the Chinese people, armed with the invincible might of Mao Tse-tung's thought, will have the means of delivering the blow which will destroy imperialism once and for all.

Until now the Vietnamese have had to concentrate on the military aspects of their tasks. The equally important political factors have been given less consideration. With victory in sight, however, politics will come increasing to the fore front. As that happens, any flaws in the present

political structure will create problems which will require correct solutions. Flaws in the Political Program of the S.V. Liberation Front are apparent already. They are the subject of much serious discussion here in Peking.

### THE S.V.N.F.L. POLITICAL PROGRAM

In my Letter No. 51 of September 23, 1967, I mentioned the "Extraordinary Congress" convened by the Central Committee of the Liberation Front, and I described (but did not comment on) the expanded Political Program then adopted. At the time, the Program was applauded in Peking, but I had had reservations about it. I could not understand why an organization which had united four-fifths of South Vietnam's territory and two-thirds of the country's population did not declare itself a government and the state power. Comrade Nguyen Minh Phung, acting head of the Front's mission in Peking, told me that a government would be set up "when the situation is ripe" and that the "present Political Program seeks to build the widest possible base against U.S. aggressors." Only a few months later, events indicated clearly that the situation *was* ripe, and that the base built against the U.S. aggressors had been wide enough for resounding victories. Chairman Mao recognized this when he wrote to President Tho that a nation can defeat any enemy "so long as it fully arouses the people, *firmly relies on them* and wages a people's war." Thus, the over-caution of the S. V. Liberation Front's Central Committee suggests that the members have not relied on the people firmly enough.

Perhaps the error has been unavoidable. The People's Revolutionary Party, which exerts the dominant influence within the Front organization, may have felt obliged to compromise with bourgeois and other anti-people elements. Such compromises merely postpone problems instead of solving them. To fight a people's war, the people need to be united under a people's government. In the past, the Front

may have been useful for propaganda and deception purposes, but now it is becoming more of a hindrance than a help.

The Front will be replaced soon by a truly revolutionary people's government. When that happens, the erroneous principles and policies stated in the 14 paragraphs of the Front's Political Program may not be easily refuted. The basic flaw in the Program is that it does not account for the class nature of Vietnam's revolutionary struggle. The Program's theme is national rather than ideological. The stated aim is not to build a socialist state with a classless society in South Vietnam, but instead to provide for "an independent, democratic, peaceful, neutral and prosperous" country. This is silly. An independent country, in today's world, is a myth; inter-dependence is the very basis of socialist solidarity, and even the imperialist nations maintain only a semblance of independence. Considering the world-wide counter-revolutionary efforts of the imperialists, the idea of neutrality—of standing aloof from the struggle against imperialism—represents wishful thinking. Democracy, peace and prosperity will be possible only when the imperialists are finally defeated and dictatorship of the proletariat exists everywhere on earth.

The real aim of the Vietnamese people is to drive out the U.S. aggressors, defend the north and unify the country. While this aim is being achieved, the anti-people elements need to be neutralized, but they also must be recognized as a deadly enemy who sooner or later must be eliminated. Here again, the Front has postponed a problem instead of striving for its solution.

The Front's Program is essentially bourgeois. Of course it does have some "liberal" aspects "Land to the tiller" is specified, for example and the "interests of the workers" are guaranteed. At the same time, however, the right of private property is protected, and capitalists are to be encouraged to develop industries. It is only naive to suppose that the opposing interests of two separate classes

can be served. At best, therefore, the statement is meaningless, and at the worst it is an impediment to the unity of the Vietnamese people.

Similarly, the Program specifies that liberty of thought and demonstration, and liberty to create parties and organizations will be permitted. If such liberties were really allowed, only the bourgeoisie and other anti-people elements would benefit. The result would be a chaotic retrogression to outmoded reactionary social forms.

Retrogression is further encouraged in the fourth paragraph of the Program. The Front is committed to "preserve and develop the fine culture and good customs and habits of our nation." The attempt to cling to old ways inevitably creates stumbling blocks to progress. The emphasis in the Front's Program on preserving a seemingly comfortable status quo, on trying to be all things to all men, can only have the effect of confusing and deluding the masses.

We are seeing today the break up of world capitalism. This fact in itself is good reason to abandon all efforts to experiment further with it. A newly emerging nation like South Vietnam, however, would not really be able to install private capitalism simply because it lacks sufficient capital and the means of acquiring it. Thus the new government would be forced to establish state ownership of the nation's basic wealth. This type of "socialism" tends to degenerate into what the Chinese call "bureaucratic capitalism." In effect the officials become the big industrialists who pile up private bank accounts, usually in Europe. This is not likely to benefit the South Vietnamese people, nor is it a social order that can be termed "progressive." The experience of the other new nations in Asia and in Africa should serve as a warning. Even the Soviet Union and East European countries are not immune to this social disease. The compromises made by corrupt officials there have deluded imperialists into believing that a "peaceful

evolution back into capitalism" is possible. This illusion is seen by China as one of the most dangerous threats to progress in the world today.

I do not believe that the heroic efforts of the Vietnamese people have been in vain and that they will fall back into reaction. They are able to profit from the greater experience of China which has become the world center for all anti-imperialist revolutionary resistance, and the Chinese people will not let their Vietnamese neighbors lose the war by default. Nevertheless, the Political Program of the S.V. Liberation Front has created some difficulties for the north as well as the south. In the north, the official approval extended to the Program would seem to condone in effect "a party of the entire people". Every political organization has its distinct class nature, and as we have shown, the nature of the Front's organization and aims are essentially bourgeois. The leaders in Hanoi may have paid only lip service to the ideological effort of their southern compatriots, but in doing so they have sown confusion within their own ranks. How could this happen? Lenin said: "The habitual forces of tens of thousands of people are the most formidable forces." By this, he meant that the enemies in our own minds are more dangerous and more difficult to overcome than our enemies on the battlefield. The ingrained habits and attitudes of our social group are insidious. Our whole tendency is to accept them without question, and even when we know they are wrong, we can slip back into them without realizing it. Marx and Engels in the "Communist Manifesto" more than a hundred years ago, stated: "The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas." A primary responsibility of all revolutionaries is to maintain constant vigilance against old habits. In fact, declaring war on old habits is regarded as a profound

revolution in itself. The leaders in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam are well aware of this, but it is not surprising that they can sometimes forget it momentarily in the press of grave problems. The result of course is a temporary lack of unity concerning the correct approach to solving the problems.

### PROLETARIAN WORLD OUTLOOK

The correct approach can be described simply. Chairman Mao teaches that politics is the commander, the soul in everything. He enjoins us "to take firm hold of revolution and stimulate production." More specifically, he has instructed that all revolutionaries should participate actively in the three great revolutionary movements (class struggle, struggle for production, and scientific experimentation), to make energetic efforts to study Marxism-Leninism, overcome non-proletarian ideas, and establish the proletarian world outlook.

In South Vietnam, the proletarian world outlook is barely perceived, and in the north it is only beginning to be acquired. Even in China where the dictatorship of the proletariat is more firmly established than elsewhere, reactionary elements have worked under cover and in high places to distort the proletarian viewpoint. Chairman Mao has said: "Those persons who represent the bourgeoisie and who have crept into the Party, into the government, into the ranks of the army, and into various cultural circles, are a bunch of counter-revolutionary revisionists. As soon as the time is ripe, they will seize political power, and make the proletarian dictatorship become a bourgeois dictatorship." If such a situation could exist in China, it is even more possible in Vietnam. In commenting further on the situation, Chairman Mao stated: "Socialist society is a long historical stage. The class struggle still exists in socialist society, and the struggle between the two lines of socialism and capitalism

still exists." If the proletariat has political power it has everything; if it loses political power, it loses everything. In China, the handful of capitalist-roaders who had infiltrated the Party used their stolen power to re-establish the bourgeois viewpoint. They even plotted to seize the political power of the entire country and to abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus China faced problems of the counter-restoration power seizure, of the restoration of capitalism and of opposing the restoration. **The socialist revolution, in other words, was not completed. Only when it is completed will the danger of capitalist restoration be past.** Chairman Mao's solution to the problem was the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution which he personally set in motion and which he personally directs. His solution is today's most scientific and most correct proletarian principle. It is a priceless contribution to the world-wide revolutionary movement.

This is what the Vietnamese leaders have yet to appreciate fully. The Political Program put forth by the S.V. Liberation Front and approved in Hanoi emphasizes goals that the various classes share, rather than the contradictions and conflicts that set them apart. The old revisionist Kautsky once said: "In a society, there are no two classes which do not have common interests, even between the slave owner and his slaves. If the master went bankrupt, the slaves starved." In the Soviet Union, Khrushchov carried this idea even further. Instead of pointing to the irreconcilable differences between capitalism and socialism, he concentrated on what they had in common. He advocated peaceful competition between the two systems on the assumption that eventually the capitalist nations would fall so far behind that they would be forced to turn voluntarily to socialism. Thus the unity of the two opposites would be achieved. **This kind of unity, however, is not dialectical. The unity of opposites referred to in materialist dialectics implies that the opposing aspects of a**

contradiction are interrelated and, under proper conditions, transform themselves into each other. This inter-relation or transformation is the outcome of struggle and it cannot come about without struggle. There is no harmony of opposites, and two do not combine into one.

Conversely, using the world outlook of "one divides into two" in examining society, the fact of class contradiction and the inevitability of class struggle become obvious. Chairman Mao, during the war of resistance against Japan, used materialist dialectics and analyzed correctly the contradiction between China and Japan, and between the various classes within China. He realized that the contradiction between the two countries was the main one and that the class contradictions within China were secondary. Thus, Chairman Mao applied creatively the law of the unity of opposites, and he formulated the principles and policies for the anti-Japanese national united front. At the same time, he recognized that the internal class contradictions still existed and one day would become the primary concern. He was steadfast therefore in maintaining the independence of his revolutionary party even while it was united with the national front. He adhered to the principle of both unity and struggle.

#### CONTRADICTIONS IN VIETNAM

In South Vietnam, the Liberation Front, as in China, has created a broad base from which to resolve the contradiction between their country and the foreign invaders. Within the Front, moreover, the People's Revolutionary Party maintains its independence and plays the leading role, through its advisers in Hanoi, in determining the Front's policies. What is not clear is how fully the PRP has repudiated the falacious "two combines into one" theory and has accepted and prepared for the inevitability of internal class struggle.

The same problem existed in China during the war of

resistance against the Japanese invaders. At that time, the man who is today China's No. 1 capitalist-roader, denied the struggle within the anti-Japanese national united front. He obliterated the class nature of the Kuomintang by calling it a "league." He worked at conciliating the contradictions between the various classes. In doing so, he was advocating the disproven theory of "two combines into one."

Vietnam has suffered almost 20 years of continual warfare. It is understandable that the people long for peace and that their leaders are impatient for an end to heavy military responsibilities. However, Chairman Mao said: "When the proletariat seizes state power, whether they should take the road of making revolution by violence or take the road of waging a 'parliamentary struggle' is an important issue in the acute struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, and between proletarian revolutionaries and all renegades of the proletariat. Revolution by violence is the only correct road for the proletariat to seize political power. It is the universal law of proletarian revolution." Again on this subject, he wrote: "Experience in the class struggle in the area of imperialism teaches us that it is only by the power of the gun that the working class and the laboring masses can defeat the armed bourgeoisie and the landlords; in this sense, we may say that only with guns can the whole world be transformed." The Vietnamese will have to keep in mind that, in resisting the U.S. imperialist aggressors, they are in fact fighting world capitalism in its most virulent form. World capitalism, in turn, is the instrument used by the international bourgeoisie to suppress and exploit the laboring masses. Hence the real enemy of the Vietnamese is the bourgeoisie inside and outside their country. When the troops of the U.S. bourgeoisie are expelled, the forces of the Vietnam bourgeoisie will still be a deadly threat.

This is why we know that the war in Vietnam will be

protracted. The defeat of the U. S. aggressors will be a serious blow to the international bourgeoisie, but it will mean no let up in the armed struggle of the Vietnamese people. This is true equally in the north and south of the country. One of Chairman Mao's most important contributions to the world-wide revolutionary movement has been his great theory on the continuation of revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. He wrote: "Socialist society covers a fairly long historical stage. In this stage, classes, class contradictions, and class struggle continue; the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and the danger of capitalist restoration remains." He added that the struggle "will continue to be long and tortuous and at time will even become very acute."

#### FUTURE TASKS FOR VIETNAM

In South Vietnam, the most important task ahead for the Liberation Front will be to isolate, disarm, demobilize and reform the Vietnamese bourgeoisie and reactionaries. The struggle against the anti-people elements in one's own society is always more acute—and often bloodier—than the struggle against a foreign enemy. The rooting out of old ideas, customs and habits is a long, difficult and painful process. Nevertheless, it is unavoidable because the social transformation which requires it is inevitable.

In the north, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam's preoccupation with the foreign aggressors had made the problem of national unity relatively easy. Once the foreigners are gone, however, the internal class conflict will revive, and the struggle to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat will continue. As China's experience clearly shows, this struggle also can be long, difficult and painful.

In all of Vietnam, a difficulty ahead will be to resist the insidious theory of "two combines into one", of succumbing to the false hope that compromises with the

enemy will mean less hardship. In this danger, the negative example of the Soviet Union and other so-called socialist western nations can prove illuminating. Recently, in the Soviet Union, the revisionist ruling clique has been intensifying its efforts to promote the revisionist line. Externally, the rulers have propped up the old order of capitalism and colonialism in league with the imperialists headed by the United States and the reactionaries of all countries. Internally, under the banner of "state of the whole people", the rulers have turned the world's first socialist state back into a capitalist state. Under the cloak of "party of the entire people", they have transformed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union into a bourgeois party. In the name of introducing "economic reforms" they have made the country's economy degenerate into a capitalist economy. Using the signboard of "culture for the whole people", they have allowed bourgeois ideology to become dominant in every sphere. The Soviet state which was so prosperous in Lenin and Stalin's time, is rapidly approaching bankruptcy. The workers are impoverished and oppressed. In 1962, Chairman Mao pointed out: "The Soviet Union was the first socialist state, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was created by Lenin. Although the leadership of the Soviet party and state has now been usurped by revisionists, I would advise comrades to remain firm in the conviction that the masses of the Soviet people and of Party members and cadres are good, that they desire revolution and that revisionist rule will not last long." Recent events indicate that the Russian people are becoming increasingly discontent under revisionist oppression and that before long the capitalist restoration will be overthrown.

Meanwhile, the Vietnamese have the positive example of the Chinese People's Republic and the guiding genius of Mao Tse-tun's thought. The Great Proletarian Cultural

Revolution provides a perfect model for the Vietnamese to emulate. "Fight self, repudiate revisionism" is the slogan which Chairman Mao provided for the Cultural Revolution. **The Vietnamese will learn the process of self-criticism (and thus self-improvement). They will come to repudiate revisionism politically, theoretically and ideologically. They will use proletarian ideology to overcome bourgeois egoism and all non-proletarian ideas. And they will transform education, literature, art and all other parts of the superstructure that are not in complete conformity with the socialist economic base.** The way ahead for the Vietnamese people is long and difficult, but at the end lie peace and prosperity.

## Imperialism And Its Asian Deputies

**I**N a round up of comments on President Johnson's March statement on Vietnam, the *Times* (London) quoted the remark of a prominent French politician: 'It is neither in the interests of Vietnam nor of Russia that the departure of the United States be interpreted as a success for China.'

It is clear that any vindication of China's line on People's War would not be in the interests of the Soviet Government. People's War is now seen as a threat to the foundations of society not only by the West but by the Soviet Union as well. No capitalist or imperialist, and no supporter of the *status quo* in the Soviet Union would want to see any conclusion drawn that a 'People's War' had proved its superiority to conventional military science, or to strategies based on co-existence between Soviet-styled socialism and imperialism. That would be to concede a key point of the Chinese case on the question of how to deal with imperialism.

But if the French politician assumed too soon that the United States was prepared to withdraw, what are we to say of Mr. Philip Noel-Baker's urging in the British House of Commons (4.4.68) that China ought to be included in the peace negotiations 'since no settlement in Southeast Asia could be lasting unless China agreed with it'? He was quickly corrected by the Prime Minister, who expressed doubts whether China 'would necessarily make the most constructive contribution towards a settlement.'

Certainly China, which stands for the independence of peoples everywhere, would not make any contribution towards a settlement designed to confirm south Vietnam

Reprinted from the "Broadsheet" of May, 1968

as a citadel of the 'free world' in Southeast Asia. China's interests do not differ from but are identical with the interests of all those fighting U. S. imperialism.

The principal objective of imperialism in Southeast Asia remains the overthrow or subversion of the Chinese People's Republic which, with Vietnam, is the main inspiration of national liberation movements throughout the world. Hopeful forecasts of political crisis and economic collapse of China, which would lead to her humbling and return to more conciliatory policies, have long since lost all credibility. Imperialist trade restrictions and military provocations have in fact strengthened the Chinese people's will to resist and speed up development. The imperialists consider that a strategy of containment holds out more hope for them in the long run. They must therefore attempt to insulate the outside world from China's example and policies in the hope that a leadership of different mind will take over.

Eighteen months ago Sir Alec Douglas-Hume described the policy of surrounding China with regimes friendly to the West as one for which Soviet conception could be secured. Since the beginning of this year moves directed at points all round the circumference of China have revealed the unanimity with which this objective is being pursued. Efforts are being made to revitalise moribund alliances and form new ones. As SEATO was meeting in New Zealand, the *Daily Telegraph* (London) defence correspondent (2.4.68) reminded us that: 'SEATO planning covers many possible situations from all-out war to local terrorist activity in member states'.

The new alliances, not yet formalised, are designed to give important roles to the major Asian nations not involved in SEATO. And with these countries is the Soviet Union which is supplying arms to India and Indonesia for 'defence' against China, and is wooing Japan and 'Malaysia.'

When Mrs. Gandhi visited Moscow in January, it was

made clear to her that the Soviet Government would welcome and assist moves by India to fill as much as possible of the defence vacuum left by the diminution of the British physical presence in Southeast Asia.

The U.S., U.S.S.R., Britain, Japan and Australia are all pumping military and economic aid into Indonesia to build up the reactionary military regime. An anti-China defence pact involving Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Burma, Ceylon, India and Pakistan was demanded by Tunku Abdul Rahman early in February. Part of the aim of such a pact is to offset the effects of Britain's military pull-out, and it has now been announced that talks between Britain, 'Malaysia,' Singapore, Australia and New Zealand will open in Kuala Lumpur in June.

Japan, moving up to third strongest naval power in Asia, is being pushed towards acquiring nuclear capability. The U.S. has 'no other alternative but to push Japan' towards thermonuclear status, it is explained in Tokyo. To do otherwise would be to 'expose a weak Tokyo to Chinese atomic blackmail.' Prime Minister Sato and President Johnson have reached a tacit agreement that the U.S. will retain her nuclear bases in Okinawa when it is returned to Japan in a few years' time. The British, for their part, have made special arrangements with Japan for exchanging political information on China. The Soviet Union proposes alternatives to Japan's developing trade with China which even include major development projects on territory taken from China by Tzarist Russia in the 19th century. Not merely the Government but the functioning of the economy of South Korea is completely dependent on U.S. military aid. And this is forthcoming only so long as the South Koreans are available to take part in U.S. operations in Asia.

Governments like those of Japan, India, Malaya, Singapore, Indonesia, the Philippines and of course, Thailand, are more appropriate instruments of U.S. policy than is Britain, the archetype of imperialist power in the area

whose contribution may now be reduced to limited aid and to working through Australia and New Zealand.

Conditions have changed radically since SEATO was organised in 1954. At that time the governments of India, Burma and other countries thought that safety lay in 'non alignment'; a defeated Japan was still disarmed and largely pacifist. Now all that has changed. The myth of non-alignment has been exploded. Today what they fear is popular movements not only within their own borders but anywhere in the area. Popular forces in these countries have grown stronger. Weakened by the blows she has suffered in Vietnam and by civil conflict at home, the U.S. pursues a policy that increasingly demands the use of Asians to fight Asians. So fresh attempts are now being made to line up the so-called 'free Asian nations' into a new front for imperialism. Soviet military and economic aid to the governments of 'free nations' is a positive contribution to this front.

How is the U.S. to keep these countries in line in pursuance of its basic policy of 'containment of China'? The first condition for membership in any new alliance must be that the government is not 'neutral' but committed to the United States, and therefore committed to containing social revolution in the whole area.

However, there are serious problems:—in India, for example, where neither western nor Soviet aid has increased the ability of her existing rulers to put down internal unrest. The defenders of the *status quo* are driven to pay more attention to problems within their own borders than beyond them. The strengthening of revolutionary forces in any one country stimulates those in all others.

The U.S., Britain and the U.S.S.R. alike are haunted by the spectre of socialist revolution on the Chinese model. Both the U.S. and the Soviet Union are intent on isolating China and on damping down the flames of popular struggle in all countries in the region. Britain is the Third Man—sometimes visible and more often not. Unfortunately for them, one thing is certain about the outcome of such a strategy in Southeast Asia—it is bound to fail.

## IS INDIA Really Independent ?

—S. Guna

### II

#### India's Economic Development

##### Agriculture :

The so-called village community had been the basic element of the mediaeval Indian society. The village isolation, which resulted from such village communities based on individual agricultural economy, cracked under the aggressive impact of British capital. Artificial irrigation by canals and waterworks constituted the basis of agriculture. Marx observed: "However changing the political aspect of India's past might appear, its social condition has remained unaltered since its remotest antiquity, until the first decennium of the 19th century." He further added, "We must not forget that these idyllic village communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies". ("The British Rule in India", Selected Works, Vol. 1)

With the inundation of the British commodities, the "unity, imposed by the British sword", strengthened and perpetuated by telegraph, the native army organised and trained by the British, the "free press" and the railways, the inertia of the village system was overcome. The Zamindari system, which made the former tax collectors and merchant

whose contribution may now be reduced to limited aid and to working through Australia and New Zealand.

Conditions have changed radically since SEATO was organised in 1954. At that time the governments of India, Burma and other countries thought that safety lay in 'non alignment'; a defeated Japan was still disarmed and largely pacifist. Now all that has changed. The myth of non-alignment has been exploded. Today what they fear is popular movements not only within their own borders but anywhere in the area. Popular forces in these countries have grown stronger. Weakened by the blows she has suffered in Vietnam and by civil conflict at home, the U.S. pursues a policy that increasingly demands the use of Asians to fight Asians. So fresh attempts are now being made to line up the so-called 'free Asian nations' into a new front for imperialism. Soviet military and economic aid to the governments of 'free nations' is a positive contribution to this front.

How is the U.S. to keep these countries in line in pursuance of its basic policy of 'containment of China'? The first condition for membership in any new alliance must be that the government is not 'neutral' but committed to the United States, and therefore committed to containing social revolution in the whole area.

However, there are serious problems:—in India, for example, where neither western nor Soviet aid has increased the ability of her existing rulers to put down internal unrest. The defenders of the *status quo* are driven to pay more attention to problems within their own borders than beyond them. The strengthening of revolutionary forces in any one country stimulates those in all others.

The U.S., Britain and the U.S.S.R. alike are haunted by the spectre of socialist revolution on the Chinese model. Both the U.S. and the Soviet Union are intent on isolating China and on damping down the flames of popular struggle in all countries in the region. Britain is the Third Man—sometimes visible and more often not. Unfortunately for them, one thing is certain about the outcome of such a strategy in Southeast Asia—it is bound to fail.

## IS INDIA Really Independent ?

—S. Guna

### II

#### India's Economic Development

##### Agriculture :

The so-called village community had been the basic element of the mediaeval Indian society. The village isolation, which resulted from such village communities based on individual agricultural economy, cracked under the aggressive impact of British capital. Artificial irrigation by canals and waterworks constituted the basis of agriculture. Marx observed: "However changing the political aspect of India's past might appear, its social condition has remained unaltered since its remotest antiquity, until the first decennium of the 19th century." He further added, "We must not forget that these idyllic village communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies". ("The British Rule in India", Selected Works, Vol. 1)

With the inundation of the British commodities, the "unity, imposed by the British sword", strengthened and perpetuated by telegraph, the native army organised and trained by the British, the "free press" and the railways, the inertia of the village system was overcome. The Zamindari system, which made the former tax collectors and merchant

usurers into new type big landowners, was introduced by the British. The ryotwari system of renting land to peasants on onerous terms for an unlimited period in South India ( Madras and Bombay Presidencies ) by the British too superseded the medieval village communities. Thereby, as in the past, India stood with a "social destitution in the midst of plenty."

Prior to the Second World War and afterwards, Britain retained India only as a raw-material supply base. Agriculture, as it is today, remained the principal mode of production. The productive relations still remain predominantly feudal or semi-feudal. The exploitation of the peasantry and its pauperisation have multiplied manifold. But the productive methods remain, still, pre-capitalist or semi-capitalist. The Comintern colonial thesis of 1928 observed :

"Capitalism, which has included the colonial village into its system of taxation and trade apparatus, and which has overturned pre-capitalist relations ( for instance, the destruction of village communes ), does not thereby liberate the peasant from the yoke of pre-capitalist forms of bondage, of exploitation, but only gives the latter a monetary expression ( feudal services and rent in kind are partially replaced by money rent, while payment of taxes in kind is replaced by money taxes and so on ), which still more increases the suffering of the peasantry." It continues: "Big land-ownership is here hardly connected in anyway with large-scale agriculture, but serves only as a means for extorting rents from the peasants. There is frequently to be found a hierarchy of many stages, consisting of landlords and sub-landlords, parasitic intermediate links between the labouring cultivator and the big landowner (Zemindar) or the state." (Ibid)

The face of India has not changed very much since then. The Indian big bourgeoisie, after coming to power, entered into agreement with the big-landlords and feuda-

lists. They have retained the survivals of mediaevalism and the feudal princes, who were the bulwark of reaction, by paying heavy privy-purses. It is bent upon retaining the bases of British imperialism, the big-landlords, at any cost. Landlordism, which represents the main basis of feudal survivals, stands as the *predominant form* of oppression and exploitation of the vast peasantry in India. The fake agrarian reforms and land legislations will testify to this. These reforms and measures preserve the survivals of feudalism and landlordism throughout India. They have thrown open the doors wide for foreign capital in the form of either direct capital investments, or indirect investments through the so-called collaboration agreements. The shadow always follows and is inseparable from the body. Similarly, their dependent economy at the mercy of Anglo-U.S. monopolists and Soviet revisionists makes them move politically closer into their orbits.

The much-acclaimed abolition of princely feudal states was a hoax. Heavy privy purses are being paid to the former princes besides allowing them to own their amassed wealth. Large tracts of arable and forest land owned by them will stand as a clear instance of the deceptive land legislations and reforms. They have shown least concern in abolishing the intermediaries like zamindars, jagirdars, inamdars and others. These intermediaries are allowed to hold big landed estates in the name of **sir**, **khudkasht**, or **pannai** lands. The tenancy laws for ryotwari areas safely retain in the hands of the landed gentry the right of resumption of land from the tenants under the false pretext of "self-cultivation." The fair-rent fixation and the land ceiling Acts were just shrewd measures on the part of the ruling classes to hoodwink the poor peasantry and the peasant labourers. The rapid pauperisation of the peasantry and eviction of the poverty-stricken indebted

\* From G.O.I., Ministry of Finance, 'India—Pocket Book of Economic Information', 1963.

peasantry make them swell the ranks of the ill-paid, starving legions of peasant-labour. In 1954-55, the rural population was 88.7% of the total population of India. Of this, the percentage of agricultural labour in the rural population was 30.4% (i.e., 15.2% with some land and the other 15.2% without any land). The following shows the foodgrain consumption of the down-trodden agricultural labour :

Levels of earning (Rs.)	Quantities consumed (ozs. per day)
51—100	11.0
101—150	15.4
151—200	17.1
201—250	19.8

Also, the per-capita availability of foodgrains in India stood at 13.5 ozs. per day in 1948 and showed a meagre improvement in 1964 which was 14.4 ozs. per day. This will reveal the burdensome life of the rural population. The plight of the poor peasantry is unbearable.

The distribution of land (operational)-holdings by size in the year 1953-54 is given in the following table :

Area of holding (acres)	Number		Area Operated	
	Million	Percentage	Million acres	Percentage
Less than 1	26.0	42.1	4.0	1.2
1-5	18.0	29.1	48.4	14.8
5-10	8.8	14.2	62.3	18.5
10-20	5.4	8.7	75.2	22.4
20-40	2.5	4.1	69.5	20.7
40-100	1.0	1.6	56.5	16.8
Over 100	0.1	0.2	20.0	6.0

This testifies to the position of the poor peasantry in the countryside.

Despite the vast tracts of land under cultivation, the food situation forms the crux of the problem baffling India.

The area of rice cultivation in 1950 which stood at 761.4 lakh acres became 833.4 lakh acres in 1960-61. The output of rice which was 25.11 million tons (100%) in 1949-50, rose to 38.64 (153.8%) in 1964-65. In 1950, the area growing wheat was 240.8 lakh acres. It became 317.51 lakh acres in 1960-61. In 1949-50, 6.75 (100%) million tons of wheat was produced, whereas it was 12.08 (178.9%) in 1964-65. Only 16% of the total area under cultivation is irrigated. Since the pre-capitalist and semi-feudal mode of agricultural production, which determines the feudal or semi-feudal relations, exists in the countryside, the ruling classes are not in a position to overcome the crisis on the food front. The comprador Indian big bourgeoisie has thrown the door wide open for the U.S. food surplus. The more the U.S. foodgrains are imported, the faster does the crisis deepen in India's agriculture. Thereby, India is virtually made a classical land of hunger, starvation and famine. Its growing dependence on the U.S. for the supply of agricultural commodities goes together with its diplomatic dependence on the U.S. It had, till July 1964, imported rice worth 165.3 million dollars, wheat worth 1630.7 million dollars and other foodgrains worth 41.3 million dollars from U.S. under the notorious P.L. 480 agreement. It is the largest single recipient of U.S. P.L. 480 "aid", which forms 22% of the aggregate P.L. 480 shipments so far. The U.S. wheat "aid" between 1954-64 to the following six countries was worth 5,364.5 million dollars. Out of this, the countries named below got 75% of the total :

India : 1905.2 mil. dollars	Brazil : 489.9 mil. doll.
Pakistan : 563.7 do	Yugoslavia : 396.4 do
U.A.R. : 532.5 do	Turkey : 298.1 do

India's share of the U.S. wheat loan was 47% of the total share of the above said six countries. Also, it is 34% of the total sale of U. S. wheat. Thus, the U.S. food surplus, which finds a vast market in India, has become a new trammel to tie up India to U. S. imperialism. The P.L.

480 fund in India is used for counter-revolutionary political activity in India and in East Asia. With all these "aids", the food shortage has not been overcome.

The false claims of the spokesmen of the ruling classes cannot save India from the crisis in agriculture. This crisis is not going to be ended just by resort to some mean excuses. The basic reason for such a crisis that has enmeshed agriculture does not lie in the failure of rain, or the periodic floods, droughts and other natural calamities. It lies in the very mode of agricultural production and the productive relations. The only redemption is a thorough-going social change in the countryside. This can be realised only by the forcible seizure of land by the tillers from the social leeches in the countryside and by owning it collectively. This is possible only when the vast strata of middle and poor peasant masses rally behind the proletariat, overthrow the feudal-landlords, thus establishing their joint dictatorship so as to carry out the people's democratic revolution.

#### Industry :

"Indian society," Marx said, "has no history at all, at least known history. What we call its history is but the history of the successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society." ("The Future Results of British Rule in India," Selected Works, Vol. I). But the advent of the British completed two tasks—one of destruction of the former Indian society and the other of laying the foundation of capitalism in India. The British steam and science achieved this.

"The ruling classes of Great Britain," Marx observed, "have had, till now, but an accidental, transitory and exceptional interest in the progress of India. The aristocracy wanted to conquer it, the moneyocracy to plunder it, and the millioocracy to underwrite it. But now the tables are turned.

The millioocracy have discovered that *the transformation of India into a reproductive country* has become of vital importance to them, and that, to that end, it is necessary, above all, to gift her with means of irrigation and of internal communication. They intend now drawing a net of railways over India. And they will do it." Further he added :

"I know that the English millioocracy intend to endow India with railways with the exclusive view of extracting at diminished expenses the cotton and other raw materials for their manufacture. But when you have once introduced machinery into the locomotion of a country, which possesses iron and coal, you are unable to withhold it from its fabrication. You cannot maintain a net of railways over an immense country without introducing all those industrial processes necessary to meet the immediate and current wants of railway locomotion and out of which there must grow the application of machinery to those branches of industry not immediately connected with railways. *The railway system will therefore become, in India, truly the forerunner of modern industry*" (Ibid). The analysis of Marx, a century back, stands as an account of the early history of the Indian industry. Thus, "Bourgeois industry and commerce create these material conditions of a new world in the same way as geological revolutions have created the surface of the earth." (Ibid).

The Indian industry was, in 1948-49, of "a typical colonial character", exclusively dependent on British capital. The imperialist powers started a predatory World War in order to re-divide their colonial loot in 1939. This encouraged the development of national industry in the colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries during the World War II period. It happened so because of the stoppage of imports from the metropolis of essential food-stuff and goods for wide consumption during the War and the need of the metropolis for military strategic

raw-materials and other necessities for the conduct of war operations. It provided ample opportunities for the development of mining and raw-material industries, the building of war factories and plants in the colonies and semi-colonies by the imperialists. This facilitated the development of a number of small industrial enterprises of a manufacturing type, the growth of domestic industry and trade. Yet the Indian industry was fundamentally colonial in character. So Stalin observed :

"It is imperialism's special method to develop industry in colonies in such a way that it is chained to the imperialist metropolis." (Collected Works, Vol. VIII). Upto the early fifties, India was somewhat an industrially developed colony of the classical type. The metallurgical industry developed, particularly on the eve of the Second World War.

The cotton and jute industries arose during the second half of the last century and are the most developed branches of Indian industry. Particularly for the colonies and semi-colonies in Asia, the textile industry remains a "strategic sector" of their economies, not only in meeting their internal consumption, but as a major earner of foreign exchange. Cotton textiles are placed high among the important foreign exchange earners for India, next only to jute and tea. Manubhai Shah, in 1967, said, "From all accounts, it is quite obvious that the Indian cotton textile industry is a sick industry. There are numerous reasons for this but the main cause has been that this industry is a very old one in our country due to the lack of a rational import policy for textile machinery in the past. Indian textile mills today are virtually a zoo of all types of textile machinery produced in the world." ('Commerce', Nov. 11, 1967).

During 1951-66, the total production of cloth by the mills and the so-called "decentralised" sectors went up from 4740 million metres to 7,336 million metres, an increase of 2,596 million metres. But exports actually fell from 669

million metres to 424 million metres. Of the cloth produced by mills, scarcely 10 to 11% was exported, and the balance of 89 to 90% was consumed within the country. This is the fate of the "strategic" industry whose share was 32.6% (at 1960-61 prices) of the total value added in manufacturing.

Following the cotton textile and jute industries, the metallurgical industry had its modest beginnings on the eve of the First World War. The production of iron and steel given below will show the position of steel industry, which is the basis of heavy industries.

#### In Thousand Tons

Year	Pig Iron	Finished Steel
1916	—	99
1939	18,35	8,48
1947	13,20	8,93
1961	49,75	28,10
1965 (provisional)	69,56	45,32

Until 1958, the production of pig iron and finished steel was a monopoly of two big industrial groups. These monopolist industrial groups in turn were absolutely in the clutches of the Anglo-U.S. imperialists. The monopolist trend in this sector of basic industry in no way changed the comprador characteristics of the big bourgeoisie.

Since the early sixties, the picture has changed a little. Steel plants were established in the state sector at Durgapur, Rourkella and Bhilai with the "aid" of Britain, West Germany and the Soviet Union. This too has not rendered any independent character to the Indian big bourgeoisie. It has increased only the monopoly of Soviet capital in the state sector. Iron and steel, oil, chemicals and other industries are virtually controlled by the Anglo-U.S. imperialists and the Soviet neo-colonialists. Industrial production in India comprises less than 20% of the total value of the

entire production of India. This magnitude is very meagre when compared to the industrial production of advanced capitalist countries, despite the fact that approximately one-sixth of the whole world's population lives in India.

The breakdown of the thenet national output given below will clearly assert that the development of the Indian industry is insignificant. This is because agriculture is predominant. Therefore, the Indian industry is basically semi-colonial.

#### Breakdown of net national output (1948-49 prices)

	(Percentage Distribution)	
	1948-49	1962-63
1. Agriculture, animal husbandry and ancillary activities.	49.1	43.4
2. Mining, Manufacturing and small enterprises.	17.1	17.3
3. Commerce, Transport and Communications.	18.5	19.7
4. Other Services.	15.5	20.2
Total :	100.0	100.0

(Source : Central Statistical Organisation)

This is a clear evidence that the Indian industry has changed little from the days of direct colonial rule of Britain. The facts show that the growth of India's industrial production and commerce is insignificant.

The Second World War encouraged the growth of chemical industry, which was non-existent in India before. The sugar, food-stuff and leather industries too had a significant improvement during the period between the two World Wars. The output of coal rose from 32.0 million tons in 1950-51 to 97.0 million tons in 1965-66. The share of different industries in value added by manufacturing in India is as follows :

#### Value added in Manufacturing (at 1960-61 prices)

	1960-61 Rs. crore.	% share in total value added.	1965-66 Rs. crore.	% share in total value added.
Food products	124.2	14.6	145.1	11.3
Textile products	277.4	32.6	298.9	23.2
Paper, Wood etc. products	56.7	6.7	92.3	7.2
Rubber and leather products	24.6	2.9	39.6	3.1
Non-metallic mineral products	57.1	6.7	79.6	6.2
Chemical and chemical products	60.3	7.1	121.6	9.4
Basic metals and other primary products	86.0	10.1	154.6	12.0
Electrical engineering and equipment	30.3	3.6	60.6	—
Transport equipment	84.2	9.9	166.2	12.9
Machinery	41.9	4.9	115.8	9.0
Miscellaneous	8.5	1.0	14.1	1.1
	851.2	100.0	1288.4	100.0

(Source : Perspective Planning Division,  
Planning Commission)

The above table makes it clear that the machine-building industry, which is "the foundation of real industrialisation and the basis of economic independence of the country", is practically insignificant. "In fact, in the implementation of these plans, the shortfalls in India appear to have been greater in machine-building than in almost any other sector. If a broad distinction is drawn between industries manufacturing the simpler types of machinery and equipment and "heavy machine-building industry", it is also evident that whatever progress has been recorded has been mainly in the

former. Indeed, output levels achieved in the latter category by 1965-66 were only a fraction of the levels which it was presumably thought possible to achieve even a few years ago. It is not therefore surprising that India is still dependent on imports for meeting well over two-fifths (possibly one-half) of its total annual requirements of machinery and equipment" (K. N. Raj, "India, Pakistan and China—Economic Growth and Outlook", 1967).

The development of industry in India, as in the case of any other colony or semi-colony, *assumed distorted forms and is of one-sided character*. It was so during the days of the Britisher's rule and continues to be so even after two decades.

The Indian industry continues to find itself chained to the British, U.S. and Soviet capital. The strained financial conditions during the War years had helped the Indian capitalists to acquire the shares of a number of British enterprises. At the end of the Second World War, the Britishers were able to regain and consolidate again the prestige of British capital in India. The Indian bourgeoisie, not only the commercial but also the big industrial bourgeoisie, were being well controlled by the British imperialists through diverse threads. These connections were established and strengthened through the credit system.

The so-called 'Managing Agencies' were "the special forms of the subservience of Indian industry" to the Anglo-U.S. imperialists. The Anglo-U.S. imperialists are obstructing by all means the industrial development of India. Balabushevich observed in 1949 :

"The policy of British imperialism which invariably aimed at holding back the industrial development of India could not, of course, provoke anything but the dissatisfaction of the Indian bourgeoisie. There existed serious differences between the Indian bourgeoisie and British imperialism. Nevertheless, the Indian bourgeoisie, which from its very birth was closely linked with British capital and feudal reaction inside the country, was not capable of or inclined towards any kind of struggle against imperialism." With the replacement of British investments by

U.S.-Soviet investments, the Indian scene underwent little change. Anyhow, the contradiction between the imperialists and the Indian big bourgeoisie has never been an antagonistic one. The very threat of revolution at home can never drag the big comprador bourgeoisie to the brink of making it antagonistic in future.

The following data will rightly locate India's position among the other colonies and semi-colonies in Asia :

	Per capita income in dollars	Industrial labour force (per cent)	National income from industry (per cent)	Per capita income from industry (dollars)
India	63.19	9.57	17	10.74
Indonesia	49.93	—	10	4.99
Burma	48.20	18.43	14	6.74
Ceylon	117.52	10.29	5	5.87
Pakistan	49.80	10.79	12	5.97
Thailand	102.27	10.00	15	15.34
Philippines	160.89	12.14	19	30.56
Turkey	165.00	6.51	16	26.40
Syria	113.71	—	15	20.59

(Source : "The Dollar and Asia" by R.A. Ulyanovksy)

It is clearly revealed that India's position among these satellites of Anglo-U.S.-Soviet alliance is in no way better.

The labour force in India is still small in number. The employment of population in different branches of economy in India and the developed capitalist countries is as follows :

Branch	Percent				
	India 1951	U.S.A. 1950	Britain 1950	Canada 1951	Japan 1951
Agriculture	71.9	12.5	5.0	19.4	48.7
Industry	1.8	30.6	43.1	29.3	17.3
Construction	1.0	6.4	6.2	6.6	4.0
Transport and Communication	1.5	7.7	7.8	7.4	5.0
Trade	5.1	19.0	14.1	16.5	11.8
Services	10.8	23.8	23.8	20.8	13.2

(Ibid)

When the reality stands so, how can the question of India being independent arise? It is still industrially dependent and predominantly agricultural. The annual average earning of a factory worker was Rs. 1,036 in 1951 and Rs. 1,407 in 1961. The living condition of the workers is going from bad to worse. The number of unemployed, enlisted on the live registers of unemployed, hit 26,80,805 in August 1964. The vast stratum of the unemployed population stands as surplus labour. Naturally, this has its bad effect on the wages of other workers.

#### Foreign Investments :

The continued plunder of the colonies and semi-colonies by foreign capital stands as the major obstacle to their economic development. The growth of national capital is stunted. The repatriated profit is reinvested so as to give a boost to their plunder. "The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilisation lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked." (Marx)

The foreign investments in India are given below :

Investing country or International Financial Organisation*	( Million rupees)			1960, as compared to 1948.	
	1948	1959	1960	Sum	Percent
Great Britain	2,099.5	4,002.0	4,464	+ 2,364.5	213
United States	179.6	842.0	1,127	+ 947.4	625
West Germany	3.5	54.0	68	+ 64.5	1,945
Pakistan	121.5	42.0	—	- 79.5	35
Other investors (includes) I.B.R.D.	471.5	1,190.0	—	+ 718.5	253
	—	830.0	—	+ 830.0	3,050
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,875.6</b>	<b>6,105.0</b>	<b>6,905</b>	<b>+ 4,029.4</b>	<b>241</b>
Share of U.S. percentage.	6.2	13.3	16.3	—	—
Share of Britain percentage	73.0	66.5	64.6	—	—

The outstanding foreign investment at the end of 1960 in the petroleum industry was Rs. 152.4 crores, in manufacturing Rs. 289.4 crores and in others Rs. 690.5 crore.

Lenin said :

"Since we are speaking of colonial policy in the epoch of capitalist imperialism, it must be observed that finance capital and its foreign policy, which is the struggle of great powers for the economic and political division of the world, give rise to a number of *transitional* forms of state dependence. Not only are the two main groups of countries, those owning colonies, and the colonies themselves, but also the diverse forms of dependent countries which, politically, are formally independent, but in fact, are enmeshed in the net of financial and diplomatic dependence, are typical of this epoch. We have already referred to one form of dependence—the semi-colony. Another example is provided by Argentina.

"South America, and especially Argentina', writes Schulze-Gaevernitz in his work on British imperialism, 'is so dependent financially on London that it ought to be described as almost a British commercial colony'...Schulze estimated the amount of British capital invested in Argentina at 8,750 million francs. It is not difficult to imagine what strong connections British finance capital (and its faithful "friend", diplomacy) thereby acquires with the Argentine bourgeoisie, with the circles that control the whole of that country's economic and political life.

"A somewhat different form of financial and diplomatic dependence, accompanied by political independence, is presented by Portugal. Portugal is an independent sovereign state. In actual fact, however, for more than two hundred years, since the war of Spanish Succession (1701-14), it has been a British protectorate. Great Britain has protected Portugal and her colonies in order to fortify her own positions in the fight against her rivals, Spain and France. In return Great Britain has received

commercial privileges, preferential conditions for importing goods and especially capital into Portugal and the Portuguese colonies, the right to use the ports and islands of Portugal, her telegraph cables, etc. Relations of this kind have always existed between big and little states, but in the epoch of capitalist imperialism they become a general system, they form part of the sum total of 'divide the world' relations and become links in the chain of operations of world finance capital." (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*)

The whole world is divided into a handful of usurer states, whose main strength lies in the quantum of export of capital, and the vast majority of debtor states. The bonds between the creditor and the debtor are stronger and more firm than the relations between the buyer and the seller. The United States which has grabbed Britain, W. Germany, Japan and other imperialists with its tentacles of financial and economic dependence, has gradually encroached upon the colonies held by these imperialist powers. With a much bigger usury capital disseminated in the form of "aid", "subsidies", "loan" and "assistance", it is able to devour at a higher rate the colonies and semi-colonies of other imperialist powers. It is just dislodging Britain and other imperialist powers from their former spheres of influence and have subordinated them to the positions of its "vassals". The Marshallisation of the European imperialist metropolitan countries converted them more and more into satellites of U.S. imperialism. Such a 'rentier' or usury state, as Lenin observes, is one of the tendencies of imperialism, in which "the bourgeoisie to an ever-increasing degree lives on the proceeds of capital exports and by "clipping coupons." (Lenin)

When the reality stands like this, the neo-revisionists in the leadership of the CPI(M) strain themselves so much to refute the assessment of the Communist Party of China

that India is semi-colonial and semi-feudal. The imperialists, who face militant opposition everywhere, devise new methods of thuggery to keep plundering the oppressed masses of the world. While retaining their policy of war and intervention, they deceptively act as though they have given up the old gun-boat diplomacy and begin to talk of help and "aid" to the so-called independent countries, which were either their former direct colonies or present semi-colonies. They make a sham separation of the economic dependence of those countries from their political and military dependence. They hold that these countries are economically dependent but "independent" politically. This is new type of colonialism. They can no more continue fooling the revolutionary masses of the world. The peoples of the world are realising that often "the imperialist interventions are being carried out under the pretext of 'aid,' 'support,' 'defence' and with pious references to the United Nations Organisation."

#### *Foreign Aid :*

The post-war foreign capital found an impetus for its penetration into India. The U.S. exports to India rose from 7.4% in 1938 to 30.3% in 1947 and stood as equal to Britain's exports which stood at 30.2% of the total Indian imports. "American monopoly capital is not the dominating force in the private sector of the Indian economy. This creates a peculiar situation; the monopolies of the strongest imperialist power in the world today hold weaker place than Britain in the private capitalist economy of the biggest developing (!) country which is of prime strategic, political and economic importance in Asia and throughout the world." (R. A. Ulyanovsky, "The Dollar and Asia"). Further, India belongs to the sterling area with its effective system of reciprocal foreign trade preferences advantageous to British and Indian capitalists. This stays as a hindrance to U. S. capital. Yet, being the leader of the imperialist

camp, it should allow its partners to continue their loot within their zones of influence. Such is the fate of India. With all the jugglings of a revisionist, Ulyanovsky continues: "Investment by British monopolies in India is slowing down and their share is now more or less stable. At the same time, the American monopolies are becoming more active and their share is growing, it mounted at a much faster rate in the second half of the 12-year period than in the first. So far these tendencies have not brought about (and they can hardly bring about in the near future) a radical change in the share of Britain and the United States in foreign investment in the private sector of the Indian economy, but a change in favour of the U.S. monopolies is definitely in the making." (Ibid).

The following are the details of loans and subsidies received by India (except from the Soviet Union and East European countries) upto the end of 1962 :

Country or financial organisation	Million Rupees	
	Loans	Subsidies
1. United States (without food loans)	7,519	1,406
On account of food deliveries under PL 665 and PL 480		
Ford Foundation	8,007	3,875
Rockefeller Foundation	—	172
2. IBRD and IDA	—	67
3. Special UN Fund	4,95	—
4. Britain	—	48
5. France	2,493	9
6. West Germany	778	—
7. Italy	2,648	21
8. Japan	214	—
9. Switzerland	705	—
10. Netherlands	120	—
11. Canada	2	—
12. Australia	276	1,128
13. New Zealand	—	160
14. Norway	—	34
	—	35
<b>TOTAL :</b>	<b>27,667</b>	<b>7,385</b>

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association are the financial institutions virtually controlled by the United States. They are chiefly used as the political and economic instruments of the United States to keep its neo-colonies under its control. Thus, "Capitalism, which began its development with petty usury capital, is ending its development with gigantic usury capital." (Lenin).

In the last ten years the U.S. came up as the main creditor of India. The export of U.S. official and state capital, together with the loans of IBRD, the Export-Import Bank and other organisations and foundations, runs to Rs. 20,000 million. This is six times the magnitude of the total investment of Britain in India. By the by, the heavy burden of servicing the foreign debt has reached high dimensions.

## Comrade Mao Tse-tung's Teachings on People's War Is the Indonesian People's Powerful Weapon

PUBLISHED in 1967 were the Indonesian versions of various works by Comrade Mao Tse-tung which are extremely valuable to the Indonesian people's revolutionary struggle. They include the red booklet "Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung", "Chairman Mao Tse-tung on People's War" and the first volume of the "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung". Another extremely important collection, the Indonesian version of the "Selected Military Writings of Mao Tse-tung" was published at the beginning of 1968. The Indonesian Communists and the revolutionary people of Indonesia warmly hail the publication of this work much needed in our struggle. The publication of this book is really a tremendous internationalist aid from the great Chinese people and the glorious Chinese Communist Party, under the leadership of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, to the armed struggle now being developed by the Indonesian people under the leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party for smashing the Suharto-Nasution fascist military regime and for setting up the people's democratic power in Indonesia.

Having learnt a profound lesson through the experiences gained in blood by the Indonesian people in past struggles, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party in a "Self-Criticism" document published in September 1966, stressed: "To achieve its complete victory, the Indonesian revolution must also follow the road of the Chinese revolution." The

Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party in a statement published on May 23, 1967, entitled "Holding High the Banner of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's Thought, Advance Further Along the Road of the Revolution!", further pointed out: "The Indonesian Marxist-Leninists unhesitatingly recognise Mao Tse-tung's thought as the peak of Marxism-Leninism in the present era, and are determined to study and use it as an effective weapon in the struggle for the liberation of Indonesia, which inevitably will have to follow the road of people's war as shown by Comrade Mao Tse-tung."

Comrade Mao Tse-tung's theory on people's war is of great universal significance. It points out the only road that the oppressed people of the world, particularly the Asian, African and Latin American people, must traverse in their struggle for emancipation. This theory is an extremely important part of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's teachings which develop Marxism-Leninism. This theory is an important component part of Mao Tse-tung's thought and also all-round, systematic and most complete Marxist-Leninist military science. This theory not only gives the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations confidence and courage to dare to wage a people's war, but also solves the question of how to wage a people's war and how to win victory. Chairman Mao Tse-tung's theory on people's war enables us to realize deeply that: "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." The only way to bring our revolutionary armed struggle to victory is: Under the leadership of the political party of the proletariat, to arouse the peasant masses in the countryside to wage guerrilla war, unfold an agrarian revolution, build rural base areas, use the countryside to encircle the cities and finally capture the cities and liberate the whole country. This theory comprises a whole series of comprehensive theses on the founding of a people's army which serves whole-heartedly the cause of the proletariat, and it teaches

## Comrade Mao Tse-tung's Teachings on People's War Is the Indonesian People's Powerful Weapon

PUBLISHED in 1967 were the Indonesian versions of various works by Comrade Mao Tse-tung which are extremely valuable to the Indonesian people's revolutionary struggle. They include the red booklet "Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung", "Chairman Mao Tse-tung on People's War" and the first volume of the "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung". Another extremely important collection, the Indonesian version of the "Selected Military Writings of Mao Tse-tung" was published at the beginning of 1968. The Indonesian Communists and the revolutionary people of Indonesia warmly hail the publication of this work much needed in our struggle. The publication of this book is really a tremendous internationalist aid from the great Chinese people and the glorious Chinese Communist Party, under the leadership of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, to the armed struggle now being developed by the Indonesian people under the leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party for smashing the Suharto-Nasution fascist military regime and for setting up the people's democratic power in Indonesia.

Having learnt a profound lesson through the experiences gained in blood by the Indonesian people in past struggles, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party in a "Self-Criticism" document published in September 1966, stressed: "To achieve its complete victory, the Indonesian revolution must also follow the road of the Chinese revolution." The

Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party in a statement published on May 23, 1967, entitled "Holding High the Banner of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's Thought, Advance Further Along the Road of the Revolution!", further pointed out: "The Indonesian Marxist-Leninists unhesitatingly recognise Mao Tse-tung's thought as the peak of Marxism-Leninism in the present era, and are determined to study and use it as an effective weapon in the struggle for the liberation of Indonesia, which inevitably will have to follow the road of people's war as shown by Comrade Mao Tse-tung."

Comrade Mao Tse-tung's theory on people's war is of great universal significance. It points out the only road that the oppressed people of the world, particularly the Asian, African and Latin American people, must traverse in their struggle for emancipation. This theory is an extremely important part of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's teachings which develop Marxism-Leninism. This theory is an important component part of Mao Tse-tung's thought and also all-round, systematic and most complete Marxist-Leninist military science. This theory not only gives the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations confidence and courage to dare to wage a people's war, but also solves the question of how to wage a people's war and how to win victory. Chairman Mao Tse-tung's theory on people's war enables us to realize deeply that: "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." The only way to bring our revolutionary armed struggle to victory is: Under the leadership of the political party of the proletariat, to arouse the peasant masses in the countryside to wage guerrilla war, unfold an agrarian revolution, build rural base areas, use the countryside to encircle the cities and finally capture the cities and liberate the whole country. This theory comprises a whole series of comprehensive theses on the founding of a people's army which serves whole-heartedly the cause of the proletariat, and it teaches

us to adopt the strategy and tactics of complete reliance on the people and bringing into full play the superiority of people's war. This theory is also a thesis on the building and role of the Communist Party, the force at the core leading the cause of the people's liberation.

At present, the study of the military writings of Comrade Mao Tse-tung is the most urgent task of the Communists and revolutionary people of Indonesia, so that they can really master Chairman Mao's teachings on people's war and apply it creatively under the specific conditions of the Indonesian revolution, thoroughly liquidate the various errors of the Right opportunist and revisionist old line, and overcome various "Left" and Right erroneous tendencies which may possibly crop up in the protracted struggle to seize victory. Therefore, the publication of the Indonesian version of the "Selected Military Writings of Mao Tse-tung" has indeed met the urgent needs of the Indonesian people's struggle.

The Communist Party and revolutionary people of Indonesia through their experiences in struggle in the past decades have come to realise deeply the correctness of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's teaching. This teaching is: "Experience in the class struggle in the era of imperialism teaches us that it is only by the power of the gun that the working class and the labouring masses can defeat the armed bourgeoisie and landlords." Particularly the experiences and lessons of the Indonesian Communist Party in the period from 1951 to 1965 and the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of Communists and progressive people since the third white terror perpetrated since October 1965 by the Suharto-Nasution fascist military dictatorial rule have proved most clearly the complete bankruptcy of all revisionist illusions such as "peaceful transition", "the parliamentary road" or the "lawful road". Since it began to abandon armed struggle in 1950 in exchange for a legal status and a place in parliament,

the Indonesian Communist Party had sunk deeper and deeper into the quagmire of "peaceful road" and of Right opportunism and revisionism. As a result the people were caught completely unprepared in face of the barbarous attacks of the reactionaries who had been sharpening their swords for a long time. In accordance with this experience and lesson gained in blood, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party summed up in its "Self-Criticism": "The Indonesian revolution must inevitably adopt this main form of struggle, namely, the people's armed struggle against the armed counter-revolution which, in essence, is the armed agrarian revolution of the peasants under the leadership of the proletariat."

In taking the road of armed struggle according to the teachings of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the question of setting up revolutionary base areas is a very important question. Chairman Mao teaches us: "As a rule, revolution starts, grows and triumphs first in those places in which the counter-revolutionary forces are comparatively weak..." Revolution starts and triumphs first in places where the enemy's forces are weak—this is a great guiding strategic thought of Chairman Mao. By following this guiding strategic thought, a solution can be found to the question of the establishment of revolutionary rural base areas, namely, the establishment of "an armed independent regime of workers and peasants" under the condition of encirclement by reactionary state power. This will enable the revolutionary force which is weak in the beginning to hold out under the encirclement by counter-revolutionary forces, to temper and develop itself and finally to completely smash the enemy. The establishment of revolutionary base areas means the establishment of the prototype of a state. Therefore, a base area cannot be established through peaceful means but in the course of smashing and defeating the enemy through fierce and unintermittent armed

struggle. Success of this struggle can be achieved only by fully arousing the masses, particularly the peasant masses and by unfolding an agrarian revolution. Therefore, armed struggle as the main form, agrarian revolution as the main content and the establishment of base areas as the mainstay are the three integral aspects in Chairman Mao's thought on "an armed independent regime of workers and peasants".

To master and apply Comrade Mao Tse-tung's thesis on the establishment of revolutionary rural base areas is the urgent task of the Communists and revolutionary people of Indonesia. The establishment of base areas is of important strategic significance to the revolution. It is the way along which revolution proceeds from seizing political power in a region to seizing political power in the whole country. Therefore, it is the only way to achieve victory in revolution. It is just as Comrade Mao Tse-tung has stressed in his brilliant writing "A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire" (January, 1930): "Only thus is it possible to build the confidence of the revolutionary masses throughout the country, as the Soviet Union has built it throughout the world. Only thus is it possible to create tremendous difficulties for the reactionary ruling classes, shake their foundations and hasten their internal disintegration. Only thus is it really possible to create a red army which will become the chief weapon for the great revolution of the future. In short, only thus is it possible to hasten the revolutionary high tide." In the past, the revisionist "theory of the method of combining the three forms of struggle" spread this point of view, namely, Indonesia does not possess all the conditions required for the unfolding of guerrilla war. The revisionists dreamt of the coming of a nation-wide revolutionary crisis, and of achieving victory in the whole country simultaneously and easily through the method of combining "peasants' struggle in the countryside", "workers' struggle in the cities" with "work within the armed forces of the enemy".

But, without the revolutionary rural base areas, the work in the cities and other fields will have no backing and will be fruitless. The "theory of the method of combining the three forms of struggle", in essence, negated the necessity and possibility of the setting up of revolutionary rural base areas in Indonesia, thus liquidating revolutionary armed struggle. The "theory of the method of combining the three forms of struggle" also spread the illusion of relying on enemy troops. This actually denied the necessity of building up a people's army under the absolute leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party. At present, a small handful of renegades from the Indonesian Communist Party who have the support of the Soviet revisionists are doing everything they can to persist and continue in carrying into effect the idea of "combining the three forms of struggle" in an attempt to sabotage the Indonesian revolutionary people's armed struggle. The Communists and revolutionary people of Indonesia must resolutely eliminate all remnant influence of the "method of combining the three forms of struggle" and take the road of people's war as shown by Mao Tse-tung, rely on the peasants in setting up rural base areas, use the countryside to encircle the cities and finally seize the cities and the state power. The "self-criticism" of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party stressed: "The Indonesian Marxist-Leninists must firmly reject the revisionist 'peace road', reject the 'theory of the method of combining the three forms of struggle', and hold aloft the banner of armed people's revolution. Following the example of the great Chinese people's revolution, the Indonesian Marxist-Leninists must establish revolutionary base areas; they must 'turn the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political, economic and cultural bastions of the revolution'."

The people's war is the most effective weapon in opposing the imperialists and all reactionaries. The brilliant

history of the struggle waged by the Chinese people under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and Chairman Mao Tse-tung has proved this point. The people's war now developing in Viet Nam, Laos, Burma, Thailand and other countries has also clearly proved this point. In South Viet Nam, the U.S. imperialist aggressors, armed with all weapons of the latest types, are suffering one defeat after another and are being driven into a passive position under the pressure of the people's armed forces led by the South Viet Nam National Front for Liberation. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has pointed out incisively that the victory of the Vietnamese people's war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation "once again demonstrates that a nation, big or small, can defeat any enemy, however powerful, so long as it fully arouses its people, firmly relies on them and wages a people's war."

At present, the Indonesian revolutionary people, under the leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party, have already taken up arms and declared war upon the Suharto-Nasution fascist military regime. The fire of armed struggle is already burning in Kalimantan, Java, Sumatra and Sulawesi and other major islands. Certainly, there are still many difficulties confronting the Indonesian people and their armed struggle is a protracted one. However, just as Comrade Mao Tse-tung has taught us: "All reactionaries are paper tigers. In appearance, the reactionaries are terrifying, but in reality they are not so powerful. From a long-term point of view, it is not the reactionaries but the people who are really powerful."

At the present stage of the Indonesian people's struggle, the publication of the Indonesian version of the "Selected Military Writings of Mao Tse-tung" comes as an invaluable internationalist aid from the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people to the Indonesian Communist Party and the Indonesian revolutionary people; the Indonesian Communists and the Indonesian people will firmly grasp

Chairman Mao Tse-tung's teachings on people's war, the powerful weapon with which to smash the Suharto-Nasution fascist military regime and to set up the people's democratic power in Indonesia.

Chairman Mao has taught us: "A revolutionary war is a mass undertaking; it is often not a matter of first learning and then doing, but of doing and then learning, for doing is itself learning." The armed counter-revolution staged by the Suharto-Nasution fascist military regime which is stained with the blood of hundreds of thousands of patriots has roused the Indonesian people to wage an armed revolutionary struggle under the leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party. Through grasping Comrade Mao Tse-tung's teachings on people's war, the Indonesian people will "learn warfare through warfare," kindle the flames of people's war throughout the country, burn up all the reactionaries on the Indonesian soil and build a free and democratic new Indonesia.

Smash the Suharto-Nasution fascist military regime with People's War!

Long live the great thought of Mao Tse-tung!

Long live Chairman Mao Tse-tung—the greatest Marxist-Leninist of the present era, the most respected and beloved leader of the revolutionary people of the whole world!

---

The Delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia has published the above article—the full title of which is "Comrade Mao Tse-tung's Teachings on People's War is the Indonesian People's Powerful Weapon For Smashing the Suharto-Nasution Fascist military Regime and Establishing the People's Democratic Power in Indonesia"—hailing the publication of the Indonesian version of the "Selected Military Writings of Mao Tse-tung."

## A Nuclear Fraud Jointly Hatched by the United States and the Soviet Union

This article by the Commentator of "Renmin Ribao" was published on June 13, 1968. The Commentator writes:

**M**ANIPULATED by the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the so-called "treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" on June 12. This is a significant step by U.S. imperialism to intensify its counter-revolutionary global strategy and a grave crime of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique in selling out the interests of the people of the world. It is a big plot and a big fraud of the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists in their counter-revolutionary global collusion. The Chinese people firmly oppose it.

The so-called "treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" was produced solely to meet the common counter-revolutionary needs of the U.S. and Soviet nuclear overlords. Today, as the waves of the people's revolution are surging violently throughout the world and the revolutionary forces of the world's people have grown stronger than ever, U.S. imperialism and its chief accomplice, the Soviet revisionist clique, are finding themselves in increasingly dire straits. To save themselves from defeat and destruction, they are bound to collude with each other ever more closely to strengthen their anti-China, anti-communist, anti-people and counter-revolutionary alliance. The chieftains of the U.S. ruling circles have publicly described the "treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" as the "child" of U.S.-Soviet co-operation. They find it "encouraging" that in the world today the United States and the

Soviet Union are able to "move forward" together. These confessions vividly reveal how badly U.S. imperialism needs the services of the Soviet revisionist clique and to what extent the latter's betrayal has catered to the wishes of U.S. imperialism!

What sort of thing is this "treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons"? To put it bluntly, it is something imposed on the non-nuclear states to bind them hand and foot. Under this treaty, the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists are not only allowed to produce and stockpile nuclear weapons and increase the number of their nuclear bases; they also undertake no commitment whatsoever not to use nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear states. The latter, on the other hand, are totally deprived of their right to develop nuclear weapons for self-defence and are even restricted in their use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. As the saying goes, "the magistrates are allowed to burn down houses while the common people are forbidden even to light lamps." In reality, this is tantamount to a demand that other countries accept for ever the U.S. imperialist and Soviet revisionist position of nuclear monopoly and place themselves at their mercy. This thoroughly unequal treaty dished up by the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists is even more unscrupulous and outrageous than the "tripartite treaty" they cooked up five years ago.

In concocting this treaty, the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists aim at maintaining their nuclear monopoly and stepping up their preparations for nuclear warfare so as to carry out nuclear blackmail against other countries, in a more unbridled way. Far from reducing the nuclear threat against other countries, this treaty has therefore greatly increased it. The U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists have gone so far as to describe the treaty as "measures to safeguard the security of peoples." What arrant nonsense!

While trotting out this "treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons," the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists, in collaboration with Britain, worked out an "agreement" in which they declared that so-called "nuclear protection" would be given to the non-nuclear states which subscribe to this treaty. As a matter of fact, they want to use such a trick to turn other countries into their "protectorates" so as to control and enslave them at will. This is a glaring manifestation of the power politics played by U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism.

It must be pointed out that this nuclear fraud of U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism is also a component part of their anti-China plot. They not only want to fan up anti-China feelings internationally through the so-called "treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" but also want to accelerate the rigging up of an anti-China encirclement by providing their "nuclear umbrella" to India and other countries bordering China. The U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists have thus taken a big step forward in their military collaboration against China.

For several years, the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists have taken great pains to lure and coerce other countries into accepting the "treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons." However, many countries have firmly opposed this big fraud. Even some countries under U.S. imperialist control are unwilling to support it for a variety of reasons. Taking stock of the unfavourable situation that confronts them, the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists have resorted to a deceptive trick by stipulating in the "draft treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" that it will "enter into force" once it has been ratified by a mere forty countries besides the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain. How ridiculous and pitiable! Isn't this a clear indication that the two nuclear overlords, U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism, like the sun setting beyond the western hills, are in their decline?

Our great leader Chairman Mao has pointed out, "Those who refuse to be enslaved will never be cowed by the atom bombs and hydrogen bombs in the hands of the U.S. imperialists. The raging tide of the people of the world against the U.S. aggressors is irresistible. Their struggle against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys will assuredly win still greater victories."

The U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists are incorrigible devotees of nuclear fetishism. They believe that with a scrap of paper such as "treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons," they will be able to preserve their nuclear monopoly and, on the strength of the nuclear weapons in their hands, to hold back the tide of the revolution of the world's people. This is day-dreaming pure and simple! The nuclear monopoly held by the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists was broken long ago and will certainly be broken again. Their nuclear weapons can neither suppress the revolutionary struggles of the people of the world, nor resolve the profound political and economic crises confronting them, nor alleviate the sharpening contradictions within the imperialist and the revisionist blocs. In a word, their nuclear weapons cannot save them from their doom. **"The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history."** Such things as atom and hydrogen bombs in the hands of the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists will, in the end, be buried together with their possessors by the people of the world!

## Nuclear Blackmail Broken

THE People's Republic of China has been attacked with monotonous regularity for refusing to join the nuclear police force organised by the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Now these powers have jointly put a non-proliferation treaty before the U.N. General Assembly in an effort to persuade non-nuclear member states to shelter under their combined umbrella. But over the years China's policy on nuclear weapons, which is basic to her difference with the U.S.S.R., has been vindicated by events.

Mao's much-quoted saying that 'The atom bomb is a paper tiger which the U.S. reactionaries use to scare people' was not only a direct challenge to the U.S. policy of nuclear blackmail. It also came as a shock to western intellectuals falling for the propaganda that mankind could destroy itself in an accidentally triggered-off nuclear holocaust. Fear of the bomb became the touchstone of 'liberal humanism' and was held accountable for the eat-drink-and-be-merry-for-tomorrow-we-die morals of a whole generation. The bomb, not as an instrument of U.S. imperialist aggression but as a thing-in-itself which must somehow be propitiated, dominated the literature of this period and was the focal point of 'peace movements'. These did not seek to disarm U.S. imperialism by exposing the policy of nuclear blackmail but in effect urged restraint on the *victims* of U.S. imperialism by begging them not to 'rock the boat' at the risk of precipitating nuclear catastrophe.

### Inanimate Arbiter ?

This elevation of the bomb in people's minds to an inanimate arbiter of events was a striking example of what Marx calls 'commodity fetishism', the illusion, prevalent in

Reprinted from "The Broadsheet" of May, 1968

capitalist societies, that things, not men, make history and determine the fate of peoples. It is what gives rise to all the fantasies of machines taking over, of computers arrogating to themselves the role of decision-makers. It is a useful cover for the class of imperialist exploiters who can pretend, for example, that the poverty of colonial peoples is a result of the natural movement of the prices of *things* independent of any human agency.

Mao Tse-tung exploded this myth and put the bomb firmly in its place. 'Of course, the atom bomb is a weapon of mass slaughter, but the outcome of a war is decided by the people, not by one or two new types of weapon.' This insistence that people are more important than weapons, than *things*, is the true humanistic position. It is the position not of *liberal* humanism which, in decrying war as such, sides with the oppressors who wish to go on exploiting the world's peoples 'peacefully', but of revolutionary humanism which supports the right of the world's peoples to throw off the yoke of imperialist oppression in national liberation struggles.

### Joint Hegemony

In fact, throughout the period of U.S. nuclear blackmail people *have* dared to free themselves from imperialist domination without the dire consequences foretold. The Chinese people completed their revolutionary war of liberation by totally defeating the U.S.-backed forces of Chiang Kai-shek; the Korean people with China's support prevented the U.S. from conquering their country; the Vietnamese people drove out the French colonialists who were armed by the U.S.; and the Algerian people freed themselves from French rule. Under the very noses of the U.S. imperialists the people of Cuba freed their country from U.S. economic exploitation. Throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America people were vindicating Mao Tse-tung's thesis that imperialism and its atom bomb were paper tigers.

In the Soviet Union the skill and energy of the people were harnessed to the task of developing a nuclear capacity in order to put a stop to U.S. threats. But by the time a hydrogen bomb had been successfully tested, the Soviet leadership under Khrushchev had opted out of the world revolutionary struggle against imperialism and was seeking accommodation with the U.S. Instead of challenging the U.S. monopoly of these weapons of mass destruction the Soviet leadership sought to become a partner with the U.S. in using the threat of nuclear weapons to back up a joint hegemony of the world. As Khrushchov said: 'We (the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.) are the strongest countries in the world and if we unite for peace there can be no war. Then if any madman wanted war, we would but have to shake our fingers to warn him off.'

### The Price

The price the Soviet leadership was prepared to pay for declaring itself in on the nuclear monopoly became apparent at the time of the backdown over the Cuban missile crisis when it even agreed to U.S. inspection at the expense of Cuban sovereignty. At the Camp David talks with Eisenhower, Khrushchev so completely reversed the role of the Soviet Union in Stalin's day as to ally it with U.S. imperialism whose declared enemy was socialist China. This traitorous policy has resulted in the Partial Test Ban Treaty, the Non-proliferation Treaty and various other agreements and forms of collaboration directed *against* China, aimed at preserving a U.S.-U.S.S.R. monopoly of nuclear weapons to keep in 'order' a world divided up between them.

Khrushchev boasted to Eisenhower that without Soviet know-how the Chinese would be unable to develop nuclear weapons for many years. The two leaders also joined in the reactionary chorus, accusing the Chinese of jeopardising

the safety of the world by refusing to pay the tribute of fear to these weapons.

### Counter-insurgency

Meanwhile, since the U.S. policy of blackmail by mass terror had not succeeded in preventing people from waging anti-imperialist struggles, the Kennedy administration began to develop 'counter-insurgency' weapons—tactical nuclear devices, napalm and phosphorus bombs, toxic chemicals and anti-personnel weapons of all kinds—for use against colonial peoples and now, as admitted by the Pentagon, being tried out in Vietnam. The great Tet victories of the Vietnamese this spring, which have thrown U.S. ruling circles into confusion, have demonstrated even more strikingly that people are more important than weapons and that people's war is invincible.

It was against the background of U.S. nuclear intimidation and Soviet betrayal that the Chinese successfully tested a hydrogen bomb in June, 1967, making nonsense of Khrushchev's boast to Eisenhower. China had more reason than any other power to protect herself with nuclear weapons and of all the nuclear powers she alone has given a solemn undertaking never to use such weapons first. But the significance of this remarkable technological achievement is not restricted to China. Its significance for the world's peoples is that China has broken the U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear monopoly.

### Threat Lifted

It is this fact that has been hailed with joy by those everywhere who are engaged in anti-imperialist struggle. As the Vietnamese Commander-in-Chief, General Vo Nguyen Giap stated in his message of congratulation: 'It is not only a new and important step in strengthening the national defence of the People's Republic of China, and a warning to the U.S. imperialists, who are plotting to

further accelerate and expand their aggressive war, but a tremendous encouragement to the Vietnamese people in their cause against U.S. aggression and for national salvation and a tremendous encouragement of their revolutionary struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

When the Democratic People's Republic of Korea captured the U.S. spy ship *Pueblo*, the U.S., in a mid-20th century version of gunboat diplomacy, sent the nuclear-powered, nuclear-armed aircraft carrier *Enterprise* towards the Korean coast. But when it became clear that Korea was standing firm this mighty warship quietly turned and went away. China's nuclear arm is a major factor in the lifting of the threat of nuclear blackmail from the peoples of Asia, and has doubtless acted as a deterrent in U.S. discussions of the possible use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam.

It is not the bomb itself which is a threat to the world, say the Chinese. It depends on who possesses it and for what purpose. In China's hands, as General Giap says, its development is a great step forward in the revolutionary struggle for peace.

### "UNITY IN ACTION" !

'Ambassador at Large W. Averell Harriman predicted today that the Soviet Union will be ready one day to discuss with the United States "how we can both protect ourselves against China's nuclear capabilities".'

'The 75-year-old statesman said in an interview that he thought the Kremlin was "very much concerned" about Peking's nuclear progress and that this was a principal reason why the Soviet Union was anxious to get agreement on a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

'With such an agreement, he said, "We will be in the same boat and automatically be able to bring some kind of pressure on Peking" '.

—U.P.I., Washington, 4.11.67.

## U.S.-Soviet Conspiracy to Strangle Arab People's Anti-Imperialist Struggle

**W**ORKING hand in glove, U.S. imperialism and the Soviet revisionist renegade clique have been busy pushing through a so-called "political settlement" of the Middle East question in an attempt to force the Arab countries to an all-round capitulation to the U.S.-Israel aggressors. They have stepped up their plotting ever since June last year when U.S. imperialism and its tool of aggression Israel launched a large-scale war of aggression against the Arab countries and seized large tracts of Arab territories. This is a big conspiracy jointly concocted by the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists to suppress the national-liberation movement of the Arab people.

During the past year, U.S. imperialism has continued to rush arms to Israel and has instigated Israel to repeatedly make war-cries and even carry out continuous large-scale military provocations against the Arab countries, exerting military pressure on them. At the same time, U.S. imperialism has trotted out a set of proposals which, in the guise of a "political settlement," were in essence aimed at forcing the Arab countries to capitulate to the U.S.-Israeli aggressors. The main content of these proposals was embodied in the "five principles" put forward by the chieftain of U.S. imperialism Lyndon Johnson on June 19 last year. All this is a big fraud, pure and simple.

Dancing to Washington's tune, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has been collaborating with the U.S. imperialists to cook up the proposals for the so-called "political settlement." Kosygin, chief of the Soviet revisionist clique, went to the United States in June last year

and held "talks" with Johnson at Glassboro. They reached a secret agreement on the so-called "political settlement" of the Middle East issue on the basis of Johnson's "five principles." This has been followed by a lot of dirty political deals made as a result of a constant exchange of letters and cables between Moscow and Washington, continual diplomatic contacts, and direct conversations over the "hot line" between Kosygin and Johnson. They have been laying special stress on using the United Nations to put across their "political settlement" hoax. At the behest of U.S. imperialism, the "special envoy" of the United Nations Jarring scurried back and forth between Tel Aviv, Cairo, Amman and Beirut dozens of times. High-ranking delegations of the Soviet revisionist clique and Tito, Indira Gandhi and other U.S.-Soviet lackeys have all gone to the Middle East to do their utmost to help sell this fraud.

What kind of merchandise is peddled by this U.S.-Soviet "political settlement" fraud? Against whom is it directed? Who will benefit from it? The answer can easily be obtained after analysing briefly the contents of the series of "resolutions" which Washington and Moscow have dished up in the United Nations Security Council since June last year.

These "resolutions" include the three successive "ceasefire resolutions" adopted by the Security Council in June 1967, the Security Council "resolution" of November 22, 1967, and another Security Council "resolution" of April 25, 1968. These "resolutions" have several features in common:

(1) They are directed primarily against the Arab national-liberation movement. Again and again they "deplore all violent incidents," demand "termination of all claims of belligerency" and the prevention of "all violent incidents." It must be pointed out that, by their counter-revolutionary violence, Zionists have occupied Arab lands and rendered over one million Palestinian refugees homeless

and destitute for 20 years. Last year Israel again launched aggressive war against the Arab countries, seizing large tracts of land and gaining control over strategic areas. Yet after all this the United Nations waves the policeman's baton, clamouring for the prevention of "all violent incidents." Obviously it is exerting pressure upon the Arabs, especially the Palestinians, in a vain attempt to force the Palestinian people to lay down their arms and end their just armed struggle to recover the occupied territories.

(2) These "resolutions" are intended to provide legal cover for the fait accompli resulting from the Israeli aggression. They call fervently for the two sides to "cease fire." In fact they are coercing the Arab countries into unilaterally accepting a "cease-fire," thus binding the hands of the 100 million Arab people in their just struggle against aggression. At the same time, these "resolutions" try in every possible way to protect Israel and connive at its aggression. As revealed by an official of the Tito renegade clique, the secret agreement reached by Johnson and Kosygin envisage "frontier adjustments" between Israel and the Arab countries. Evidently this will allow Israel to occupy more Arab lands. All this is designed to ratify the result of the Israeli aggression as a fait accompli and make it possible for Israel, a U.S. imperialist tool of aggression, to occupy a better position strategically so as to further intimidate the Arab countries and launch new aggression against them.

(3) The November 1967 Security Council "resolution" stressed the necessity for "guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every state in the area." In appearance it looks fair and impartial, but in essence it means that the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionists have ganged up with Israel to put pressure on the Arab countries. It totally disregards their sovereignty and is another vicious trick to force them to submit to Israel and its rabid military aggression.

(4) In order to help the United States and Israel realize the objectives which they have not been able to achieve completely through their war of aggression, the U.N. "resolutions" also advocate guaranteeing "freedom of navigation through international waterways" in the area and contain other clauses in favour of Israel.

It can be seen clearly from these facts that the so-called "political settlement" cooked up jointly by the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionists is a political snare to lure and force the Arab nations into surrender. It proves once again that U.S. imperialism is the most ferocious enemy of the Arab people and that the Soviet revisionist renegade clique is the No. 1 accomplice of U.S. imperialism.

In recent years, U.S. imperialism has been plagued with difficulties at home and abroad and is finding the going tougher every day. It is being badly mauled on the Vietnam battlefield. The Afro-American struggle against violent repression is spreading far and wide. Its financial crisis is deepening daily. Under these circumstances, U.S. imperialism urgently needs to strengthen its strategic position in the Middle East and maintain its huge oil interests there. However, following the ever wider dissemination of Mao Tse-tung's thought, the Arab people are awakening with each passing day and the national-liberation movement in the Arab region is developing in depth. In particular the flames of the Palestinian people's armed struggle are raging ever more fiercely. All these have dealt deadly blows to the U.S. neo-colonialist policies in the Middle East. Hence the situation in which U.S. imperialism, more than ever needs its accomplices, the Soviet revisionists, to benumb the fighting will of the Arab countries in their struggle against imperialism and to stamp out the flames of the national-liberation movement and armed struggle in the region.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has all along been pursuing in the Middle East its counter-revolutionary revisionist general line in foreign policy—"peaceful coexistence"

between the aggressor and the victim of aggression. So as to put into effect the so-called "Tashkent spirit," it has urged the Arab people to "coexist peacefully" with their deadly enemies, U.S. imperialism and Israel. It mortally fears and bitterly hates the national-liberation movement, especially the people's armed struggle; it is afraid that the Arab people's anti-imperialist revolutionary storm might disrupt the Soviet revisionist and U.S. imperialist control and plunder of the Middle East and shatter its fond dream of "U.S.-Soviet collaboration for world domination." Through its foreign policy of capitulation and betrayal, the clique aims at complete co-ordination with U.S. imperialism to suppress the Arab national-liberation movement; it is indeed playing a role that U.S. imperialism cannot play.

Our great leader Chairman Mao has said, **"The oppressed peoples and nations must not pin their hopes for liberation on the 'sensibleness' of imperialism and its lackeys. They will only triumph by strengthening their unity and persevering in their struggle."**

The daily awakening Arab people will not be intimidated, nor will they be deceived. At recent anti-U.S. rallies, Arab masses have shouted such resounding slogans as: "What has been taken away by force must be recovered by force!" "Al Fatah" (the Palestinian liberation movement) solemnly pointed out in a recent statement in Beirut: "We reject all resolutions passed by the United Nations on Palestine." The statement said that "Al Fatah" rejects the "political settlement" fraud peddled by the U.N. "special envoy" Jarring. "We reject every formula which limits the freedom of the Palestinian people in their struggle to liberate their homeland", it said. A leading member of "Al Fatah" declared unequivocally that "Al Fatah" knows of only one formula, that is, "to wage armed struggle for the final liberation of Palestine." Another leading member said, "No matter how many difficulties we may face, we

are determined to fight till final victory." Since the beginning of this year, the Palestinian guerrillas have launched more than 200 attacks in the Israeli-occupied areas, badly battering the aggressors. This serves as a powerful rebuff to the "political settlement" swindle.

The contradictions between the Arab people on the one hand and U.S. imperialism and its accomplices on the other are irreconcilable. It is entirely wishful thinking for the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionists to imagine they can stamp out, through their "political settlement" scheme, the raging flames of the Arab people's struggle against imperialism. Today the national liberation movement in the Arab region is further developing in depth. The 700 million Chinese people armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought resolutely support the just struggle of the Arab people. So long as the 100 million Arab people closely unite and persevere in a protracted struggle, they will surmount all difficulties, defeat all enemies and achieve final victory in their struggle against imperialism.

---

*People of the whole world, unite still more closely and launch a sustained and vigorous offensive against our common enemy, U. S. imperialism, and its accomplices!*

—MAO TSE-TUNG

*The people of all countries, the masses comprising more than ninety per cent of the entire population, sooner or later want revolution and will support Marxism-Leninism. They will not support revisionism. Though some people may support revisionism for a while, they will eventually cast it aside. They are bound to awaken gradually; they are bound to oppose the imperialists and reactionaries in all countries; they are bound to oppose revisionism.*

—Mao Tse-tung

## **Premier Chou En-lai Denounces Soviet Aggression Against Czechoslovakia**

Speaking on August 23 at the National Day reception given by Rumanian Ambassador to China Aurel Duma in Peking, Premier Chou En-lai lashed out at the blatant aggression against Czechoslovakia by the Soviet social-fascists. The following is the full text of his speech:

**Respected Ambassador Aurel Duma,  
Comrades and friends,**

Today is the twenty-fourth anniversary of the liberation of the Rumanian people from the yoke of fascism. On behalf of the Chinese people and government, I extend warm congratulations to the Rumanian people and government.

Twenty-four years ago, the Rumanian Communist Party led the people in staging an armed uprising and overthrowing the reactionary Antonescu regime, thus opening a new chapter in Rumanian history. Making use of their national resources and relying on their own efforts, the Rumanian people and their leaders have scored significant successes in the cause of building their motherland in the past twenty-four years. We wish the Rumanian people new successes in the struggle to defend and build their motherland with greater industry and courage.

Comrades and friends! A few days ago, the Soviet revisionist leading clique and its followers brazenly dispatched large number of armed forces to launch a surprise attack on Czechoslovakia and swiftly occupied it with the Czechoslovak revisionist leading clique openly calling on the people not to resist, thus perpetrating towering crimes against the Czechoslovak people.

This is 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 marks the total bankruptcy of Soviet modern revisionism.

The Chinese government and people strongly condemn the Soviet revisionist leading clique and its followers for their crime of aggression—the armed occupation of Czechoslovakia and firmly support the Czechoslovak people in their heroic struggle of resistance to Soviet military occupation.

Over a long period of time, modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist leading clique as its centre has been beset with internal contradictions and riddled with crises. The aim of the Soviet revisionist leading clique in brazenly invading and occupying Czechoslovakia is to prevent the Czechoslovak revisionist leading clique from directly hiring itself out to the western countries headed by U.S. imperialism and to prevent this state of affairs from leading to uncontrollable chain reactions. This is the inevitable result of the great-power chauvinism and national egoism practised by the Soviet revisionist leading clique; it is the inevitable result of Khrushchov revisionism practised by the Soviet revisionist clique of renegades over the years.

Discarding all its fig-leaves of what it calls "Marxism-Leninism" and "internationalism," the Soviet revisionist leading clique has brazenly resorted to direct armed aggression and intervention and is trying to create puppets with the help of guns. It is exactly the same as Hitler of the past in his aggression against Czechoslovakia and U.S.

imperialism of today in its aggression against Vietnam. The Soviet revisionist clique of renegades has long degenerated into social-imperialism and social-fascism.

The Soviet revisionist leading clique has all along pursued the counter-revolutionary policy of U.S.-Soviet collaboration for world domination. Since the Glassboro talks, not to mention anything earlier, U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism have struck a series of dirty deals on such important questions as Vietnam, the Middle East and the prevention of nuclear proliferation. The present Czechoslovakia incident is no exception. It is the result of the sharpening contradictions in the scramble for and division of spheres of influence by U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism in Eastern Europe: it is, moreover, the result of the U.S.-Soviet collusion in a vain attempt to re-divide the world. The aggression by Soviet revisionism was carried out with the tacit understanding of U.S. imperialism.

Since U.S. imperialism has acquiesced in the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia by Soviet revisionism, how is it possible for Soviet revisionism to oppose the forcible occupation of southern Vietnam by U.S. imperialism? In fact, Soviet revisionism has long become the No. 1 accomplice of U.S. imperialism in its aggression against Vietnam and the rest of the world. That a big nation should have so wilfully trampled a small nation underfoot serves as a most profound lesson for those harbouring illusions about U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism.

The armed aggression by Soviet revisionism has brought calamity to the Czechoslovak people, but it has also educated them, enabling them to realize gradually that revisionism is the root cause of this calamity. This is likewise a very good lesson for the people of the Soviet Union, the other East European countries and the rest of the world. Our great leader Chairman Mao has long

pointed out : "For a while some people may not see things clearly or may be hoodwinked or may commit mistakes, but so long as they want to make revolution, having once understood the true situation and seen revisionism in its true colours, they will eventually break with revisionism and come over to the side of Marxism-Leninism in the course of their revolutionary practice." We are convinced that the Czechoslovak people with their glorious revolutionary tradition will never submit to the Soviet revisionist military occupation but will surely continue to rise and carry on the revolutionary struggle against the Soviet revisionist leading clique and the revisionist leading clique at home, whereas by their perverse acts the Soviet revisionist leading clique and its followers will only hasten their complete downfall as well as the total collapse of the entire modern revisionist bloc.

Comrades and friends ! Rumania is now facing the danger of foreign intervention and aggression. The Rumanian government is mobilizing the people to wage struggles in defence of their independence and sovereignty. The Chinese people who have grown even stronger through the tempering of the great proletarian cultural revolution, support you. It is our firm belief that so long as one truly relies on the masses and perseveres in protracted struggle, any foreign intervention and aggression can be and certainly will be defeated.

Defeat to U.S. imperialism !

Defeat to Soviet revisionism !

Victory to the people !

Long live the friendship between the Chinese and Rumanian peoples !

## Total Bankruptcy of Soviet Modern Revisionism

The *People's Daily* on August 23 carried on the front page an article by Commentator entitled *Total Bankruptcy of Soviet Modern Revisionism*.

The article reads in full as follows :

**T**he Soviet revisionist renegade clique, at a time when the masses of the people are being hoodwinked, deployed late on the night of August 20 large numbers of aircraft, tanks and ground forces in a surprise attack and carried out a military occupation of Czechoslovakia. This act of naked armed intervention has brought out to the full the grisly fascist features of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique and has fully revealed its extreme weakness ; it has proclaimed the total bankruptcy of Soviet modern revisionism.

That the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has flagrantly set in motion its armed forces is the outcome of the extremely acute contradictions within the whole modern revisionist bloc. It is the result of the extremely acute contradictions between U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism in their struggle for control of Eastern Europe. It is the outcome of the collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union in their vain attempt to re-divide the world. For a long time, there have existed profound contradictions and bitter strife between the Soviet revisionist renegade clique and the revisionist cliques of the Eastern European countries. The Khrushchov revisionist renegade clique, ever since it rose to power, has most shamefully made one dirty deal after another with U.S. imperialism. Following the

example of the Soviet revisionists, the Czechoslovak revisionist renegade clique wanted to follow in their footsteps, throwing themselves into the lap of U. S. imperialism. However, the Soviet revisionists regard Eastern Europe as their own sphere of influence and forbid the Czechoslovak revisionists to have direct collaboration with U.S. imperialism. As the difficulties besetting the Soviet revisionist clique both at home and abroad are growing from day to day, the trend of disintegration within the modern revisionist bloc is coming to the surface more and more. An outstanding manifestation of this trend of development is the recent rise to power of the Dubcek revisionist clique in Czechoslovakia. In order to force the Dubcek clique into submission and bring Czechoslovakia back under the continued control of the Soviet revisionists, the Soviet revisionist ruling clique has resorted to all sorts of tough and soft tactics against the Dubcek clique. At times they used threats of force by staging military manoeuvres; at other times they arranged conferences with honey on their lips and murder in their hearts in an attempt to make the Czechoslovak revisionist leaders fall into their trap. But as the Czechoslovak revisionist renegade clique was hell-bent on establishing direct links with U. S. imperialism (and also with West Germany), all the threats and cajolery of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique failed one after another. At the end of its rope, the Soviet revisionist clique was compelled to throw away its mask and, mustering the revisionist cliques of Gomulka, Ulbricht, Kadar and Zhivkov, resorted to armed force. Thus the melodramatic dog-fight within the modern revisionist bloc is being acted out on the world stage.

On August 21 after they sent their troops into Czechoslovakia, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique issued a statement through Tass. The statement is a ridiculous figleaf used by the Soviet revisionist clique in an attempt to cover up its disgusting features.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique claims that they sent troops into Czechoslovakia in order to "defend" the "socialist gains". What amazing gall! Who, after all, has capitulated to U. S. imperialism and ruined the socialist gains of the Soviet Union? Who has peddled Soviet modern revisionism in Eastern Europe and ruined the socialist gains of a number of European countries? You are the guilty ones, you, the worst renegades in history! It is completely useless for you to put up such a phony sign-board in a vain attempt to deceive the people of Czechoslovakia, the people of the Soviet Union and of the rest of the world.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique claims that it sent troops into Czechoslovakia out of "concern for the consolidation of peace" and to preserve "the mainstays of European peace". This is sheer gangster logic of the imperialists. Is it not true that both Hitler's occupation of the Sudeten region of Czechoslovakia in the past and U.S. imperialism's present aggression against Vietnam were carried out under the flag of "defending peace"? The apprentices have learned from their teachers. This claptrap spread by the Soviet revisionist clique is merely a cover-up in their fight against the U.S. imperialists for control of Czechoslovakia. It is nothing but putrid junk picked up from the imperialists' garbage pails.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique also claims that their action was taken for the "unbreakable solidarity" of the "fraternal countries" and in "the interests of the security of the states of the socialist community". In that miserable mishmash of your revisionist bloc, where is your "unbreakable solidarity"? It is clearly a case of each trying to cheat and outwit the other and each going his own way. You do not really want to build any "socialist community". What you really want is to found a colonial empire with the Soviet revisionist clique as the overlord. You want to re-divide the world in collaboration

with U.S. imperialism. All those countries who are part of your "community" have to put themselves at your disposal and at your mercy, or else—they will be heading for disaster.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has long ago degenerated into a gang of social-imperialists. The relations between them and the U. S. imperialists, just as the relations among all the imperialist countries, are relations of both mutual collaboration and mutual struggle. In spite of the fact that they have conflicts of one kind or another they are at one with each other in their stand against communism, against the people and against revolution. No sooner had they ordered the troops into Czechoslovakia, than the Soviet revisionist renegade clique reported this action to Johnson. This portrays a vivid image of the relations between them.

At a time when U. S. imperialism is having a very hard time, this action of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique in Czechoslovakia has actually done a great service to the Johnson government.

Our great teacher Chairman Mao pointed out some time ago: **"The people of all countries, the masses comprising more than ninety per cent of the entire population, sooner or later want revolution and will support Marxism-Leninism. They will not support revisionism. Though some people may support revisionism for a while, they will eventually cast it aside. They are bound to awaken gradually; they are bound to oppose the imperialists and reactionaries in all countries; they are bound to oppose revisionism"**.

U. S. imperialism is a paper tiger, so are the Soviet revisionist renegade clique and the reactionaries of all countries. The ugly performance by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique at this time has further educated the Soviet people, the Czechoslovak people and the revolutionary peoples all over the world. It has helped them to see more clearly the counter-revolutionary features of the

Soviet revisionist clique and its pawns, and has given an impetus to their awakening and their revolutionary struggle.

The seven hundred million Chinese people, armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought, firmly stand on the side of the revolutionary Soviet people, of the revolutionary Czechoslovak people and of all the revolutionary peoples in the world who oppose imperialism, modern revisionism and the reactionaries of all countries. The Chinese people resolutely support the struggle of the peoples the world over against U.S.-imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism. The Chinese people resolutely support the proletariat and all the revolutionary people in the Soviet Union, in Czechoslovakia and in the other countries under the rule of the modern revisionist cliques to rise and overthrow the modern revisionist reactionary regimes and take back the state power in their own hands so that their homelands may return to the road of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. We are deeply convinced that such a day is bound to come!

## NOTE

( Continued from page 16 )

tration into it, the Soviet clique of renegades resorted to naked armed aggression against Czechoslovakia. And while launching the invasion, they specially instructed their Ambassador Anatoly P. Dobrynin to report personally this act of aggression to the chieftain of U.S. imperialism, Lyndon Johnson. Both the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists are all well aware that, despite their contradictions, they cannot afford to lose each other's friendship and active co-operation, without which they cannot hope to "contain China", stem the tide of national liberation struggle and redivide the world between themselves. So, the U.S. protests against the crime of the Soviet renegades were more formal than real. "A supplementary cause [ of the Czechoslovak tragedy ]," laments E.B. Brook from Vienna, "is the timidity and supineness of the non-communist western world that, apart from courteous protests to Moscow, has stood by once again and let, to all intents, an independent Czechoslovakia disappear... **Cynically, the two super-powers respect each other's doorsteps**". ( *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, September 6, 1968—our emphasis)

When the tanks and armoured cars of the invaders rumbled through the streets off Prague and other cities and occupied the key-positions, the pro-U.S. Dubcek clique capitulated to the invaders without any resistance at all. They were unceremoniously bundled off to Moscow and made to sign on a dotted paper. Immediately on his return to Prague, Dubcek declared that their first task was to restore the Soviet aggressors' trust in them! So, the Dubcek clique is obediently carrying out the instructions of the Soviet masters, including the re-organization of the Government and the Party.

Once Lenin said: "The bourgeoisie are behaving like bare-faced plunderers who have lost their heads: they are

## NOTE

committing folly after folly, thus aggravating the situation and hastening their doom." The new bourgeoisie of the Soviet Union also seem to have lost their heads: by this mad desperate act of aggression against Czechoslovakia they have intensified much more than before the crisis in the revisionist camp and hastened its disintegration and doom. The armed aggression and the subsequent events have exposed before the people of the world, particularly the Soviet people and the peoples of East European countries the real face of the revisionists and heightened their political consciousness.

The Soviet armoured cars and tanks will be constant, grim reminders to the Czechoslovak working people of the Soviet rule imposed on them. Inheritors of a great revolutionary tradition, they will hardly endure this slavery and will rise up to break the shackles that bind them. Their contradiction with the treacherous clique of native revisionists, which has already become acute, will grow much more sharp in the course of their revolutionary struggle. Their struggle for national liberation and socialism will no doubt sweep, away this vermin, too. As Chairman Mao has said, "The people of all countries, the masses comprising more than ninety per cent of the entire population, sooner or later want revolution and will support Marxism-Leninism. They will not support revisionism. Though some people may support revisionism for a while, they will eventually cast it aside. They are bound to awaken gradually; they are bound to oppose the imperialists and reactionaries in all countries; they are bound to oppose revisionism."

Insoluble contradictions are tearing the revisionist bloc apart. The Soviet revisionist renegades' armed aggression against Czechoslovakia has only hastened this process of disintegration. The day of the final collapse of the revisionist bloc is not far off. The chief strategic weakness of revisionism in this era of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the

era when imperialism is heading towards its final defeat and extinction and when socialism is marching towards world-wide victory, lies in its own existence.

### The Flames of Naxalbari Spread

At the time of going to the press we received important news from Muzaffarpur, Bihar. The flames of Naxalbari have spread to Mushahari Block in that district. Inspired by the great revolutionary example of Naxalbari, the peasant struggle under the leadership of the Communist Revolutionaries has reached a new height in Mushahari,

---

We very much regret that on account of circumstances beyond our control *New Assessment of the History of the CPI* by Bande Ali Khan could not appear in this issue of *Liberation* also. We hope it will be regularly published from the November issue.

We also regret that for unavoidable reasons we are unable to continue publication of S. Guna's article *Is India Really Independent?*

\*   \*   \*   \*

---

We are glad to inform our readers that the October issue of *Liberation* will come out as a Special Issue to mark the 19th Anniversary of the Great Chinese Revolution.

Regd. No. C 3432

LIBERATION

Price 1.00

---

## LIBERATION

October 1968

Will come out as a

**SPECIAL ISSUE**

To mark the 19th Anniversary of  
**THE GREAT CHINESE REVOLUTION**

Price Rs. 1.50

Send Advance Order with Money

---

### READ & SUBSCRIBE

Hindi Weekly

**LOK-YUDDH**

Local Agents ! Please collect your copies  
from office.

Agents Outside ! Send your Agency  
Deposit at the rate of Re. One per Copy.

#### SUBSCRIPTION RATE :

Yearly	10.00	Half-yearly	5.00
Quarterly	2.50	Per Copy	0.20

Manager :

**LOK-YUDDH**

60A. Keshab Ch. Sen Street, Calcutta-9.

---

Edited and Published by Nimai Ghose from 60A, Keshab  
Chandra Sen Street, Cal-9 and Printed by him from  
Pragati Printers, 59A, Bechu Chatterjee St., Cal-9.