

RED



FLAG

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
(MARXIST-LENINIST)

Volume I, Number 2

March-April 1966

CONTENTS

Interim Policy on Recruitment and Membership...Page 2

Khrushchevite Revisionists Take One Further Dangerous
Step Towards Capitalist Degeneration of
Socialist Economy.....Page 7

C.P.U.S.A. (M-L) Supports Indonesian
Communist Party.....Page 19

Statement by the Communist Party of the United
States of America (Marxist-Leninist) in op-
position to Fidel Castro's Attack upon the
People's Republic of China.....Page 21

Open Letter to the CPSU.....Page 23

Fifteen Years Since the Issue of the Information
Bureau Resolution "on the Situation in the Yugoslav
Communist Party".....Page 25

Long Live the Victory of the People's War.....Page 34

The RED FLAG is published bi-monthly by the Com-
munist Party of the United States of America (M.-L.).
The articles appearing in the RED FLAG represent the
views of the Party.

The RED FLAG is distributed by the Workers' Inter-
national Book Store, 9122 So. Compton Ave., Los Angeles,
California 90002 U.S.A. Rates: single copy \$1.00; Sub-
scription: surface- \$6.00/year, airmail- \$12.00/year-
anywhere in the World.

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

RED FLAG

c/o Workers International Book Store

9122 So. Compton Avenue

Los Angeles, California 90002, U.S.A.

INTERIM POLICY ON RECRUITMENT AND MEMBERSHIP

In order to build a strong Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, the Central Committee of the C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) has adopted the following policy with regard to the question of membership and recruitment. The policy is based on the application of Marxist-Leninist principles to the concrete situation of building a revolutionary proletarian organization. This is an interim statement approved by the Central Committee pending ratification by the First National Party Congress scheduled for September, 1966.

Conditions of Party Membership

A. Membership of the Party is open to any resident of the United States of America who works and does not exploit the labor of others, accepts the program and Declaration (the Constitution when approved) of the Party, joins and works in one of the Party's organizations, carries out the Party's decisions and pays dues as required.

Duties of Party Members

- B. Party members have the following duties:
1. To strive to study Marxism-Leninism and unceasingly raise the level of their understanding.
 2. To safeguard the Party's solidarity and consolidate its unity.
 3. To faithfully carry out Party policy and decisions and to energetically fulfill the tasks assigned them by the Party.
 4. To strictly observe the principles of the Declaration (until the Party Constitution is adopted) and of communist ethics. No exception is made for any Party member, whatever his services and position.
 5. To place the interests of the Party and the masses of the people above their personal interests, and in the event of conflict between the two submit unswervingly to the interests of the Party and the masses of the people.
 6. To serve the masses of the people conscientiously, to strengthen their ties with the masses of the people, to learn from them, to listen with an open mind to their wishes and opinions and to report these without delay to the Party, to explain the Party's policy and decisions to the people.
 7. To set a good example in their Party work and constantly raise their productive skill and professional ability in their Party work.

8. To practice criticism and self-criticism, expose shortcomings and mistakes in work and to strive to overcome and correct them; to report such shortcomings and mistakes to the leading Party Party bodies up to and including the Central Committee, and to fight both inside and outside the Party against everything detrimental to the interest of the Party and the people.

9. To be honest and truthful with the Party and not to conceal or distort the truth.

10. To be constantly on the alert against the intrigues of the enemy and to guard the secrets of the Party. Party members who fail to fulfill any of the above-mentioned duties shall be criticized and educated. Any serious infraction of these duties, splitting the Party unity, violation of Party discipline, damaging Party interest, or deception toward the Party constitutes a violation of Party discipline and disciplinary action shall be taken against it.

Rights of Party Members

C. Party members enjoy the following rights:

1. To participate in free and practical discussion at Party meetings or in the Party press on theoretical and practical questions relating to Party policy.

2. To make proposals regarding the Party's work and to give full play to their creative ability in their work.

3. To elect and be elected within the Party.

4. To criticize any Party organization or any function at Party meetings.

5. To ask to attend in person when a Party organization decides to take disciplinary action against them or to make appraisal of their work.

6. To reserve their opinions or submit them to a leading body of the Party in case they disagree with any decisions which, in the meanwhile, they must carry out unconditionally.

7. To address any statement, appeal or complaint to any Party organization, up to and including the Central Committee. Party members and responsible members of Party organizations who fail to respect these rights of a Party member shall be criticized and educated. Infringement of these rights constitutes a violation of Party discipline, and disciplinary action shall be taken against it.

Recruitment Policy

D. The following is the Party's recruitment Policy:

1. Applicants for Party membership must undergo the procedure for admission individually. New members are admitted to the Party through the basic political unit, the cell. An applicant must be recommended by two full Party members and is admitted as a probationary member after being accepted by the general membership meeting of the cell and approved by the next higher Party organization. The applicant may become a full member only after the completion of the probationary period of three months. Under special conditions applicants may be admitted to the Party directly with the approval of the Secretariat.
2. Party members who recommend an applicant for admission to the Party must be highly conscientious in furnishing truthful information about the applicants ideology, character and personal history, and must explain the Party program and Declaration (Constitution) to the applicant.
3. Before approving the admission of an applicant for Party membership, the Party Committee concerned must assign a Party functionary to have a detailed conversation with the applicant and carefully examine his application form, the opinions of his recommenders and the decisions made by the Party cell on his admission.

Probationary Membership

E. The following is the Party's policy on probationary membership:

1. During the probationary period, the Party organizations concerned shall give the probationary member an elementary Party education and observe the probationary member's political qualities. Probationary members have the same rights as full members except that they have no rights to elect or to vote on any motion.
2. When the probationary period of a member has expired, the Party cell must discuss without delay whether that member is qualified to be transferred to full membership. Such a transfer must be accepted by a general membership meeting of the said Party cell and approved by the next highest Party organization. When the probationary period of a member has expired, the Party organization concerned - the cell - may prolong the probationary period for three months after which time a final evaluation must be made. If the probationary member at the end of six months is found to be unfit for transfer, then the status

of probationary membership shall be annulled. Any decision by the cell to prolong the probationary period of a probationary member or to deprive him of his probationary status must be approved by the next higher Party organization.

3. The probationary period of a probationary member begins from the day when the general membership meeting of a Party cell accepts the applicant as a probationary member. The Party standing of a member dates from the day that the general membership meeting of the cell accepts the member.

Transfers Within the Party

F. Party members transferring from one Party organization to another become members of the latter Party organization.

Withdrawal From the Party

G. Party members are free to withdraw from the Party. When a Party member asks to withdraw, the cell to which that member belongs shall, by the decision of the general membership meeting, strike that member's name from the rolls and report the matter to the next higher body.

Reasons for Disciplinary Action

H. A party member who over a period of one month and without proper reason fails to take part in Party life, or pay membership dues, is regarded as having quit the Party. The cell to which that member belongs shall by decision of the general membership meeting strike his name from the rolls and report the matter to the next higher body.

Disciplinary Action

I. Party organizations at appropriate levels may, according to each individual case, take disciplinary measures against any member who violates Party discipline, such as warnings, serious warnings, removal from post held in the Party, placing on probation within the Party or expulsion from the Party. The period in which a member is placed on probation shall not exceed six months. During this period the rights and duties of the member shall be the same as those of a probationary member. If after being placed on probation the member shows that he has corrected his mistakes, his rights as a full Party member shall be restored and the period in which he is placed on probation will be reckoned in his Party standing. If that member is found to be unfit for Party membership he shall be expelled from the Party.

J. Any disciplinary measures taken against a Party member must be decided on by a general membership meeting

of the cell to which he belongs and must be approved by the next higher body. Under special conditions, the Party cell has the power to take direct action against a member but it (the action) is subject to the approval of the next higher body.

K. Any decision to remove a member or alternate member of the Central Committee of the Party of the Party from the Central Committee, or to place that member on probation or to expel that member from the Party, must be taken by the National Party Congress. In conditions of urgency, such decisions may be taken by a two-thirds majority vote of the Central Committee at a Plenary session, but it must be subject to subsequent confirmation by the next session of the National Party Congress.

L. Expulsion from the Party is the most severe of all inner-Party disciplinary actions. In taking or approving such an action, all Party organizations must exercise the utmost caution, thoroughly investigate and study the facts and material evidence of the case, and listen carefully to the statement made in that Party member's defense by that Party member concerned.

M. When a Party organization discusses or decides on disciplinary measures against a Party member, it must, barring special circumstances, notify the member concerned to attend the meeting to defend himself. When disciplinary action is decided upon, the person against whom such action is taken must be told the reasons for it. If the member in question disagrees, that member may ask for a reconsideration of his case and address an appeal to higher bodies, up to and including the Central Committee. Party organizations at all levels must deal with all such appeals seriously or forward them promptly; no suppression is permitted.

KHRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISTS TAKE ONE FURTHER DANGEROUS STEP TOWARDS CAPITALIST DEGENERATION OF SOCIALIST ECONOMY.

The following work is excerpted from a pamphlet by the same title published in Tirana, Albania in 1965. (The article first appeared in ZERI I POPULLIT, November 18, 1965). The article deals with the question of degeneration of Socialist Economy, as manifested in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It gives the entire history of the degeneration of the Soviet economy, its source and its future.

The Albanian Comrades deal decisively with the revisionist leaders of the USSR. The article points out the collaboration of the Khrushchev-Kosigin clique in undermining socialist economy in the USSR.

The Central Committee of the CP, USA (M/L) endorses the correct conclusions of the Albanian comrades concerning this important question.

A plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was held during the last days of September this year in which A. Kosigin read a report on the so-called "improvement of the management of industry, perfecting of planning and strengthening economic stimulation of industrial production". He wound up the last phase of debates on "economic reform" which had been started in the Soviet Union as early as Autumn 1962.

Like every other plenum since the Khrushchevite revisionist group has assumed the leadership in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the last one too took a further step towards treason, this time in the field of economy.

The main topic of the plenum was a change in the method of management of industry and of planning industrial production.

The scrupulous examination of these problems so loudly proclaimed shows that their virtual intention is to pave the way for a wider and more consistent application of revisionist views in matters of managing socialist economy, in the aims of socialist production, in the ways that should be followed and the economic levers that should be used. Measures taken at the last plenum are a continuation and logical deepening of the revisionist course in the field of economy, an application of capitalist organizational forms and methods painted in socialist colors. We are all familiar with N. Khrushchev's so-called reforms like the break up of the Tractor and Motor Stations and the sale of their means to the Kholkhoses, "the virgin new lands", the setting up of people's economic councils and of directorates of Kholkhosian and sovkhosian production, his tutelage of the maize cult, the insertion of material.

stimuli as the only factor to promote socialist production and so on. Now the Soviet leaders themselves and their press are obliged, in view of failures met with, to admit that many of these "reforms" were nothing but gross blunders causing grave consequences to Soviet economy.

"The new economic reforms" of N. Khrushchev's successors, far from correcting any of the catastrophic measures taken at N. Khrushchev's time, are a deeper implementation and a more complete application of the directives given by Khrushchev to insert into Soviet economy forms of organization and methods of management typical for capitalist economy. Khrushchev in his time, had more than once expressed his sympathy towards the system of organization and management of capitalist economy, and had consistently given advice to learn from the experience of Eatons and Hearsts & Co. It is this experience that the present revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union are inserting on a large scale in Soviet Economy.

Under guise of criticizing the bureaucratic, inefficient administrative management of industry, the plenum launched its attacks on the principle of centralized management and planning of socialist economy. Under guise of extending the use of economic stimuli and economic methods of management, it attacked the principle of regulating socialist production in a planned way, of adjusting it to the material and cultural needs of workers. Instead of this principle it was pointed out that the most effective mechanism to regulate production and distribution in socialism should be the use of free markets, the unrestricted action of the law of values, profit, credits, independent activity of enterprises and other categories of capitalist economy. Under guise of promoting the initiative of the working masses through material interest, it attacked the socialist principle of distribution according to work done, upholding the cultivation of bourgeois views on becoming rich and on creating for managers of enterprises such privileged positions as to enable them to become rich by unlawful means, which would consequently degenerate them into a new bourgeoisie.

The main features of the economic policy of the Soviet revisionist leaders lie in demagoguery, preserving only the form, the outward view of the basic principles of socialism. Their true essence is their violation, their disregard of these principles, their anti-marxist, capitalist treatment and solution of the fundamental problems of socialist economy. The aim of this policy has always been camouflaged preparation of conditions to degenerate the Soviet economy. The measures taken also at the 1965 September plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union serve this end and are drawn up in this spirit.

**The complete failure of N. Khrushchev's measures
to set up councils of people's economy**

It is borne well in mind by all that, following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet

Union, N. Khrushchev began to launch his frontal attack against the fundamental issues of Marxism-Leninism. This attack could not spare, and in reality it soon affected the sound Marxist-Leninist principles of management of socialist economy.

Giving full play to his revisionist course, N. Khrushchev undertook to "reorganize" the management of industry and building construction in the Soviet Union about the middle of 1957. He suppressed all economic Ministries at the center and in the United Republics. Councils of people's economy were set up in their place for the USSR and for all economic regions which were charged with the task of managing the various branches of industry and building construction.

N. Khrushchev and his closest collaborators, Brezhnev, Mikoyan and Kosigin considered this measure at that time a major economic "reform", "the creative development" of the Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist economic management which would allegedly correct the bureaucratic distortions which had arisen in this field by J. V. Stalin's cult. It was also alleged at that time that this reform was being made for the sake of enforcing the Leninist principle of centralized and planned management of economy, for the sake of combining centralization and local initiative better, of raising the standard of concrete and operative management of enterprises, and so on and so forth.

Khrushchev as well as his heirs today- Brezhnev, Kosigin, Mikoyan and all the gang of his propagandists tried their uttermost to prove that this reform was an objective necessity which was allegedly supported by and emanating from Lenin's teachings. But no matter how much mud Khrushchevite revisionists may throw on the memory and teachings of Lenin, they will never succeed to distort before true marxists his great revolutionary teachings on socialist economic management. Lenin, at his time, stressed the principle of management of socialist economy. "Communism", he used to say, "demands and presupposes the highest centralization of large-scale production throughout the country." (V.I. Lenin, Works, vol. 36, page 392)

This Leninist principle passed the historical test of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. It was concretized and further enriched in the system of Soviet economic management which was established in the USSR during the period of socialist construction under J.V. Stalin.

The real purpose of setting up councils of people's economy was to decentralize Soviet economic management and development.

The economic and technical unity of management and development of the branches of industry was broken up. A situation was created in which plans of production and of the use of modern technique were studied and approved by certain organs, plans of production and capital investments by certain other organs, while plans of furnishing -- by third organs. Localist discriminating tendencies became so matter-of-fact that they led to attempts at local autarchy, or to setting up a closed economy at the level of the territory under the jur-

isdiction of each economic council. In Soviet economic life it happened that the leaders of one economic region or another tried their best to organize the production of this or the other product or equipment, although these might be produced better in other regions. In addition to this, the Soviet press has recently been obliged to mention, allegedly for purposes of "criticizing", many other cases that show that when an economic district produces products that are scarce, when it comes to distribution it looks only to "supplying its own needs" with no regard for the needs of other districts or the general interests of people's economy.

By adopting the system of territorial management state discipline and state responsibility became so weak that it started to give place to chaos. This system created such conditions as to enable the managers of enterprises to attribute all failures to reach plan targets to higher offices and account for every failure by "objective reasons". Direct personal responsibility for work assigned to them disappeared. Only through this can the following and many other similar examples, of which the Soviet press is full, can be accounted for: 30 different signatures from several firms were needed to coordinate the plans of supply of one enterprise alone.

As a result of these consequences the rate of increase of industrial production (not to speak of agricultural production) and of national income slowed down. During the period from 1963 to 1964 these rates were lower among the lowest the Soviet Union has ever recorded during the last thirty-five years.

Finding itself in straits the Khrushchevite group of the Soviet leadership tried hard to find a way out. And the best way out for it was to stretch out its palms to American imperialism for grains and credits. The Soviet Union which was formerly considered by all the world as the greatest exporter of grain, was now obliged to import unheard-of quantities of grain from the USA and other capitalist countries. In 1963 it imported 14 million tons of grain from the USA. Since July this year the Soviet Government bought over 7 million tons of wheat from Canada, Argentina and France, and in September this year it was announced that the Soviet Union would again buy nearly 2 million tons of wheat from America. This way out is not a casual solution. On the contrary, it is a manifestation, a well thought-out aspect of the revisionist policy and plot to discredit the Soviet order, the socialist order of things to the advantage of capitalism.

These were the inevitable results of the revisionist economic policy of N. Khrushchev and his group, which would one day surely come to light as they actually did. The economic laws of the development of society cannot be changed by any revisionist policy deviating from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, trying to revise these teachings, and failing to take into account the historical experience of socialist construction, regardless of all attempts to keep it going, even in a powerful economy as that of the Soviet Union, is bound to fail and to fail for certain, as it has done in recent years.

The real meaning and purpose of the steps taken at the 1965 September plenum is to root out the very foundations of planned management of Soviet economy, to decentralize it under new conditions, under another name and on a larger scale, to plunge Soviet economy deeper and deeper into the pit of its degeneration.

In spite of the great damage the creation of economic councils brought about and their complete failure, the present revisionist leaders did not condemn N. Khrushchev's reform. On the contrary, they tried their best to minimize these losses and this failure and to prove that this reform was allegedly correct at that time, but that conditions had now changed(!). Kosigin himself stated that "the organization of industrial management through economic councils had many positive sides to it, but as time went on, major deficiencies began to come to the fore."

This stand of revisionist leaders is not to be wondered at. The present leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are Khrushchev's most trusted men and closest collaborators. They did not renounce Khrushchev's reform as they try to cover up, to conceal their responsibility as co-authors of this reform, as persons who have been fully at one with Khrushchev's economic policy and faithful agents to carry it out. On the other hand, the stand the revisionist leaders took towards Khrushchev's reform shows once again that they are determined to pursue to the letter and to carry out to the end Khrushchev's revisionist economic policy without Khrushchev.

At the 1965 September plenum revisionist leaders tried their hardest to create the impression that measures proposed by them to change the management of industry and planning were the result of collective study, that they were submitted to extensive public discussion and that they were based on deep scientific study and so on, whereas for the not very distant past, when Khrushchev was in power, they speak rather reluctantly of the existence of subjectivistic methods, of arbitrary acts, of personal decisions taken without taking into account the experience of the masses and the views of scientists and so on. Soviet leaders have really become ridiculous. How soon have Brezhnev and Kosigin forgotten that right after the 20th Congress they had hailed the "true democratic and the spirit of collective leadership" which had allegedly been established in the party and in its Central Committee after Khrushchev "had smashed J. V. Stalin's cult of the individual". Did Mikoyan not state at the time that "the main features which characterize the work of the Central Committee and its presidium these last years is the fact that after a long interval, our party set up a collective leadership of the Central Committee headed by N. S. Khrushchev have triumphed".

When L. Brezhnev awarded the decoration of Lenin's Order to Khrushchev in April 1964 he cried out loud: "In our country there have been established Leninist norms in the life of the party and of society, the immortal spirit of Lenin in all its purity and rectitude

has again prevailed. Your name, Nikita Sergeyevich, has been linked for all time with this new historical phase in the life of our country, which will consecrate the magnificent glory of the pioneers of communism during the present generation of the Soviet people!"

In the message addressed to Khrushchev at that time by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union we read: "We all know the major role and the Leninist revolutionary courage which you showed in the struggle for the triumph of Leninist norms in the life of the Party and of society. The Party and all the Soviet people know how energetically and with what talents of a prominent organizer and knowledge of facts you work, Nikita Sergeyevich, in urgent matters of economic and cultural reconstruction of scientific and technical development, of communist enlightenment;" and so on and so forth.

Did Khrushchev himself not declare at the time that the reform of creating people's economic councils was a collective measure of the Party which had been discussed with the laboring masses and was accepted by them?

Hence the question: When have they taken collective decisions, during Khrushchev's time or now, during the time of his successors and, have there ever been true collective decisions taken after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? If what has been said after the 20th Congress, namely, that "full Leninist norms of collective leadership have been established" in the life of the Party, is true, then are the present Soviet leaders, as close collaborators of N. Khrushchev, not fully responsible for all that had occurred during this time? And if all this hue and cry about "the re-establishment of Leninist norms in the life of the Party" after the 20th Congress, was an outright bluff (which it really was), why then is the finger not placed on the sore spot, why is the culprit for the creation of this situation not named and not condemned openly in public?

It is not the first time that the present revisionist leaders maintain an attitude of this kind towards themselves and towards the principal culprit, the top leader of modern revisionism, Khrushchev. And this attitude is neither casual nor without a purpose; for can it be accounted for by lack of courage. To expose Khrushchev and to discard his revisionist course would be tantamount to the present leaders to expose themselves, to incriminate themselves, for they are part and parcel of Khrushchevism, for they are faithful perpetrators of Khrushchev's course. Therefore, the myth about "the new collective leadership" is sheer bluff. The truth is that the same revisionist spirit and the same revisionist methods of leadership continue to prevail in the Party and in its leading organs.

"The new economic reform" - A major step
towards decentralizing Soviet economy

What do we understand by the economic efficiency of social production? At first sight this might seem very simple. But let us not jump into conclusions. In reality, it is exactly the distortion of the matter that the Soviet revisionist leaders use as their principal passport to cross over to their new economic reform.

The problem of economic efficiency of production is a dominant one for all social orders. As such the classics of Marxism-Leninism and historical practice has proven that it can be solved aright only from positions and requirements of the basic economic law of each given order, through a just combination of the yield of people's economy as a whole and the yield of one individual branch or enterprise.

In the socialist order of things in which the purpose of production is to meet the material and cultural needs of society as a whole, this purpose serves also as a basic and universal criterium to determine the economic efficiency of production in all phases of its development. Consequently, the only leit-motif to which socialist production should serve and submit is to meet the needs of the workers, to raise their material and cultural welfare. The main index by which to measure, in the last resort, the economic efficiency of production is the degree in which this production meets and responds to the needs of society.

As far as yields, the concrete expression of economic efficiency, are concerned, these again must be seen as closely related to the requirements of the basic economic law and the degree of people's economy as a whole. This means that the yielding capacity of an individual branch or enterprise should be evaluated, first and foremost, from positions of needs and perspectives of the development of national economy, and then of course, from positions of urgent advantage. Any other narrow interpretation of rentability in socialist economy is at variance with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and with the historical experience of socialist construction. To place the rentability of one branch or enterprise above the interests of future development of national, would mean to act in the same way as in the capitalist order of things. Finally, in the matter of evaluating economic efficiency and rentability Marxism-Leninism teaches us that we should take into account the internal and external political factor, the political obligations of building socialism and communism.

Soviet revisionist leaders, however, did not stop short of revising even this vital matter of the socialist order and of substituting it with capitalist conceptions. According to them, socialist production should not submit to the fundamental economic law, the fulfilment of the material and cultural needs of the masses, but to securing as maximum results with as minimum efforts. They openly declare that attaining

maximum results with minimum efforts is the most universal law of socialism.. This law should also serve as the sole criterium by which to judge the economic efficiency of socialist production and of each individual branch or enterprise.

But why did the revisionist leaders stand in need of substituting the fundamental law of socialism with the law of economic efficiency? What lies behind this "new theoretic discovery"?

Of course there is nothing bad in the objective of attaining maximum results with minimum efforts in production as such. Nor can it be said that this is an unknown, alien objective for socialist society. The evil and all the stratagems of Soviet revisionist leaders lie in the fact that they purposely distort the Marxist-Leninist meaning of this objective, they turn it into an objective similar to capitalist production, and, as a consequence, advocate the same ways, methods and organizational forms which are used in capitalist economy to attain it. According to them, in socialist economy as in capitalist economy, profit should be the sole criterium to serve as inducement and measure of economic efficiency in production. "Orientation to increase efficiency in production", Kosigin stated in his report read at the plenum, "is best served by the index of profit, of rentability". Thus, the Soviet revisionist leaders turned the just socialist principle of producing as much as possible with as little expenditure as possible (that is, at lowest costs) to the capitalist principle: the greatest profits from the least capital.

As can be seen, the Soviet revisionist leaders stood in need of the matter of economic efficiency and its distortion in order to pave the way for profit, to usher it in as the main motive force of production in the socialist order too.

Always under the pretext and watchword of increasing economic efficiency of production, the Soviet leaders urged the need for changing the method of economic management in a radical manner. According to them, it is high time to cross over from methods of "administrative" management of people's economy to the so-called methods of economic management. But what do revisionist leaders consider "administrative" methods of management of economy? It suffices to pose this question to see that by by that they mean the management of socialist economy in a planned and centralized way by the state has nothing to in common with the economic methods of management; as if these are not two things that complement, that presuppose each other. In short when the revisionist leaders raise their voice against "administrative" management of economy which is based on the economic laws of socialism, they raise their voice against planned and centralized management of economy by the state, against the leninist principle of democratic centralization in economy. According to them, planned centralization and management of economy by the state are consequences of J. V. Stalin's cult of the individual, therefore are to be abandoned as soon

as possible and the "cult of planning" should be discontinued once and for all time.

For the Soviet revisionist leaders the only economic methods of management of socialist economy are those based on the free play of the mechanism of the law of values and of markets and on the unhampered action of all categories connected with them, such as profit, credits, percentages, prices and so on. Renegade Khrushchev's downright capitalist motto "we should act in the same way as the capitalist would act in this case"

Before the socialist order ever came to being, classics of Marxism-Leninism had envisaged the preservation and existence of production goods, of the law of values, the markets and other categories connected with them in socialism. But at the same time they clearly indicated that their economic and social role would radically change. The historical experience of socialist construction shows that socialist society should use these categories in a planned and conscientious way for the benefit of society, for the benefit of socialism, narrowing down and limiting the sphere of their spontaneous action, their devastating consequences. In this sense alone these categories serve in socialism both as economic levers in managing the economy, in regulating social production, distribution, exchange and consumption, as well as in managing the economic activity of enterprises and organizing the relations among them. Only in this way can a just connection be established between plans and the law of values and marketing and the law of values and markets can be divested of its function as a spontaneous adjuster of production.

Judging by the masses envisaged in the economic reform it turns out that, according to Soviet revisionist leaders, the more highly developed socialist production is, the greater becomes the need of regulating production on the basis of the law of values and the market, the more necessitous it becomes to limit the role of planning in a centralized way. Under these conditions the economic activity of enterprises and the relations between them should also be freed from any intervention by the state and should be regulated only by the action of the law of values and the market. Such an interpretation of the action of the law of values and the market aims at leaving socialist economy at the mercy of spontaneity. To uphold the free play of the market in socialist economy means to undermine centralized management of economy and to pave the way for spontaneous and decentralized development. This means to place the sign of equality between capitalist and socialist production of commodities.

Insertion of capitalist methods and organizational forms into Soviet economy

On the basis of the economic reform, relations according to the pattern of capitalist economy are established between individual enterprises and people's ec-

onomy as a whole, among enterprises themselves, as well as between enterprises and the market. All these relations are pervaded with the spirit of liberalism and decentralization, with the idea that profit should be the motive power of socialist production, while the market should be the principle regulator. As to integrated, universal planning to govern all the people's economy, the revisionist leaders, while keeping it 'pro forma', speak a lot, but in reality it is wrecked and it is replaced with prognostic planning.

The first measure envisaged by the reform is that of extending the free activity of economic enterprises, exempting this activity from centralized and planned management, of giving full freedom to enterprises to take their cue from and act in accordance with the demands of the market with a view to deriving as large profits as possible. The enterprise is authorized to set in an entirely free way the volume of production, its nomenclature, the yield of work, the size of the working force, wages, cost of production, capital investments and so on. Profit will represent the whole objective of the economic activity of the enterprise whereas sales (the market) will serve as a means through which the enterprise will take its cue in its activity to achieve this objective. In short, the enterprise will produce not to better meet the material and cultural demands of the working masses, but to sell in the market so as to secure as high a profit as possible. Hence the question: What distinguished this production of a "socialist" enterprise from that of a capitalist one? Nothing. This is production of a capitalist category.

The economic reform envisages a broad decentralization in the policy of accumulation and capital investments.

The new economic reform changes also both in form and in substance the nature of financial relations between an enterprise and the state budget. It is envisaged to abolish taxes on turnover, as one of the forms of the net income of society and to replace it with a new tax, as the Yugoslav revisionists have recently done. The new taxes which enterprises will pay will be a percentage on the productive funds (basic of turnover), which is identical with the familiar capitalist category-percentage on capital.

Measures specified in the new economic reform in the Soviet Union are, in essence, as like as two water drops with the measures long in practice and now even more so in Yugoslav economy. We are all familiar with the results which these measures have yielded in Yugoslav economy. Yugoslav economy at present is characterized by chaos, spontaneity and competition, by a rise of capitalist elements and speculators, by a disproportionate development of branches of economy, by the constant rise of prices and by the lowering of standards of living of the laboring masses and by other typical manifestations of capitalist economy.

Titoite reforms have led and are constantly lead-

ing Yugoslav economy towards capitalist development. Through the new economic reform Soviet economy is also bound, sooner or later, to share the same fate.

In their new economic reform the Soviet revisionist leaders have put aside the socialist principle of distribution according to labor and have replaced it with capitalist forms of remuneration for work done.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the use of the material interests of the workers as a stimulating factor in developing productive efficiency and raising output of work, is correct and essential. On the other hand, it has been proven, both in theory and in practice, that the principle of material interest can be effectively used to the benefit of the laboring masses themselves only when it is rightly combined with the communist stand of workers towards work and its results, with the formation and steeling of their socialist conscience, with the use of moral stimuli, with educating the workers in the spirit of placing social interests above personal interests.

In arrant contradiction with this, the new economic reform proclaims material interest as the sole factor for whose sake the the workers of socialist enterprises should labor and produce and on the basis of which their work should be remunerated.

This is a typically capitalist system widely used in enterprises in capitalist countries. This system creates innumerable opportunities for managers to speculate arbitrarily to the detriment of the workers.

The new method of remunerating work creates conditions and educates the workers with the spirit of looking at all their efforts in production in the light of their material and pecuniary interests, with the spirit of running after money and becoming its slave. It spreads and cultivates bourgeois views of getting rich of placing personal above social interests: it represses the socialist ideology of the laboring masses and poisons their conscience.

The policy of creating privileges and enriching certain classes of the population at the expense of the laboring masses pursued by the Soviet revisionist leaders has a specific aim in view. This aim is: to expand the ranks of people who serve as a social basis to carry out the political line and revisionist views of the treacherous leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The demagogy of revisionist leaders and reality

Practice is the only criterium of truth. Historical practice and that of Yugoslav economy indicate in a most convincing and clear-cut way that there are only two ways to promote present economic development. There is no nor can there be a middle course or a grafting of capitalism into socialism. Therefore, the course the Soviet revisionist leaders are mapping out for Soviet economy is that of degeneration, of evolution towards capitalism. A certain length of time was needed to prepare public opinion, by demagogical means, of course, and get people accustomed to capitalist methods and or-

ganizational forms, covered always under the cloak of socialism. Even now, after the reform, the Soviet revisionist leaders dare not yet call things by their own name.

A. Kosigin stated: "The essence of the system of economy lies in the fact as to in whose hands lie state power, the means and tools of production, to the interests of which class is production developed and profits distributed. This is a basic matter and in this matter we have stood and will always stand on firm positions of Marxism-Leninism." It must be asserted that A. Kosigin can claim no originality for this statement. He has copied it literally from A. Mikoyan who, returning from a visit to Yugoslavia, and in order to prove that the Yugoslavs were allegedly building socialism in their country, declared at a meeting of the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that: "the means and tools of production are in the hands of the working class, of the workers' state in Yugoslavia."

The economic reform adopted in the Soviet Union and the measures taken by other socialist countries in Europe have aroused a lot of interest in the capitalist world. In all principle capitalist countries they have been hailed with satisfaction and have been called by their real name as initial doses of capitalism in socialist economy. The international bourgeoisie, the American imperialists in the first place, have already begun to export their capital in the form of credits to the Soviet Union and to certain Eastern-European countries, as they have long done in Yugoslavia. Knowing the ruthlessness and intentions of monopolist capital it is clear that the fundamental objective of the imperialists is to use these credits as fetters to hold in economic bondage the Soviet Union and the other Eastern European countries as they have done Titoite Yugoslavia.

The new economic reform of the revisionist leaders is one which opens the way towards degeneration to Soviet economy. This undeniable truth cannot be covered up by any demagogy and cunning of the Soviet revisionist leaders, however refined they may be. Through this reform the present Soviet leaders showed once again their true anti-socialist and anti-Soviet features; it showed that they are persistently marching along the Khrushchevite path of treason. No doubt that while pursuing this path they can hope for no better destiny than their inspirer-- N. Khrushchev.

STATEMENT BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (MARXIST-LENINIST)
IN SUPPORT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDONESIA

OS

The C.P.U.S.A. (M.L.) issues the following statement:

"The C.P.U.S.A. (M.L.) gives its firm support to the correct Marxist-Leninist stand of the Indonesian Communist Party, and offers to help the Indonesian Communist Party in whatever way possible.

"The Indonesian Communist Party, steeled in 45 years of revolutionary struggle, is the vanguard party of the Indonesian people, and is sure to defeat imperialism and reaction.

"The Indonesian Communist Party has fought courageously against colonialism, and imperialism. The Party was instrumental in the formation of NASAKOM (a united front for national unity against imperialism) and has been the main force within Indonesia in opposition to the reactionary state of "Malaysia", which was set up by British and U.S. Imperialists as a front for aggression in South-east Asia. The Indonesian Communist Party has been the main fighting force in defense of the Indonesian people. The Party has fought resolutely under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

"Unable to weaken the ideological position of the Indonesian Communist Party, the imperialists and their lackeys have attempted to physically destroy the Indonesian Communist Party.

"The imperialists and their lackeys have used the excuse that the Indonesian Communist Party attempted a "coup d'etat", and therefore they (the imperialists and their flunkies) had to prevent such an occurrence. This is an attempt to hide the truth of the matter. It is a well known fact that the Communist Party of Indonesia, like Communist Parties everywhere, rely on the mass action of the people and not on conspiracies as the bourgeois press attempts to

portray. It is also a well known fact that the Indonesian Communist Party has the support of the Indonesian people, and that it is the largest Communist Party outside the Socialist camp.

"The attacks and slander hurled against the Indonesian Communist Party and their supporters have pointed out more clearly the fact that U.S. imperialism and reaction is becoming more desperate. It also shows the extent to which the imperialists will go to suppress the revolutionary struggle of the people. The recent events in Indonesia also points out the ability of the people to survive and to become stronger by steeling themselves with the revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. The Indonesian Communist Party has fought resolutely against modern revisionism and against the revisionist theory that imperialism is willing to hand over state power to the proletariat. The Communist Party of Indonesia prepared itself for all possible means of struggle to survive any attacks by imperialism and reaction and to carry the revolutionary struggle forward for the destruction of the capitalist system.

"The people of the world, all persons struggling against U.S. imperialism and its flunkies, the people of Asia, Africa and Latin-America, all anti-imperialist forces have full confidence in the coming victory of the Indonesian Revolution and of the socialist revolution everywhere.

"Long live the Indonesian Revolution!

"Long live the Indonesian Communist Party!"

STATEMENT BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (MARXIST-LENINIST)
IN OPPOSITION TO
FIDEL CASTRO'S ATTACK
UPON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

On February 5, 1966, Prime Minister Fidel Castro of Cuba made a speech in Havana attacking the People's Republic of China. The excuse for the attack was centered around the question of trade between the two nations and the question of the arrival in Cuba of political material published in China. In regard to Castro's attack the Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) issues the following statement:

"The Communist Party U.S.A. (M.-L.) strongly condemns the unjust attacks made upon the People's Republic of China by Prime Minister Fidel Castro of Cuba. Castro's attack points to the penetration of modern revisionism into the ranks of certain members of the Cuban leadership. The warm reception Castro's attack had in the imperialist countries points to its anti-revolutionary, splitting nature.

"Prime Minister Castro prates very much about unity among the socialist nations in the face of imperialist actions. Yet, in the same breath he degrades and attempts to trample into the mud the correct political positions of the People's Republic of China. Such political hypocrisy only exposes the fallacies of the policies pursued by Castro. The People's Republic of China has been consistent in its correct and steadfast Marxist-Leninist, anti-imperialist position, while the history of Castro's position is one of currying favor for the Khrushchevite revisionists. Now Castro has joined in the revisionist chorus in attacking the correct position of the People's Republic of China and of the Communist Party of China.

"The C.P.U.S.A. (M.L.) after careful study of the pertinent documents and after careful consideration of the positions put forward by both the People's

Republic of China and Prime Minister Castro, fully supports the stand of the People's Republic of China on the question, and fully condemns the vituperative anti-China slanders of Castro's capitulation to revisionism reveals to the world a betrayal of Marxist-Leninist principles in the anti-imperialist struggle. Castro has fallen into the pit of hypocrisy and capitulation, and his revisionist prattle only serves to separate him further from the revolutionary people of the world. The C.P.U.S.A. (M.,L.) fully supports the Cuban people and the Cuban Revolution and all those forces opposing U.S. imperialism and modern revisionism."

C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) OPEN LETTER TO THE C.P.S.U.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America (M.-L.) sent the following letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on April 4, 1966:

Comrades,

The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) wishes to express with regard to your invitation to the C.P.U.S.A. that it will not send a delegation to the twenty-third Congress of the C.P.S.U.

This decision has been made in light of the ideological differences existing between the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) concerning the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, and in light of the anti-Marxist approach that the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has taken with regard to the question of polemics within the international Communist movement. The incorrect stand that the C.P.S.U. has taken since the twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. has, in reality, supported imperialism and reaction against the people of the world, specifically on the questions of peaceful transition, peaceful coexistence and the recognition of Stalin and his contributions to the science of Marxism-Leninism and socialist construction.

The polemic method used by the present leadership of the C.P.S.U., beginning with Khrushchev, is anti-Marxist and does not seek to resolve the basic question of differences through comradely discussions and analysis. Marxist-Leninists use polemics so that the most correct position can gain supremacy over the incorrect position, so that the revolutionary forces can be best equipped to deal heavy blows to the enemy. The approach taken by the modern revisionists has not been to resolve the question of difference through polemics, but one of slandering the Marxist-Leninist position.

The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) deplores the attacks and slanderous accusations that the present leadership of the C.P.S.U. has hurled against the correct Marxist-Leninist position taken by a number of fraternal parties, particularly the Communist Party of China and the Albanian Party of Labour. We further deplore the splitting activities engaged in by the revisionist leadership of the C.P.S.U. with regard to fraternal Parties. The accusations have not dealt with political questions nor with the real ideological differences. The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) is confident that the people of the U.S.S.R. and the Marxist-Leninists within the C.P.S.U. will certainly overcome revisionism and end the further degeneration of the U.S.S.R. toward capitalism.

We point out that any delegation from the U.S. at the twenty-third Party Congress of the C.P.S.U. does not represent the Marxist-Leninists of the U.S.A. but merely represents the revisionist renegades of Marxism-Leninism and the betrayers of the international Communist movement. The renegade Hall clique :

does not represent the Communist movement in the U.S.A.
but merely the traitors to the principles of the Inter-
national Communist movement and the proletariat.

(Signed)

M.I. Laski

General Secretary,

For the Central Committee
of the Communist Party

U.S.A. (M.-L.)

the
on
was
(2e
to
and
und
soci
bor
to
exp
agat
idea

F
tion
in t
this
for
a gr
ism,
Revi
as a
lead
I
Part
deni
theo
soci
on t
Peop
into
post
date
In
achi
the
doba
carry
the
a bi
work
up fo

"On the Situation In The Yugoslav Communist Party"

The following item consists of excerpts from the article entitled "15 Years Since the Issue of the Information Bureau Resolution 'On the Situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party'". The article was first published in the Albanian newspaper ZERI I POPULLIT (People's Voice) of Tirana on June 29, 1963.

The article traces the history of modern revisionism from Tito to Khrushchev and shows the actual collusion between the Yugoslav and Soviet revisionists and the U.S. imperialists. It shows the underlying reasons behind Khrushchev's "peaceful transition to socialism", his attack upon Stalin, and the growing Soviet collaboration with U.S. imperialism.

The article also goes into the meaning of modern revisionism to the international Communist and workers' movement today. The exposure of revisionism is a most necessary part of the fight against imperialism. Revisionism is the presence of bourgeois ideology into the Communist and workers' movement.

Fifteen years have elapsed since the Resolution of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties "On the Situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party" was made public on June 29, 1948. This resolution was an historical document of special significance for the international communist and workers' movement. It disclosed a grave and threatening menace, the manifestation of modern revisionism, represented by the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party. Revisionism, which had existed also before in the communist movement as an opportunist trend, prevailed now for the first time over the leadership of a party which had taken the reins of state in its hands. In their internal policy the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party deviated from the Marxist theory of class and class struggle, denied the dictatorship of the proletariat, preached the opportunist theory of peaceful infiltration of the capitalist elements into socialism. The Yugoslav leaders revised the Marxist-Leninist theory of the Party, lowering its role by fusing it with the non-party People's Front. They violated democracy within the Party, introduced into it Trotskyite military methods of leadership and displayed positive tendencies of liquidation, which constituted the danger of deteriorating the Party and the Yugoslav state.

In internal affairs they pursued the policy of nullifying the achievements of the national-liberation war of the Yugoslav people, the policy of liquidating the true cadres of the party and of debasing the party into a tool in the hands of the Tito's clique to carry out their anti-Marxist-course. Following the announcement of the resolution of the Information Bureau, the Tito's clique launched a big campaign against the internationalist communists by making short work of them physically or attacking them ideologically. They set for this purpose a large police force of terror whose methods

were provocation, threat, terror, torture and murder. The jails and concentration camps at Goli Otok in Dalmatia, Stara Gradishka and other regions are the stain and stamp of Titoite shame and crime which nothing can efface. Much as Karushchey may try, he can never succeed in whitewashing Tito's mask, for the specter of the infamous UDB has held and continues to hold sway over Yugoslavia to this very day. Facts prove that over 200,000 communists, half of the total membership, were expelled from the Yugoslav Communist Party during the period from 1948 to 1952. In Montenegro alone they sent to jail nearly all the members of the government and of the Central Committee, and deported 800 Montenegrin communists to Goli Otok. Over 5,000 officers, among whom were a number of generals and colonels, mainly commanders or commissars of brigades, divisions, army corps, were cast into prison, while 12,000 officers were discharged from the army.

As a distinguished Marxist-Leninist and a firm defender of the Leninist teachings and norms of relations between fraternal parties, Stalin examined the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia proceeding from the basic interests of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, of the working class and people of Yugoslavia itself, viewed it from positions of Marxism-Leninism and assessed the situation on the basis of facts and reality. The meeting of the Information Bureau, in conformity with all Leninist rules and regulations, pursued a correct procedure in examining the issue and adopting its Resolution. This was also one of the major reasons why the communist and workers' parties approved the Resolution of the Information Bureau unanimously and carried it out with determination.

The correctness of the conclusions of the Information Bureau is borne out clearly by the splitting undermining and plotting activities of the Tito clique. Their counter-revolutionary, anti-socialist acts in the service of American imperialism are numerous indeed. Their experience as agents of imperialism is of long standing. As early as 1951 the Tito's clique signed with the USA the agreement on the so-called "mutual defence", which aimed at increasing tension through provocations especially in the Balkan region. Two years later the Belgrade clique together with two member states of the aggressive NATO bloc set up the Balkan Pact as an appendage to NATO in this region.

The peoples of the socialist countries, especially in the Balkans and in Europe, are well aware of the counter-revolutionary plots hatched by the Yugoslav revisionists through their agents in Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Albania and other countries. They are well aware of the counter-revolution which broke out in Hungary and imperilled its very existence as a people's democracy, a counter-revolution incited and organized by the Tito's clique and their agents in collaboration with the American imperialists. They are well aware of the plot which the Yugoslav revisionists hatched in April 1956 against the Party of Labour of Albania through their agents in collaboration with anti-Party and treacherous elements, a plot that was discovered and exposed at the Party Conference in Tirana. They are likewise aware of the 1960 plot contrived jointly by the Yugoslav revisionists, the Greek monarchic fascists, the imperialists and certain traitors like T. Sejko, P. Plaku, inveterate agents of Greek and Yugoslav espionage, aimed at overthrowing the people's regime in Albania.

While all the communist parties unanimously and resolutely opposed the anti-socialist views and acts of the Tito clique, within the communist movement the Khrushchev group and its followers, appeared as a group of admirers and ardent supporters of Yugoslav revisionism. Having assumed the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union through intrigues, counter-revolutionary strokes and plots, Khrushchev proceeded on the road of discrediting Marxism-Leninism. In order to attain this objective of betrayal, he had to assail Stalin, follower and great defender of Lenin. Khrushchev was, according to Khrushchev, his closest and most faithful ally in this infamous undertaking, for Tito had for years given ample proof in this matter. This was the beginning of the line of approach and collaboration between Khrushchev and the Yugoslav revisionists.

Persisting in his line and violating the Leninist norms governing relations among parties, Khrushchev went to Belgrade in 1955 to hand to imperialist agent Tito a certificate of good conduct, rehabilitating him without complying with the usual procedure of consulting the other fraternal parties, though with the approval, which he had obtained, through intrigue and cajolery, of the parties composing the Information Bureau. He begged the revisionists' pardon. He launched the slogan about the "superstructure" that had weighed so heavily on the "Yugoslav comrades", accusing Stalin of deteriorating relations with Yugoslavia, because of the alleged "totally erroneous assessment which he had made of the Yugoslav comrades".

This kowtow to the Yugoslav revisionists by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made them ruffle up their feathers like cocks and proclaim loudly and wide that their cause was a just one and that it had triumphed, that it was not the Yugoslav leadership that had erred, but the communist and workers' movement which made them increase their activity, causing a split in the socialist camp, in the communist movement, in the movement for national liberation and among various peace-loving forces. This was Khrushchev's first official act of betrayal.

By opposing the joint decision of the communist and workers' movement approving the Resolution of the Information Bureau, by opposing the line jointly formulated by these parties to combat Yugoslav revisionism, by getting closer to the Tito clique, Khrushchev gave rise to grave differences on principle between his group and the workers' movement. By so doing, he struck a heavy blow at the unity of views and acts within the communist movement. The Party of Labour of Albania, well acquainted with the attitudes and bearing the brunt of the hostile activity of this clique, was convinced of the justice of combating Yugoslav revisionism and was, therefore, opposed in principle to Khrushchev's plan of going to Belgrade to rehabilitate the Tito clique. Changing the attitude towards the Yugoslav revisionists and modifying the Resolution of the Information Bureau were not matters for Khrushchev alone to decide. They were matters pertaining to the entire communist movement and any decision about them should have been taken after due consultations among partners, according to Leninist principles. Therefore the Central Committee of our Party wrote to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in May 1955 expressing our Party's opposition to Khrushchev's going to Belgrade to rehabilitate the Tito clique.

Time has further corroborated how correct and timely was the warning of our Party that the rapprochement with the Yugoslav renegade band would bring a great danger to the communist movement and to socialism. As a matter of fact, Khrushchev's ideological and political approach to Tito, the latter's rehabilitation and the coordination of their activity constituted the prelude to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party, where the theses of modern revisionism were promulgated to the communist movement. It is significant that only a few months later Tito was warmly received in Moscow as a distinguished Leninist. And the counter-revolutionary coup took place in Hungary with the direct participation of the Yugoslav revisionists only a few months after that.

Following the November 1956 counter-revolution, Tito, in his speech at Pula, issued an open call for subversive activity. "Yugoslavia," he said, "should not keep itself in its own shell. It should set to work in all directions in the field of ideology so that the new trend may triumph." He was not satisfied with the first steps taken by Khrushchev in fighting for "de-Stalinization", or with his opportunist theses preached at the 20th Congress, and called upon him and all revisionists to carry the war against the so-called cult of the individual and its consequences to the end.

No sooner had the Tito's clique uttered these words than they acted on them. In 1953 they published their program which was approved by the 7th Congress of the League of Yugoslav Communists. This program was an out-and-out anti-Marxist and anti-socialist one, it was the ideological platform and code of international revisionism, zealously comprising every notorious theory of the various anti-Marxist trends of all time. It was a serious ideological deviation, a general assault against the basis of the revolutionary theory and practice of scientific socialism, an attack on the joint document of the international communist movement, the 1957 Moscow Declaration.

The communist and workers' movement unanimously and firmly condemned the Tito's clique for the third time as traitors to Marxism-Leninism, as wreckers and splitters of the socialist camp, the communist movement and all peace-loving forces and states of the world, condemned it as servants of American imperialism through the 1960 Moscow Declaration signed by the representatives of 81 communist and workers' parties. "Further exposure of the leaders of the Yugoslav revisionists and active efforts to guard the communist as well as the workers' movement against the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists," the 1960 Moscow Declaration insisted, "continues to be an essential duty of the Marxist-Leninist parties."

A month had hardly elapsed since the publication of the 1960 Moscow Declaration when Foreign Minister A Gromyko, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, speaking on the relations with Yugoslavia to the Supreme Soviet on December 23, 1960, stated: "It should be pointed out with satisfaction that on basic international issues our positions are identical."

On October 3, 1961, L. Brezhnev told the Yugoslav Ambassador "we have all the conditions for further and all-round co-operation". And these statements were followed by a great wave of exchanges of declarations, of signing of agreements of all kinds under the slogan of peaceful coexistence.

All the problems lying in the way of extending all-round economic and political relations were resolved with marvellous speed and alacrity and the ground was systematically prepared for ideological approach and collaboration between them.

The 22nd Congress from whose rostrum Khrushchev sparked the differences within the ranks of the communist and workers' movement through his open attacks on the Party of Labour of Albania, served as a means of approach to the "Yugoslav comrades" and of establishing ideological relations and collaboration with them.

In his address to the Supreme Soviet Khrushchev clearly defined his stand towards the Tito clique. He stated that his stand towards the League of Yugoslav Communists "is in full accord with the lines of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union", that he is prepared "to do his utmost to overcome the differences that have still remained" which seem to spring from "the concrete historical and geographical conditions", that "it would be unfair to draw up a stereotyped pattern (referring to the Moscow Declarations) which all should abide by", that those who oppose Yugoslav revisionism "borrow the jungle laws of the capitalist world and introduce them into the relations among socialist countries, as the Albanian dissenters do, who are ready to tear the communists to pieces for their mistakes", that it behooves the communist movement to help the Tito clique "to occupy the place they deserve in the family of all the fraternal parties", that "consolidation and development of economic connections, of state and social relations between our countries create the basis for the approach of our attitudes in ideological matters as well", that "the Yugoslav comrades are strengthening the achievements of socialism and, proceeding from objective laws, from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, it is impossible to deny that Yugoslavia is a socialist state", and so on and so forth.

According to Khrushchev's logic it turns out that the 31 communist and workers' parties, who unshakably condemned the Yugoslav revisionists, did not proceed from an analysis of the real situation in Yugoslavia, from objective laws, from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism in formulating their judgment, but that they borrowed the jungle laws of the capitalist world and introduced them into the relations among socialist states. It turns out, therefore, that today there is one and only one supreme judge of Marxism-Leninism: Khrushchev.

In order to reject the conclusions of the 1960 Moscow Declaration, Khrushchev props up his thesis with the argument that the Yugoslav leaders have made "changes" both in internal and in external affairs. This argument does not hold water. The Yugoslav revisionist leaders - Tito, Kardelj and others - have themselves rejected them; they have more than once stated that they have made no change nor do they intend to make any changes in the days to come. The Yugoslav revisionists have even forewarned those who are looking forward to such changes not to cherish illusions and vain hopes.

Is not the stand of the American Imperialists themselves, their assessment of the activities of the modern revisionists, a strong and persuasive argument to prove whose interest the political course of the Tito clique serves? The billions of American dollars are not lavished in vain on "Yugoslav socialism". It was not without purpose that Dean Rusk rose against certain rumors heard in the American Congress demanding a re-examination of the aid to Yugoslavia, and warned: "If a change was made to the wise policy of the USA

towards Yugoslavia, a thing of this nature would be a very serious drawback for the West." For, as Dean Rusk said on another occasion, "Yugoslavia has been and continues to be a source of discord within the ranks of international communism." This subversive role of the Tito clique is clearly expressed by J. Kennan, United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia, who, according to the newspaper Long Island Press, stated before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "Tito is putting all his efforts to overthrow Enver Hoxha's regime in Albania through secret operations within the Communist Party. If these subversive operations fail, he will resort to military operations".

To us it has been made clear that the noise Khrushchev makes about "changes" and "turn-about" in Yugoslavia, is only a tactical measure to justify his complete agreement with the Tito clique and the admission of Yugoslavia into the socialist camp.

Let us consider the attitude of the Yugoslav revisionists towards international matters. The Tito clique have effected no change in their foreign policy, which has served and continues to serve the interests of the imperialists. Examples are numerous: What, for instance, is the stand of the Yugoslav revisionists towards the Caribbean crisis? Referring to the causes of the Cuban crisis, the newspaper Borba dated October 1, 1962, instead of denouncing the American imperialists as aggressors and warmongers, wrote: "If we look for the cause of the Cuban crisis we will find that it lies in the unfortunate creation of blocs and in that state of mind which raises the policy of force and of nuclear power to the height of a principle." This places the countries of the socialist camp and the imperialist countries on a par. The Yugoslav revisionists called the firm stand of the revolutionary government of Cuba against imperialist aggression a "biased forcing policy", "an aggravation of relations with the USA", "lack of tact", and "Cuba becoming a front in the cold war". They denounced Cuba because "it dealt blow for blow" and they reproached the Cuban Government as "being a stumbling-block in reaching the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement", they denounced Cuba's refusal of "international inspection", considered Cuba's just 5-point demands as a hindrance to the solution of the Cuban crisis, and so on.

The attitude of the Tito clique towards the Sino-Indian border conflict is even more hostile and more openly pro-imperialist. In this matter, the Yugoslav revisionists, together with all the reactionary bourgeois propaganda, condemn the People's Republic of China as aggressor, as having caused the Sino-Indian conflict, as "pursuing a policy of creating tension", and as trying to settle the border issue with India by resorting to the use of force", and so on. Even as the question of the well-known proposals and initiatives of the People's Republic of China to settle the conflict peacefully, proposals which have met with full approval by all the peace-loving forces of the world, the Yugoslav revisionists, lining up with the Indian reactionaries and the most warmongering circles of imperialism, hastened to declare that "Peking's conditions are utterly unacceptable to India", that "the initiative taken by China contain in their elements which are hard for the other party to accept". It is clear that the attitude of the Tito clique in the Sino-Indian border conflict does not at all aim at preserving Sino-Indian friendship and settling this conflict in a peaceful manner. On the contrary, this attitude serves the anti-Chinese plot of international imperialism and revisionism.

It is a well-known fact that Tito considered the aggressive intervention of the American neo-colonialists in the Congo as a "factor that ~~should~~ stabilize the situation, a very important and valuable factor". The Yugoslav revisionists called Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress", which is a plan to colonize Latin America, "readiness to adjust and correct errors"; they called the brutal intervention of the U.S.A. in the internal affairs of Laos "true concern for peace and the security of Laos"; they called the rightful struggle of the Indonesian people to free West Irian unjustifiable and preached its settlement by "peaceful means", whereas the liberation of Goa by the Indian reactionary bourgeoisie was considered a just one, only because their ally Nehru had demanded it. This is the policy and principle of the modern revisionists.

In Yugoslavia there is an ever growing manifestation of the characteristics of capitalist economy - typically local and chaotic trends, rivalry between republics, provinces and economic organizations, broad operations in market relations, free play of prices, violation of the principle of distribution according to work, disproportion in development of the branches of economy, low standards of specialization and cooperation of production, unemployment and exploitation of man by man, and so on.

The features of capitalist economy are even more evident in the Yugoslav countryside. What is most striking in the present Yugoslav village is the process of differentiation and polarization. The wealthy economic units become richer, while the poorer units deteriorate and are being eliminated. The larger rural estates, which make up less than 14 per cent of the total number of the rural estates of Yugoslavia, own nearly 40 per cent of all private land. By taking advantage of such conditions as the free purchase, sale and rent of land, the exploitation of laborers through the wages system, speculation in farm products, and also by taking advantage of state credits, the kulaks keep strengthening their economic positions. At the same time, tens of thousands of poor peasants, having been totally ruined are compelled to abandon their land and go to the cities in search of jobs. The growing dependence of the Yugoslav economy on American dollars shows along what lines the Tito clique has pushed Yugoslavia.

Khrushchev himself declared at the 7th Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party that the American dollars which the Yugoslav clique had received were not given to it to develop socialism. "It is a well-known fact," he said, "that no one will believe that there are two kinds of socialism in the world: a socialism which the world reactionaries resent in a frenzied manner and another socialism acceptable to the imperialists, to which they give support and assistance. Everybody knows that the imperialists never give anybody money for nothing, for 'his good looks'; they invest their capital only in those enterprises from which they expect to get good profits."

Just as before the Tito clique still receives today large sums in the form of credits, loans and alms from the American and other imperialists. On November 23 last year, the Yugoslav Government and the USA Government signed an agreement on the basis of which the USA would supply the Tito clique with agricultural surplus products to the total amount of 103.3 million dollars. The Yugoslav press reported that in 1962 the

USA gave the Tito clique a new credit of 46.6 million dollars and 31.6 million dollars more through international organizations supervised by the USA. Britain extended a credit of 20 million pounds sterling.

But, according to Khrushchev's logic, receiving dollars from the imperialists is of no significance at all, nor is it detrimental to a socialist construction in Yugoslavia. This poses a question: are we to assume that imperialism is no longer imperialism, that it is now willing to help sincerely and with the best intentions the development of socialism in various countries, that American dollars can be put to good use for socialism, that the dollars are now given without the intention of securing profits and that the imperialists now demand no interest for their dollars?

The Party of Labour of Albania is of the opinion that to make common cause with the Yugoslav revisionists, with these dangerous agents of imperialism, especially today when a bitter struggle is raging in the world between socialism and capitalism, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations, would mean accepting their program as a just and Marxist-Leninist one and consequently rejecting as out of date the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the joint and unanimous decisions of the communist and workers parties condemning Yugoslav revisionism. This would mean revising the whole strategy and tactics of the communist and workers' movement, replacing its revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line with the strategy and tactic of the renegade Tito group, with their opportunist anti-Marxist line of submission to imperialism, as the Khrushchev treacherous group are doing on a large scale. This would mean renouncing the true unity of the socialist camp and of the communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism and on the Moscow Declarations and adopting a false unity based on the anti-Marxist political and ideological platform of the program of the League of the Yugoslav Communists. It would mean wiping out the distinction between friend and foe, between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, between the defenders of unity and the splitters, between the anti-imperialist fighters and the imperialists' agents - as the Khrushchev treacherous group are doing on a large scale.

The question now is; either to agree with the Moscow Declarations in exposing the views and acts of the Yugoslav revisionists, of the revisionists of every hue and defending the Marxist-Leninist unity of the movement; or to agree with Yugoslav revisionism in opposing the Moscow Declarations and Marxism-Leninism and splitting the communist and workers' movement.

As concerns the position of the Party of Labour of Albania towards the Yugoslav revisionists, it has always been a principled position, precise, firm and inalterable during these 13 years. This was proclaimed once more by the leader of our Party at the 4th Congress of the Party in February 1961 when he said: "Our Party stands firmly on the position of the 1960 Declaration of the 31 communist and workers' parties, because the further exposure of the leaders of the Yugoslav revisionists and the active struggle to guard the international communist movement against the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, continue to be an essential duty of all the Marxist-Leninist parties. It holds the view that a determined and irreconcilable struggle should be waged against revisionism until its complete and final elimination. Every laxity of revolutionary vigilance against it, every weakening of the principled struggle against it, every wavering in this struggle under whatever pretext, leads inevitably to

invigoration and activization of revisionist trends, which will seriously prejudice our great cause. Without mercilessly denouncing revisionism and the Belgrade revisionist clique in the first place, it is impossible to denounce imperialism as it should be denounced. Without drawing a clear line between the revisionist views and Marxism-Leninism it is impossible to fight dogmatism and sectarianism with success and from correct positions. The fight for the complete ideological and political elimination of this band of renegades is an internationalist aid to the Yugoslav people themselves."

The attitude of our Party towards Yugoslav revisionism has never been a haphazard policy dictated by narrow interests. Our Party has always considered the struggle against revisionism as an internationalist duty and, as such, has carried it out regardless of difficulties, regardless of any sacrifice. Our Party withstood with pluck and prudence the hard trials of recent years, when Khrushchev launched frenzied attacks against the Leninist stand of our Party which was fighting against revisionism, with a view to curbing the spirit of the Party of Labour of Albania, and alienating it from the correct Marxist-Leninist road. It did not slacken, it did not withdraw from its Marxist-Leninist principled stand. The justice of the cause for which it fights strengthens its trust and unflinching confidence that in the fight against modern revisionism the victory will be on the side of Marxism-Leninism.

In the light of the events that have taken place during these fifteen years following the announcement of the Resolution of the Information Bureau on the situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party, all the communists and revolutionaries of the world feel proud of the victories in the great and consistent struggle of principle against modern revisionism in general and against Yugoslav revisionism in particular.

Constant adherence to the teachings of the Resolution of the Information Bureau and of the historic letters of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party and of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations will insure the communists and the revolutionaries of the whole world holding aloft and unstained the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism, the banner of proletarian internationalism; will insure their fighting with tenacious courage and unshakable confidence so that Marxism-Leninism in any situation, however complicated, in any storm and hurricane, will triumph over modern revisionism, over this principal menace threatening the international communist movement, over this dangerous agency of imperialism.

LONG LIVE THE VICTORY OF PEOPLE'S WAR by Lin Piao

The following item consists of a section from the article "Long Live the Victory of People's War" written by Lin Piao, Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and Vice-Premier and Minister of National Defense of the People's Republic of China. This Section is the section on the Marxist-Leninist policy on the united front dealing with the role of the Party of the proletariat in the anti-imperialist united front.

This section is of particular importance in the U.S.A. today where the rise of fascism is the present tactic of U.S. monopoly capital. The formation of a people's anti-fascist united front is of particular concern, as is the question of the formation of a national liberation front in the Negro Nation.

The character of the struggle and of the united front, as this article points out, is based upon the decisiveness of the Party of the proletariat - a point that must be fully understood.

Correctly Apply The Line And Policy Of The United Front

In order to win a people's war, it is imperative to build the broadest possible united front and formulate a series of policies which will ensure the fullest mobilization of the basic masses as well as the unity of all the forces that can be united.

The Anti-Japanese National United Front embraced all the anti-Japanese classes and strata. These classes and strata shared a common interest in fighting Japan, an interest which formed the basis of their unity. But they differed in the degree of their firmness in resisting Japan, and there were class contradictions and conflicts of interest among them. Hence the inevitable class struggle within the united front.

In formulating the Party's line of the Anti-Japanese National United Front, Comrade Mao Tse-Tung made the following class analysis of Chinese society.

The workers, the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie firmly demanded that the War of Resistance should be carried through to the end; they were the main force in the fight against Japanese aggression and constituted the basic masses who demanded unity and progress.

The bourgeoisie was divided into the national and the comprador bourgeoisie. The national bourgeoisie formed the majority of the bourgeoisie; it was rather flabby, often vacillated and had contradictions with the workers, but it also had a certain degree of readiness to oppose imperialism and was one of our allies in the War of Resistance. The comprador bourgeoisie was the bureaucrat-capitalist class, which was very small in number but occupied the ruling position in China. Its members attached themselves to different imperialist powers, some of them being pro-Japanese and others pro-British and pro-American. The pro-Japanese section of the comprador bourgeoisie were the capitulators, the overt and covert traitors. The pro-British and pro-American section of this class favoured resistance to Japan to a certain extent, but they were not firm in their resistance and very much wished to compromise with Japan, and by their nature they were

opposed to the Communist Party and the people.

The landlords fell into different categories; there were the big, the middle and the small landlords. Some of the big landlords became traitors, while others favoured resistance but vacillated a great deal. Many of the middle and small landlords had the desire to resist but there were contradictions between them and the peasants.

In the face of these complicated class relationships, our Party's policy regarding work within the united front was one of both alliance and struggle. That is to say, its policy was to unite with all anti-Japanese classes and strata, try to win over even those who could be only vacillating and temporary allies, and adopt appropriate policies to adjust the relations among the classes and strata so that they all served the general cause of resisting Japan. At the same time, we had to maintain our Party's principle of independence and initiative, make the bold arousing of the masses and expansion of the people's forces the centre of gravity in our work, and wage the necessary struggles against all activities harmful to resistance, unity and progress.

Our Party's Anti-Japanese National United Front policy was different both from Chen Tu-hsiu's Right opportunist policy of all alliance and no struggle, and from Wang Ming's "left" opportunist policy of all struggle and no alliance. Our Party summed up the lessons of the right and "left" opportunist errors and formulated the policy of both alliance and struggle.

Our Party made a series of adjustments in its policies in order to unite all the anti-Japanese parties and groups, including the Kuomintang, and all the anti-Japanese strata in a joint fight against the foe. We pledged ourselves to fight for the complete realization of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary Three People's Principles. The government of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia revolutionary base area was renamed the Government of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Special Region of the Republic of China. Our Workers' and Peasants' Red Army was redesignated the Eight Route Army and New Fourth Army of the National Revolutionary Army. Our land policy, the policy of confiscating the land of the landlords, was changed to one of reducing rent and interest. In our own base areas we carried out the "three thirds system" in our organs of political power, drawing in those representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, the national bourgeoisie and the enlightened gentry and those members of the Kuomintang who stood for resistance to Japan and did not oppose the Communist Party. In accordance with the principles of the Anti-Japanese National United Front, we also made necessary and appropriate changes in our policies relating to the economy, taxation, labour and wages, anti-espionage, people's rights, culture and education, etc.

While making these policy adjustments, we maintained the independence of the Communist Party, the people's army and the base areas. We also insisted that the Kuomintang should institute a general mobilization, reform the government apparatus, introduce democracy, improve the people's livelihood, arm the people, and carry out a total war of resistance. We waged a resolute struggle against the Kuomintang's passive resistance to Japan and active opposition to the Communist Party, against its suppression of the people's resistance movement and its treacherous activities for compromise and capitulation.

Past experience had taught us that "left" errors were liable to crop up after our Party had corrected Right errors, and that Right errors were liable to crop up after it had corrected "Left" errors. "Left" errors were liable to occur when we broke with the Kuomintang ruling clique, and Right errors were liable to occur when we united

with it.

After the overcoming of "Left" opportunism and the formation of the Anti-Japanese National United Front, the main danger in our Party was Right opportunism or capitulationism.

Wang Ming, the exponent of "Left" opportunism during the Second Revolutionary Civil War, went to the other extreme in the early days of the War of Resistance Against Japan and became the exponent of Right opportunism, i.e. capitulationism. He countered Comrade Mao Tse-tung's correct line and policies with an out-and-out capitulationist line of his own and a series of ultra-Right policies. He voluntarily abandoned proletarian leadership in the Anti-Japanese National United Front and willingly handed leadership to the Kuomintang. By his advocacy of "everything through the united front" or "everything to be submitted to the united front," he was in effect advocating that everything should go through or be submitted to Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang. He opposed the bold mobilization of the masses, the carrying out of democratic reforms and the improvement of the livelihood of the workers and peasants, and wanted to undermine the worker-peasant alliance which was the foundation of the united front. He did not want the Communist-led base areas of the people's revolutionary forces but wanted to cut off the people's revolutionary forces from their roots. He rejected a people's army led by the Communist Party and wanted to hand over the people's armed forces to Chiang Kai-shek, which would have meant handing over everything the people had. He did not want the leadership of the Party and advocated an alliance between the youth of the Kuomintang and that of the Communist Party to suit Chiang Kai-shek's design of corroding the Communist Party. He decked himself out and presented himself to Chiang Kai-shek, hoping to be given some official appointment. All this was revisionism, pure and simple. If we had acted on Wang Ming's revisionist line and his set of policies, the Chinese people would have been unable to win the War of Resistance Against Japan, still less the subsequent nation-wide victory.

For a time during the War of Resistance, Wang Ming's revisionist line caused harm to the Chinese people's revolutionary cause. But the leading role of Comrade Mao Tse-tung had already been established in the Central Committee of our Party. Under his leadership, all the Marxist-Leninists in the Party carried out a resolute struggle against Wang Ming's errors and rectified them in time. It was this struggle that prevented Wang Ming's erroneous line from doing greater and more lasting damage to the cause of the Party.

Chiang Kai-shek, our teacher by negative example, helped us to correct Wang Ming's mistakes. He repeatedly lectured us with cannons and machine-guns. The gravest lesson was the Southern Anhwei Incident which took place in January 1941. Because some leaders of the New Fourth Army disobeyed the directives of the Central Committee of the Party and followed Wang Ming's revisionist line, its units in southern Anhwei suffered disastrous losses in the surprise attack launched by Chiang Kai-shek and many heroic revolutionary fighters were slaughtered by the Kuomintang reactionaries. The lessons learned at the cost of blood helped to sober many of our comrades and increase their ability to distinguish the correct from the erroneous line.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung constantly summed up the experience gained by the whole Party in implementing the line of the Anti-Japanese National United Front and worked out a whole set of policies in good time. They were mainly as follows:

(1) All people favoring resistance (that is, all the anti-Japanese workers, peasants, soldiers, students and intellectuals, and businessmen) were to unite and form the Anti-Japanese National United Front.

(2) Within the united front, our policy was to be one of independence and initiative, i.e. both unity and independence were necessary.

(3) As far as military strategy was concerned, our policy was to be guerrilla warfare waged independently and with the initiative in our own hands, within the framework of a unified strategy; guerrilla warfare was to be basic, but no chance of waging mobile warfare was to be lost when the conditions were favorable.

(4) In the struggle against the Anti-Communist diehards headed by Chiang Kai-shek, our policy was to make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few and destroy our enemies one by one, and to wage struggles on just grounds, to our advantage, and with restraint.

(5) In the Japanese-occupied and Kuomintang areas our policy was, on the one hand, to develop the united front to the greatest possible extent and, on the other, to have selected cadres working underground. With regard to the forms of organization and struggle, our policy was to assign selected cadres to work under cover for a long period, so as to accumulate strength and bide our time.

(6) As regards the alignment of the various classes within the country, our basic policy was to develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the anti-Communist die-hard forces.

(7) As for the anti-Communist die-hards, we followed a revolutionary dual policy of uniting with them, in so far as they were still capable of bringing themselves to resist Japan, and of struggling against and isolating them, in so far as they were determined to oppose the Communist Party.

(8) With respect to the landlords and the bourgeoisie -- even the big landlords and big bourgeoisie -- it was necessary to analyse each case and draw distinctions. On the basis of these distinctions we were to formulate different policies so as to achieve our aim of uniting with all the forces that could be united.

The line and the various policies of the Anti-Japanese National United Front formulated by Comrade Mao Tse-tung stood the test of the War of Resistance and proved to be entirely correct.

History shows that when confronted by ruthless imperialist aggression, a Communist Party must hold aloft the national banner and, using the weapon of the united front, rally around itself the masses and the patriotic and anti-imperialist people who form more than 90 per cent of a country's population, so as to mobilize all positive factors, unite with all the forces that can be united and isolate to the maximum the common enemy of the whole nation. If we abandon the national banner, adopt a line of "close-doorism" and thus isolate ourselves, it is out of the question to exercise leadership and develop the people's revolutionary cause, and this in reality amounts to helping the enemy and bringing defeat on ourselves.

History shows that within the united front the Communist Party must maintain its ideological, political and organizational independence, adhere to the principle of independence and initiative, and insist on its leading role. Since there are class differences among the various classes in the united front, the Party must have a correct policy in order to develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and oppose the die-hard forces. The Party's work must center on developing the progressive forces and expanding the people's revolutionary forces. This is the only way to maintain and strengthen the united front. "If unity is sought through struggle, it will live; if unity is sought through yielding, it will perish."² This is the chief experience gained in our struggle against the die-hard forces.

History shows that during the national-democratic revolution there must be two kinds of alliance within this united front, first, the worker-peasant alliance and, second, the alliance of the working people with the bourgeoisie and other non-working people. The worker-peasant alliance is an alliance of the working class with the peasants and all other working people in town and country. It is the foundation of the United front. Whether the working class can gain leadership of the national-democratic revolution depends on whether it can lead the broad masses of the peasants in struggle and rally them around itself. Only when the working class gains leadership of the peasants, and only on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance, is it possible to establish the second alliance, form a broad united front and wage a people's war victoriously. Otherwise, everything that is done is unreliable, like castles in the air or so much empty talk.

1. The "three thirds system" refers to the organs of the political power which were established according to the principle of the Anti-Japanese National United Front and in which the members of the Communist Party, non-Party progressives and the middle elements each occupied one-third of the places.

2. Mao Tse-tung, "Current Problems of Tactics in the Anti-Japanese United Front", Selected Works, Vol. II.

WORKERS INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE

"Revolutionary Literature from Around the World"

CHINA

Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung Volumes I through IV.....	each	2.25	post pd.
Selected Military Writings of Mao Tse-Tung.....		2.25	"
How to be a Good Communist Liu Shao-Chi.....		.50	"
Long Live the People's War Lin Piao.....		.35	"

ALBANIA

On the Relations Between the People's Republic of Albania and the Soviet Union.....		.25	"
Modern Revisionists-The Greatest Liquidators in the History of the International Communist Movement..		.35	"
Collaboration with American Imperialism to Dominate the World-The General Line of the Soviet Revisionist Leaders.....		.25	"
Unity of the International Communist Movement.....		1.50	"

VIETNAM

Against U.S. Aggression.....		.75	"
Some Aspects of Guerilla Warfare.....		.30	"
On the Problems of War.....		1.00	"
Prison Diary.....		1.00	"

KOREA

Democratic People's Republic of Korea.....		4.50	"
Korea as Seen by Foreigners.....		1.00	"

PERIODICALS

China Pictorial Monthly.....		.50	"
Peking Review Weekly news journal from China.....		.30	"
Women of China Monthly.....		.50	"
The People of Vietnam Will Triumph, U.S. Aggressors Will be Defeated.....		1.00	"
Vietnam Courier.....		.30	"
New Zealand People's Voice30	"

This is only a sample list. Many other items are instock.