

The Workers' Advocate



WORKERS, OPPRESSED NATIONS AND PEOPLE OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

NEWSPAPER OF THE CENTRAL ORGANIZATION OF U. S. MARXIST-LENINISTS

Vol. 5, No. 3 June 15, 1975 15¢
P. O. BOX 11942, CHICAGO, ILL.

U.S. IMPERIALISTS STEP UP WAR PREPARATIONS

The U. S. imperialists are preparing for a world war. They have just suffered a decisive defeat in Indo-China, with the liberation of both South Viet Nam and Cambodia. Have they learned any lesson? Have they changed their nature, laid down their butcher knives, become

peaceful? No! In evacuating U. S. military personnel from South Viet Nam, it has been revealed that the U. S. imperialists carried out very heavy bombing and also intruded into the South Vietnamese territorial waters with marines and warships. Following shortly afterwards, the

U. S. imperialists sent their spy ship the Mayaguez into Cambodian waters it was justly seized by the Cambodians. The U. S. imperialists, using their armed occupation of Thailand to launch attacks against Cambodia, carried out bombings of Sihanoukville and other sovereign
(continued on page 4)

OPPOSE THE SHIFTING OF THE BURDEN OF ECONOMIC CRISIS ONTO THE BACKS OF WORKERS

The U. S., as well as the whole capitalist world, is in the grips of the worst economic crisis since the depression of the 1930's. The monopoly capitalist economic system itself is the cause of this crisis. The monopoly capitalists are attempting to make the workers pay for this crisis by shifting its burden onto the workers' backs.

According to the Department of Labor statistics, unemployment has increased from 8.9% in April to 9.2% in May. Increases in unemployment were concentrated in the construction, manufacturing, transportation and public utility industries. Jobless rates of 19.3% in construction and 12.2% in manufacturing were at a record high since WWII. According to the May 5th issue of Newsweek magazine, the rate of unemployment among minority teenagers is listed at a record rate of 41.6%. But the actual rate, according to the magazine, is closer to 60%, and even that is expected to swell in the next few months.

Furthermore, consumer prices in April rose another 0.3%, or 10.2% more than in April, 1974. The consumer price index for the same month moved up to 158.6; in other words, what could be bought for \$100 in 1967 cost \$158.60 this April. The Labor Department pointed out on May 21 that real spendable earnings--that is, what is left after deductions for taxes and allowances for inflation, were 4.1% less this April than they were a year ago.

Since January, American workers and other working people have fought resolute struggles against the unemployment and layoffs, for better working conditions, higher wages, job security and the right to organize:

Beginning in January, a national strike of oil refinery workers took place for higher wages. In a number of instances, the workers had to resort to taking up guns and other forms of resistance in
(continued on page 3)

Public Sector Workers ... p 2
No Inflation in China..... p 14
General Line on
Workers' Movement .. p 6

INSERT: PCDN SERIES "CHINA, THE TWO SUPERPOWERS AND THE THREAT OF WORLD WAR", page 7-14

RAILROADS

BRAC Prepares for National Strike

CLASS STRUGGLE, NOT INDUSTRIAL PEACE

C. L. Dennis, president of the Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks, announced on Wednesday, June 18, that his union will strike the railroads beginning Monday, June 23, if there is no contract settlement. BRAC has been under an imposed so-called 60-day "cooling off period," brought in by President Ford to sup-

press the railroad workers' rights to strike and to throw them into arbitration.

What is it the railroad workers under BRAC want? They are fighting on the question of job security, including guarantees against lay-offs. It was pointed out that the railroad capitalists' offer is completely inadequate. Dennis said,
(continued on page 17)

Workers' Advocate Hails The EAST INDIAN DEFENCE COMMITTEE

Worker's Advocate is reproducing the following article from the pamphlet entitled "WHAT IS THE TROUBLE AND WHO IS THE TROUBLE MAKER IN THE EAST INDIAN COMMUNITY?" This pamphlet provides the basic line of the East Indian Defense Committee--the defense organization of the East Indian communities in Canada--on several important issues. The position of the East Indian Defense Committee (British Columbia) was publicly stated at a press conference in Vancouver on March 9, 1975. The conference was addressed by Comrade Hardial Bains together with Sardar Bela Singh Thandi, President of the EIDC. Here is the statement issued after the press conference (reprinted from People's Canada Daily News), followed by a letter from the above mentioned pamphlet (printed as a special issue of Lok Awaz 17):

STATEMENT ISSUED BY EAST INDIAN DEFENCE COMMITTEE MARCH 12

Comrade Hardial Bains together with Sardar Bela Singh Thandi, President of the East Indian Defence Committee (B.C.), addressed a press conference on March 9, 1975 in Vancouver. Sardar Bela Singh Thandi spoke for a few minutes in Punjabi and Comrade Bains translated these remarks and then answered questions from the reporters.

Sardar Bela Singh pointed out that the only way to defend our community is through self-defence and that the fact the East Indian Defence Committee already exists and that it has protected our people on several occasions from racist attacks, the East Indian Defence Committee is fulfilling its role and should be supported.

Salient points made by Comrade Bains during the press conference were as follows:

1. The racists wish to create an atmosphere of fear amongst our people. These racists are actually promoted by the government and the media. Their technique is to create psychological fear and complement it by actual physical attacks. The role of the East Indian Defence Committee is to counter this psychological fear and provide actual physical defence to racist attacks. This

means that while government and media actually practice racism, carry on scare campaigns against our people, persecute our people on the basis of race, the East Indian Defence Committee unites our community against the policy of the government and media, repulses actual physical attacks on our people and opposes persecution on a racist basis. This is the way things stand at this time in Vancouver: On one hand are the government, media, racist hooligans and police, and on the other hand are the East Indian people led by the East Indian Defence Committee. The contradiction between the two goes through many phases, and the most dominant phase is the governmental and institutional discrimination against the East Indian people. The "Green Paper" released by Mr. Andras, Minister of Manpower and Immigration, is the true example of governmental and institutional racism.

2. When an East Indian family is attacked, they first contact the police. The police usually arrive late, villify our own people (to the extent that the police actually have asked certain families to leave the country), and then do nothing about the case. The usual excuse given on these occasions is: "Catch the guilty party and then
(continued on back page)

LETTER FROM LOK AWAZ ON PAGE 19

PUBLIC SECTOR WORKERS HAVE AN ABSOLUTE RIGHT TO STRIKE

The deepening economic crisis and especially the impact of inflation have led to a large scale strike movement by public sector workers during the last year and a half. Nationwide there was a record number of strikes by public sector workers in 1974 - three to four times as many as in 1973. In California alone public sector workers launched 46 strikes in 1974 - also a record - to raise the total number of such strikes to over 170 in the past seven years. These 1974 California strikes involved 41,400 workers including firefighters, transit workers, teachers, water and power workers and others in cities across the state. Traditional advantages of civil service workers such as job security and adequate wages are gradually being stripped away by the economic crisis. Governments are increasingly turning to layoffs, hiring freezes, wage freezes, and intensification of labor - thus increasing the exploitation of public sector workers. The strike movement is the principal means by which the workers are resisting the attempts of the governments to lower the workers standard of living and to intensify their labor. It is a distinct feature of the life of public sector workers - who now number 1 out of 5 of all workers in the country and also in the state - that several years ago the income of one breadwinner with a public sector job was often sufficient to raise a family, while that task is extremely difficult today.

Governments have traditionally held strikes by its own workers to be illegal. In a 1919 conflict on this issue Calvin Coolidge, when Governor of Massachusetts, declared "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, at any time". Many state and local governments still follow that reactionary idea and have laws making strikes by public sector workers illegal. Unions have increasingly defied those laws in order to defend the workers interests. Whenever such a strike occurs the capitalist politicians and media denounce the workers as "irresponsible", "lazy", "unproductive", "acting against the public interest" and "disrupting essential services". Threats of fines and jail are made against workers

and union leaders. All of this is of course also done in California despite the fact that there is at present time no law either recognizing or prohibiting the right to strike by public sector workers in the state.

San Diego Mayor Pete Wilson is one of those who is playing a leading role in developing the strategy of the state, county and municipal governments for increasing the exploitation of public sector workers. In 1973 he advanced the idea that the wages of San Diego city workers should no longer be linked to the rising pay scale of either private sector workers or workers in other government units. The city council supported this scheme. This makes the city workers bear the entire burden of the spiralling inflation. At the time of the 1974 U.S. Conference of Mayors, held in San Diego last summer, Wilson boasted "I indicated that if anybody wanted to walk out, they could keep walking." Thus over the past two years the wage increases in some San Diego government job categories have risen only one tenth as fast as inflation, meaning that these workers have suffered a 20 - 25% decrease in their standard of living. Through such experiences over the years public sector workers have learned that governments as employers are not above classes but on the contrary are no different from any capitalist employer - and seeks to reduce its workers to the lowest possible level if the workers do not defend themselves by forming unions and waging strike struggles. Most governments have refused to recognize the right to strike because that is the main means the workers have to resist the attacks of the governments on their standard of living.

In California any collective bargaining legislation which recognized the full legal rights of the 1.5 million public sector workers was opposed by the former Reagan administration. Present state laws covering public sector workers recognize only the right to be represented by the organization of the workers' choice and the "right" to "meet and confer" with their public employer. But the public sector workers are excluded from the provisions of the State Labor Code which recognizes both participation in collective bargaining for binding contracts and the right to

strike. Thus the existing law covering public sector workers provides no mechanism for settling an impasse in a dispute and no way to force the public employers to go beyond the empty promise to "meet and confer". An official of the California State Employees Association said "People don't believe in the divine right of kings anymore and they don't believe in the divine right of management in the public sector either". As a result of the rising militancy of public sector workers the new Brown administration is moving towards making miniscule changes in the law as an act of political deception - to appear "sensitive to the needs of the workers". The problem for the state and local governments is that there have been too many strikes. They seek "industrial peace" in the public sector.

Senate Bill 275, which is now under consideration in committees of the state legislature, is called the "Peace in Public Employment" bill. It will make some minor changes in the law. But SB275, in its recently amended form, does not recognize the right to strike and does not contain effective procedures for handling an impasse in collective bargaining. It therefore fails to meet the basic need for legislation which defends the elementary rights of the working class. SB275 has other faults as well. It does not require full negotiation of all issues and conditions of employment. It furthermore would reduce the rights of some transit workers, whose present rights under the public utilities code would be lost under SB275. (The Illinois state legislature recently pulled a similar trick - by "giving" rights to certain workers while taking away the previously won rights of other workers, thus splitting the public sector workers.) It appears unlikely that the Brown administration will achieve its dream of "peace in public employment" through SB275. It is a law of history that where there is oppression there is resistance. Already there is opposition to SB275 amongst public sector workers. Some are rejecting the bill as a deception. Several unions representing public sector workers are justly demanding that any new legislation include recognition of the right to strike, provision for arbitration procedures, and negotiation of all issues between public sector workers and governments. Some workers are seeking changes in the bill to suit their interests. We are not opposed to that, nor are we opposed to those workers who choose the method of direct confrontation against the government as employer in order to achieve their just demands. The various public sector workers themselves must decide the tactics they will use in the developing struggle for their rights and their demands.

(Reprinted from San Diego Worker, Volume 1, #2, May-June 1975)

U. S. IMPERIALISTS STEP UP WAR PREPARATIONS (continued from page 17)

bles they are preparing, if they are given a free hand.

See what is happening in the world! The peoples of the Soviet Union are being oppressed and nursed in an aggressive nationalist spirit, the peoples of the pseudo-socialist countries of Europe are also being oppressed, and their ruling cliques submit the interests of their peoples to those of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty. The Kremlin oppresses and threatens them: «Either you act the way I want and order you, or I will invade and suppress you as I have done with Czechoslovakia». This was the way of Hitler; he began with Austria, then went on to Czechoslovakia and to the other countries. It was in the same way that Soviet social-imperialism began, and it is in the same way that it will end. Like Hascha began and ended, in the same way have begun and will end Husak, Beck-Gierek, Zhivkov-Filov and others.

US imperialism is crushing the peoples under its bloody heel. It has trodden down on its «allies» trying by every manner of means to keep them under the constant menace of the economic crisis, the atomic bomb, the Soviet threat, intrigues and diversion. It tries to preserve the Atlantic alliance by stirring up rival-

ries in its midst, always in its favour, and creating a climate of uncertainty in the countries and governments of its so-called «allies».

The United States attack Vietnam and Cambodia. In complete solidarity with one another, the Americans and Soviets provoke wars in the Middle East, manipulate the Chilean and Cyprus tragedy, intervene in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Everyone waits in anguish. Where will they strike next? The world is now full of noise and rumours spread by parlour and club diplomats, all of them agents provocateurs, sold-out scribblers, people in the service of the two superpowers who try to fish in troubled waters through blackmail and intimidation. Tomorrow, they say, it will be Yugoslavia's turn! What will happen after Tito? Yugoslavia will be annexed either to the Soviet or the American sphere of influence; Rumania will be gobbled up by the Soviets; Albania will not go unscathed. Which side will Greece take now that it withdrew from NATO? etc. etc.

All these rumours express the wishes and plans of the two superpowers, they are not only a psychological campaign to demoralize the people of those countries, but also a real military preparation to

weaken their resistance and drown them afterwards in blood.

The psychosis of fear and war is fostered by the two superpowers. This psychosis of threat is used to proclaim the two umbrellas, one Soviet the other American, as the sole way of salvation. According to them, there is no other choice, if you want to be saved. «Don't think with your head, your freedom and fate are dependent on these two monsters». Over all this psychosis of blackmail, intimidation and terror hovers a thick smoke of meetings, contacts, talks, bilateral and multi-lateral commissions. Everything is put under discussion, but no question is solved, or, when allegedly settled, nothing is certain. Even the implicit bourgeois «moral obligations» of the diplomatic acts of former times have today been affected by a horrible corruption and rotteness. The policy of the superpowers and their allies is ridden by degeneration, falsity, deceit.

Should the peoples sit idle in face of the catastrophe these criminal bands are preparing for mankind? Certainly not! What should be done, then? We say that we must fight. (from Our Policy is an Open Policy, the Policy of Proletarian Principles, Tirana, 1974)

Oppose the Shifting of the Burden of the Economic Crisis Onto Workers

(continued from page 1)

order to carry through their strike. Since February 10th, over 19,000 aircraft workers have been on strike at the McDonnell-Douglas plants in St. Louis, southern California, and Cape Canaveral, demanding pay hikes and better working conditions. In the same month, 5,800 steel workers at the Ohio Sheet and Tubes Campbell Works in Youngstown walked out in protest against the company's speed-up. Coal miners, during the last few months, walked out in union organizing drives in Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota. There have been strike actions by New York doctors for the first time in history this March, with 4,000 doctors from 21 hospitals taking part. 4,000 medical workers in Los Angeles were involved in a strike in February. Many house staffs in hospitals are also attempting to get organized for the first time, to fight against low pay, long hours and bad working conditions. In spite of a state ban, many Detroit teachers went off their jobs last December and January. Teachers in Connecticut and Pennsylvania have also held strikes this year.

Numerous strikes being held by the United Steelworkers of America have been under attack by the state machine. Construction workers have fought a large number of strike struggles for higher wages in response to a nationwide campaign by the construction capitalists for actual wage-cuts and the use of scab construction outfits in place of unionized workers. Similar struggles have been waged by REA workers against the plans of their capitalist employers to cut the workers' wages in order to maintain their own profits. Workers on Eastern Airlines are facing the same attempts by the airline capitalists to make direct pay cuts, and they are preparing for struggle on this front. In this period of economic crisis, many other sections of organized labor are being confronted with similar attempts by the capitalists to cut their pay, not only through higher prices and inflation, but through direct pay cuts.

10,000 unemployed autoworkers held a protest rally on February 5th in Washington, D. C., against the large unemployment in the industry. Protest demonstrations by construction workers against unemployment were also held in New York, where 10,000 construction workers denounced their employers and fought against the attacks of the police. The construction workers also rallied in Oakland, San Leonardo, Milwaukee and many other cities. On April 26th, 60,000 trade unionists including employed and unemployed, whites, blacks and other national minority people, closed their ranks and gave support to each other at a trade union rally in Washington, D. C. Massive demonstrations were held in the first weeks of June in New York City against the Municipal authorities for dismissing workers and cutting budgets. This included a demonstration of 25,000 teachers, workers, parents and students on June 9th, as well as a demonstration on June 4th by sanitation workers, teachers, hospital workers, truck drivers, firefighters, and housing maintenance workers at the headquarters of the First National City Bank to protest against the municipal authorities for massive lay-offs, heavy cuts in funds for health services and education. The authorities had announced at the end of last month that they would dismiss 38,000 city workers in June--11% of all city workers. 24,000 workers have already been dismissed in the past 6 months. None of these attacks by the monopoly capitalist class are being taken lightly by the working class.

But only about 25% of American workers are organized into unions, which means that the great majority of workers are without any defense organizations. And the government is trying to force those unions that do exist to become appendages to its dictatorship and a force against the working class itself.

At this time in the United States the trade union movement is dominated by reactionary leadership. These belong to the upper levels of



STRIKING BURLINGTON-NORTHERN MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR WORKERS DEFEY A COURT RESTRAINING ORDER, KEEPING TRAINS SHUT DOWN THROUGH CHICAGO'S RUSH HOUR.

the labor aristocracy; they are very small in number but very highly paid agents of the capitalists in the ranks of the workers, and they are the ones who bring ideas of class collaboration and industrial peace into the workers' movement.

Whenever workers' struggles take place, they turn into battles with the capitalists--the history of the last few months outlined here as well as many battles fought in the past show this clearly. And when such battles take place, in addition to mobilizing their agents within the workers' movement the capitalists bring to bear the pressure of the entire state and propaganda organs, including police and national guard, etc., courts, scabs and stoolies, reactionary members of the mass media--these and all other possible weapons are used by the capitalist class against the workers' movement, with the aim of liquidating it.

A number of recent examples of the anti-worker activities of the capitalists would include:

--The use of the Railway Labor Act by the railroad capitalists and the government to suppress the strike struggle of the Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks (BRAC), as well as other railroad unions who recently attempted to strike for higher wages and job security. The Act was invoked in order to paralyze the struggle in arbitration and mediation.

--The infamous Taft-Hartley Law and the use of court injunctions against trade union struggles, is a commonly used tactic of the capitalists in their attempts to prevent strikes. Recently a Mr. Rees, Director of the Government Council on Wage and Price Stability, chided the U. S. monopoly capitalists for not using the Taft-Hartley legislation enough, saying, "They don't use the rights they have..." He further added that he was amazed "at the extent to which American management continues to bargain on a fragmented basis," and that "under existing laws, managements could form bargaining associations, but they don't."

--Ford has introduced a bill into Congress to freeze the wages of all Federal employees at 5% increase limitation. Furthermore, machinery is already in motion to reintroduce new wage and price controls in 1976. Rees, in a recent talk to the National Economist Club, spread the deception and lie that so-called "wage inflation" is a clear danger for 1976. This is the capitalist lie that higher wages lead to higher prices. He said, "By god, we'll get them..."

--The proposed Senate Bill Number one, which is presented as the first uniform federal crim-

inal code, has many fascist provisions, which can be used against the workers' trade union struggles, as well as against democratic rights. For example, any of the following sections from the proposed bill, phrased in vague and ambiguous language open to use by the capitalists as they see fit, can be used against trade union struggles:

1) "...tumultuous conduct" by five or more persons that "creates a grave danger of injury or damage to persons or property" is defined as a "riot" carrying a penalty of three years in prison. It is common knowledge that the capitalists turn facts on their heads and claim that strikes create a danger to property and persons.

2) The bill makes it a crime for a person to delay or obstruct the "production, repair or delivery" of "any property particularly suited for national defense use" if this is done "in reckless disregard of the fact that his conduct might impair the ability of the United States to prepare for defense activities." "Unusual strike" activities fall specifically within this provision, which carries a punishment of 3 years imprisonment, increased to 7 during a "national defense emergency" which the President is authorized to declare whenever he finds an "actual or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States." This provision can obviously be used against workers in the defense industries, as well as in any of the heavy industries or other industries such as primary metals, electronics manufacture, etc., which are deemed for "national defense use."

3) In a revision of the anti-communist Smith Act, and an attempted revival of the McCarthy period, the bill says there can be 15 years imprisonment for someone who "incites other persons to engage in conduct that they or at some future time would facilitate the forcible overthrow" of the government. This obviously is directed at Marxist-Leninists and militant trade unionists in the workers movement.

4) There is also a catch-all clause which is a definition of so-called "criminal attempt" which can be punished with the same sentence as a completed "crime." This can be used against any activity that the capitalists want to term a "crime," such as: strikes and demonstrations. A person would be "guilty" even though he only "indicated his intent to complete commission of the crime," and even though it

(continued on page 18)

U.S. IMPERIALISTS STEP UP WAR PREPARATIONS (continued from page 1)

areas of Cambodia, and sent their marines to invade Cambodian islands under the hoax of liberating the Mayaguez. Also since the beginning of May, the U.S. imperialist war mongers have stepped up their threats against Korea, massed their troops on the border of the Democratic Republic of Korea, and according to Evans and Novak, journalists close to the U.S. ruling circles, threatened use of "nearly 1,000 daily air sorties, including devastating B-52 raids, using the most sophisticated non-nuclear technology. Infantry would then clean up decimated North Korean forces." The use of nuclear bombs has also been threatened. All of this proves that the U.S. imperialists are still hell-bent on seeking world hegemony.

Most significant, however, has been President Ford's recent trip to Europe and the convocation of a NATO summit meeting under Ford's sponsorship. The purpose of Ford's NATO summit meeting was to strengthen an aggressive military block under the jackboot of U.S. imperialists in Western Europe, to be used against the social-imperialists in the Soviet Union and their militarist Warsaw block. This is another example of the stepping up of the contention between the two super-powers for world hegemony with Europe as the focus. The U.S. imperialists have suffered setbacks in Indo-China and the Middle East region, and the Soviet imperialists, trying to capitalize on Washington's predicament, are wildly stretching their hands into U.S. spheres of influence. The Soviet imperialists are intensifying their infiltration in Southern Europe, stirring up trouble in the Iberian peninsula and the Balkan peninsula, exploiting the opportunity to expand their influence and cut the ground from under NATO, and undermine U.S. foundations in the Middle East, Mediterranean and Western Europe as a whole.

Since the U.S. imperialists have suffered their setbacks, a number of people in the U.S. ruling circles have advocated a so-called reassessment of U.S. foreign policy. They maintain that Washington should emphasize safeguarding its main interests, that is to say, concentrate its strength on countering the Soviet offensives in Europe and on its southern flank--the Middle East, the Balkans and the Mediterranean. On June 9th U.S. News and World Report pointed out that "the U.S. no longer dominates the world, or even the Western nations as it once did. It has only relative parity with Russia in nuclear might."

To secure its position, the U.S. has shifted its attention to those important areas of contention with Soviet revisionism. The Pentagon has announced its plan for reinforcing troops stationed in Central Europe. Ford, Kissinger and Schlesinger have taken the field themselves and made "blitz visits" to Western Europe and Turkey, and separately participated in NATO and CENTO conferences. Their main purpose is to strengthen relations with so-called allies in Western Europe, the Middle East and the Near East and bring them under the jackboot of the U.S., formulate a new military strategy in the rivalry with the Soviet revisionists and, in particular, mend the rift on the southern flank of the NATO group. Furthermore, without letting up in the seesaw battle with Soviet revisionism for the Middle East, the U.S. is doing all in its power to thwart the Soviet revisionist scheme to control the region.

Also, the economic rivalry between the two superpowers is intensifying in Europe. The Soviet revisionists want to use the economic crisis in the West to get more capital and know-how in order to save the Soviet Union from the economic difficulties arising from its frenzied armaments expansions and war preparations, and continue to intensify these activities. They also want to undermine the U.S. imperialists' position in Western Europe by carrying out expansion and infiltration into the Western European countries for the consolidation of the

Soviet position in its contention for world domination. However, the Soviet social-imperialists have failed to achieve what they wished. The U.S. imperialists have taken retaliatory measures to deal with the Soviet maneuver to undermine its influence in Western Europe. Taking advantage of some East European countries' tendency of drifting away from the Soviet revisionists, it is stepping up infiltration of Eastern Europe and tries hard to prevent the Western European capitalists from exporting advanced technology to the Soviet Union. However, under the signboard of "all-Europe economic cooperation" the Soviet Union is doing everything possible to make the Western European capitalists dependent on Soviet new capitalists, taking them out of the U.S. sphere of influence--such as by making various deals to sell them energy materials. Though lagging behind the U.S. in terms of absolute figures of exports to Western Europe, the Soviet Union has surpassed Wall Street in terms of growth rate of exports which, between 1965-72, grew by 9.2% per year, as compared to 6.8% for the U.S. interests. They have also set up a banking network in the financial centers of Western Europe. These are all examples of further contention, interpenetration and mutual exclusion practiced by the two superpowers. This is further evidence of the aggressive imperialism of the two superpowers. "They are dividing the world into spheres of influence and proceeding to the division and occupation of world markets. Their ultimate aim is to dominate over the whole world, to rule over all nations and states. Hence their irreconcilable contradictions which may lead them to another war." (Enver Hoxha)

Most characteristic of this period of increasing contention between the two superpowers is the feverish arms race, especially the nuclear arms race. These and other war preparations are being carried out under the slogans of "detente," "peace" and "disarmament." A case in point is the recent Geneva Conference to review the implementation of the so-called "nuclear non-proliferation treaty." The purpose of this treaty and the conference was to fortify the nuclear monopoly held by the two superpowers, increase the nuclear blackmail against the world's people and intensify their own nuclear weapons build up.

An examination of history since the signing of the treaty exposed both the political deception as well as the military adventure of the two superpowers in their contention for world domination: The treaty was signed by the Soviet Union and the United States in 1968. It became effective after rectification in 1970. But since 1968, the Soviet Union, which made every effort to eulogize the treaty as "stopping up all loopholes in the spread of nuclear weaponry," has been going a head with its nuclear arms drive at an unprecedented speed. It only had seven nuclear submarines capable of launching long range ballistic guided missiles in 1968. The number increased to 50 in 1974, a more than sevenfold rise in six years. It had some 800 intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads in 1968; by 1974 the number had risen almost two-fold to 1,500. To catch up with and surpass its opponent in sophisticated nuclear weaponry and delivery vehicles, it conducted more than 100 test firings on intercontinental ballistic missiles and over ten underground nuclear tests in 1973 alone. Its nuclear tests were far more frequent last year.

Confronted with such harsh reality, U.S. imperialism, not to be outdone, has openly declared it will not tolerate but will respond to all this. Hence the sharp rise in its military spending in fiscal 1975 to more than 104,000 million dollars, a record high in U.S. history. According to the 1975 Yearbook published recently under the title, "World Armaments and Disarmament" by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute: "The U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal contains: about 500 submarines; and 1,054 land-

based strategic missiles. The Soviet nuclear arsenal contains: 40 nuclear strategic bombers; 42 strategic nuclear-powered submarines and 1,540 land-based strategic missiles. . . In addition to huge strategic forces, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. have deployed tens of thousands of tactical nuclear weapons. In Europe alone there are about 7,000 U.S. and 3,500 Soviet tactical nuclear weapons. . . the total explosive power of existing tactical nuclear weapons is enormous--so large as almost to defy imagination."

Lenin, on the eve of WWI, exposed the European great imperialist powers who "engaged in a mad armaments hurdle race" while chanting with a worn out "peace" theme in a thousand and one ways. He said "Put no faith in phrase mongering, it is better to see who stands to gain!" Don't believe the empty phrases of "disarmament" and "detente"--they are the lying words of superpowers who are preparing for world war. If you don't believe this, just examine what has appeared in the U.S. capitalist press in the last few weeks:

--"Air Force Begins Training For Limited Nuclear war." Air Force bomber crews have been ordered to start training for a limited nuclear war in case the U.S. should want to exercise that option. Many crews, under the top secret orders that have added a number of war time missions to the strategic war command, have already received "mission folders" explaining their new tasks. These instructions represent another big step in the Ford Administration's controversial decision to prepare the nation for a small nuclear war, where destruction might be controlled, as well as for a war of massive incineration. (Chicago Sun Times, June 15, 1975.)

--"Schlesinger: Atom Attack Possible": Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger has told Congress that the U.S. might have to use nuclear battle field weapons to stop a Soviet attack on Europe with conventional forces. . . Schlesinger said it was possible to envision much worse circumstances than those planned for in the event of a massive Soviet non-nuclear attack with men, tanks and planes. For that reason, Schlesinger said, it was impossible to rule out NATO's first use of nuclear tactical weapons. (Chicago Daily News, May 30, 1975.)

--"The Pentagon's New Plan: Mine Shafts Will Be Nuclear Shelters." "Crisis relocation is part of a new strategic policy called flexible response. . . basically what flexible response means is the U.S. is prepared to fight various kinds of limited nuclear wars with Russia, instead of just one big war. According to those who believe in flexible response, this helps to deter any enemy from making limited attacks against the U.S., because presumably, the other side realized that if they attack one of our missiles, we will attack one of theirs; if they attack two of our missiles, we will attack two of theirs; if they attack one of our cities, we will attack one of theirs, and so on. (Chicago Sun Times, June 15.)

Comrade Enver Hoxha points out:

We, the people of the People's Republic of Albania, of a small country in the Balkans which has suffered much at the hands of the barbarous imperialist occupiers through the centuries and which has won its freedom and everything it enjoys today arms in hand, call on all common people of the world: Look out! US imperialism and Russian imperialism are leading the world into another world war, more terrible than the two previous wars! These two superpowers are responsible of the present great crises, they are vying with one another for world hegemony, they are fighting to occupy markets, that is, to oppress and enslave the peoples. It is precisely the two superpowers that arm anti-popular cliques and governments to use them as watchdogs and their peoples as cannon fodder for the inevitable sham-

(continued on page 2)

ZANU!

(The following article from Zimbabwe News deals with the current situation in Zimbabwe, where, in the face of the growing victories by the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and the Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army (ZANLA) in their anti-colonial, anti-imperialist and anti-racist fight under the leadership of Comrade Ndabaningi Sithole, all the reactionary forces are being gathered to come to the assistance of the racist and fascist Ian Smith regime. It has long been clear that the main force of reaction inside Zimbabwe is the racist white settlers who maintain their rule by oppressing the majority of the Zimbabwean people. It has also been clear that externally the British and U.S. imperialists have been the main factors in propping up the Smith regime, with the Soviet social-imperialists coveting influence in the area. Now, however, a circle of reactionaries led by Kenneth Kaunda, head of the Zambian government, is operating against the Zimbabwean liberation forces, having obviously succumbed to the pressures of the colonialists and racists. Furthermore, under the smokescreen of "detente" and "peace", the Ian Smith racist government is trying to undermine and smash up the liberation struggle. The meaning of "detente" on behalf of the Ian Smith racists was exhibited very clearly by the massacre of Zimbabwean liberation fighters in Salisbury by the Smith regime. This quite clearly proves that the reactionary forces have united in action, regardless of their race, and are trying every underhanded and cowardly trick to defuse the armed struggle in Zimbabwe. The continuing attempts to cut the membership of ZANU and ZANLA off from their leadership, the longstanding attempts to slander and frame Comrade Sithole, the murder of Comrade Chitepo, Kaunda's conscious attempts to sabotage the ZANU and ZANLA forces—all these cowardly attacks are an intensification of the class warfare and represent a last ditch alliance of the reac-



Comrade Ndabaningi Sithole, leader of the Zimbabwe people, is greeted on his arrival in Dar es Salaam in April.

tionary forces.

The struggle in Zimbabwe is a national liberation struggle against the external forces of imperialism and against the internal reactionaries who safeguard the interests of the imperialists. The fight being waged by the ZANU and ZANLA forces is also a revolutionary struggle, which is arming the people to bring about their own liberation. Here are the words of ZANU itself:

"WE SHALL NOT BE INTIMIDATED, COWED AND BLACKMAILED INTO SUBMISSION TO IMPERIALISTS AND REACTIONARY FORCES. WE WILL HIT AND HIT HARD. THERE WILL BE NO COMPROMISE OR SURRENDER ON PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES. WE SHALL FIGHT TO THE BITTER END."

UNITED FRONT AND ARMED STRUGGLE IN ZIMBABWE

The people of Zimbabwe want unity. Africa wants unity in Zimbabwe. Socialists and progressive forces in the world want unity in Zimbabwe. But the big question is: **WHAT KIND OF UNITY IS DESIRABLE FOR ZIMBABWE?**

The Lusaka Declaration for Unity in Zimbabwe was a move in the right direction. We support it because we accept its necessity. What we in ZANU would have preferred is a united front, in the crucial days ahead. But as a revolutionary party we had to make a compromise. In revolution, compromises are necessary and a revolutionary party must know when to make compromises and the types of compromises to make at a particular time. As Lenin declared: "There are compromises and compromises. One must be able to analyse the situation and the concrete conditions of each compromise or of each variety of compromises. One must learn to distinguish between a man who gave the bandits money and fire-arms in order to lessen the danger they can do and facilitate their capture, and execution; and a man who gives bandits money and fire-arms in order to share in the loot."

ZANU made compromises in the unity talks in order to serve the revolution. First, we wanted our military operations to continue. Secondly, we had to think of the thousands of our fighters in the field and in training camps and hundreds crippled, maimed and injured and old men, women and children under our care.

UNITED FRONT OR FUSION?

Why does ZANU prefer a united front to a fusion? Fusion means the merger of all parties and party organs and structures into one single organisation. Ideally, this would be the greatest development that would happen in Zimbabwe. But in revolution, one does not deal with ideals or abstract sentiments, but with concrete things or matter.

Complete fusion of the liberation movements in Zimbabwe would have disastrous consequences on armed struggle in the country. In the first place, how can a liberation movement operating within Zimbabwe (under the control of Ian Smith) wage armed struggle? Our experiences before 1963 shows that this is impossible. Secondly, the movements that have signed the Lusaka declaration have different political backgrounds, ideological outlooks, attitudes towards national liberation in Zimbabwe. For example, on the question of political settlement in Zimbabwe, ANCI's on record for supporting parity

or the sharing of power with white settlers in Zimbabwe. ZAPU and FORLIZI are on record for seeking gradual majority rule. They accept a transitional period. Only ZANU has said, "MAJORITY RULE IS NOT NEGOTIABLE", and that only the immediate introduction of one man one vote will satisfy the people of Zimbabwe. There are also differences of opinion on the form of struggle in Zimbabwe. Some of these groups prefer peaceful and constitutional struggle. Others think that Smith has been hit hard enough to be prepared to concede majority rule and therefore it's time to talk to him. We in ZANU say only armed struggle is the answer in Zimbabwe and that Ian Smith has not been hit hard enough. Our President Comrade Ndabaningi Sithole best summed Smith's attitude when he said, "Mr. Smith hasn't changed. He still sounds like a white ruler in the 1920's when in fact we are living in the 1970's when African countries are independent". We therefore maintain that the primary method or form of struggle is armed struggle and that all other forms of struggle are secondary.

OPPORTUNISTS CONFUSE MATTERS

On the question of a ceasefire in the country, some of these groups prefer to have a ceasefire with Smith, partly because most of them do not have forces in the field and partly because they are just tired of the struggle. Some have even gone to the extent of lying that messages of a ceasefire are being transmitted to the fighting forces in the field. ZANU says that there is no ceasefire and there won't be a ceasefire until there is a definite programme to transfer power to the African people of Zimbabwe. And the only man who can call for a ceasefire is Comrade Ndabaningi Sithole, the President of ZANU.

Given such a wide divergence of views about the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe, a complete merger or fusion is out of the question no matter how desirable it might seem. In any case, the mere fact of having a complete situation such as the one in Zimbabwe means that you are bound to have conflicting views about the best way to resolve the problem. The idea of a fusion in the revolutionary struggle therefore tends to go against historical evidence. Few countries, if any, in the world have achieved their revolutions without splits or many parties or groups.

(continued on page 17)

SITHOLE CONDEMNS SMITH'S MASSACRE OF ZIMBABWE FREEDOM FIGHTERS

Dar es Salaam

Ndabaningi Sithole, leading member of the Zimbabwean liberation movement, has called on the Zimbabwean people to close their ranks in the fight against the enemies, the paper "Uhuru" reported.

Sithole made this call when he left here on June 8 for a visit to a number of European countries and the United States. He said that the Zimbabwean people should unite as one to fight the enemy during the present hard time.

Speaking on the recent massacre of Zimbabwean people in Salisbury by the Smith regime, Sithole pointed out that this demonstrated how Smith tried to prolong the white minority rule.

He said that to hold talks with Smith would be meaningless because Smith wanted to deceive the world. Smith said he was ready to find a solution to the constitutional crisis, but actually he was not working for this end.

Reprinted from Hsinhua News Bulletin, 6/10/75

... AND FROM GHANA

The Ghanaian paper "Daily Graphic" says in an editorial yesterday that the opening fire of Rhodesian police on unarmed Africans was another ghastly scene reminiscent of the Sharpeville massacre 15 years ago.

Reprinted from Hsinhua News Bulletin, 6/7/75

BRITISH COLUMBIA LABOUR CODE BILL 11

HARDIAL S. BAINS

GENERAL LINE ON THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

-- Text of the speech delivered by Comrade Hardial Bains, Chairman of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist), on NDP anti-labour legislation, on February 16, 1974 in Vancouver, B.C.

Comrades and Friends,

I have been asked by the B.C. Provincial Committee of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) to make some general comments on the NDP anti-labour legislation, Bill 11 in B.C. My comments are based on specific work our Party has done in the past few years. This includes the work I undertook from the spring of 1970 to date concerning the working class movement in a certain region of Canada where I and my committee have gained certain specific first-hand knowledge and experience of the problems facing those who are attempting to organise the unorganised and the specific role federal and provincial anti-labour legislation plays in obstructing this process. Also, I have been engaged in talking to a large number of workers who are themselves engaged in trade-union activity and who are the veterans of the trade-union movement and of the communist movement in Canada. They have provided me with valuable information and insight into the problems of organising the unorganised and the general problems of the working class movement. Also, I have talked to ordinary, unorganised and organised workers who are being brought into the movement by the impending economic crisis. These workers are mainly young and the majority of them are long-time Canadians. I held extensive discussions with immigrant workers, the majority of whom are unorganised and are the worst hit by the economic crisis. I have also heard the views of trade-unionists who are part of the CLC machine. Besides, I have analysed actual strike struggles over the past five to six years beginning with the struggle of the taxi drivers in Montreal to the strike struggle of the United Aircraft workers in Montreal. A detailed analysis has been done of some of the strikes, for example, the Dare workers' strike struggle in Kitchener-Waterloo. Furthermore, I have learned much by studying the positive and negative lines which emerged during the upsurge of the revolutionary youth and student movement of the 1960's. Apart from the work carried out by my own committee, the Party has gained much valuable experience in organising the working class movement since the Regina Conference of May, 1969. This experience has assisted me immensely in terms of grasping the basic problems facing the working class movement. For several years (especially since January, 1972), the majority of our comrades have been carrying out organisational work in the working class movement and we have been struggling to get the Organise-the-Unorganised campaign going. Our efforts are just beginning to bear fruit and the material conditions have been created for bringing forth a high tide in this campaign. I am certain that we will have tremendous victories on this front, a major front for the work of CPC (M-L) in the coming months and years.

Over the past six years (since the re-organisation of The Internationalists in May, 1968), we have strived from time to time to participate fully in the working class movement. But our participation on this front has been limited (until more recently) because of several factors, the most important of which come under the category of the subjective condition - the question of consciousness of class struggle, the realm of political line. The upsurge in the youth and student movement brought us into the arena of the working class struggle. The main thrust of the youth and student movement was struggle against the bourgeois decadent educational system, and against the cultural aggression of the U.S. imperialists and the monopoly capitalist class. The struggle on the cultural front zeroed in on the questions relating to ideology and theory, and on the questions of motivation; for example, the question of whom to serve, the working class or the monopoly capitalist class. The youth and student movement arose when U.S. imperialism was expanding into Canada at a tremendous speed and the modern revisionists had liquidated the revolutionary movement on all fronts. The activists in the youth and student movement enthusiastically came out of the universities, and the core of the movement adopted Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought as its guide to action. Hundreds of youth joined the working class and took up the cause of organising the working class movement. But, in spite of good wishes and correct declarations, a line against accepting Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought as the theory guiding our thinking and the line of not organising the working class movement kept obstructing our work. A large amount of time was spent in criticising and repudiating this line.

This is the line of anarcho-syndicalism. It is the line of not organising the Party and the working class movement, leaving the working class movement

at the mercy of the reactionaries and pamphleteering from the sidelines. We launched a struggle against this line during the Regina Conference in May, 1969 and defeated it there, but over the years the line emerged again and again. During the proceedings of the Second Congress of CPC (M-L) I pointed out: "Modern revisionism still remains the main enemy in this period but the enemy is fighting us through dogmatism now. We must hit at the precise form in which it shows itself and wage vigorous struggle against it. That precise form is anarcho-syndicalism. To overcome it and defeat it is to move forward. Not to overcome it, and to espouse it, is to be paralysed and move backward. Comrades have to make up their minds about this."

The main propagandist for the anarcho-syndicalist line is Jack Scott, currently resident in Vancouver. Through his essays and a book on "working class" "history" and through talks (and study groups) he is peddling his "left", in form, but right, in essence, line. There are certain elements inside the Party peddling the same line. The Progressive Workers Movement (now a defunct organisation) was founded in the fall of 1964 as an anti-revisionist organisation with Jack Scott at its helm. The Internationalists for a long time supported PWM and considered it a centre of the working class movement in this country. We were influenced by this organisation concerning the working class movement. But as we ourselves went into the working class and had direct experience of the working class movement, we found that Jack Scott's so-called anti-revisionism was actually neo-revisionism and that he was a resolute propagandist for anarcho-syndicalism.

At this time, when the general economic crisis is deepening in the capitalist world, the masses of workers are extremely concerned about it, while the monopoly capitalists are busy shifting the burden of this crisis onto the shoulders of the workers. The workers are fighting back. The resistance of the workers is causing grave concern to the capitalist circles and they are increasingly using political deception and demagoguery in order to make the organs of the state more efficient in suppressing the struggles of the workers. Specifically since 1968, new anti-labour legislation has been enacted all across Canada, and a militia is being trained to oppose the struggles of the workers. Major battles against capital are shaping up on the economic front. Increasingly large numbers of workers are being drawn into the struggle. The broad masses are getting extremely concerned about the spiralling inflation, the increasing job insecurity, the high unemployment and the sky-rocketing prices. The unionised workers are having extreme difficulty in maintaining even their previous year's standard of living. The non-unionised workers are at the mercy of the capitalists and have no defence organisation of their own to fight for job security and better wages and working conditions. Every wage demand of the unionised and non-unionised workers and every demand for better working conditions and job security becomes a battle. The militancy of workers in strike struggles and their political consciousness is increasing.

Besides using the state machinery against the workers, the capitalists are also using political deception. The New Democratic Party, which claims to be the party of the working class and has labour aristocrats in it, is in the forefront of this political deception. This party gets elected in the name of the workers and then passes legislation against the working class and in support of the capitalists. The closest ally of this party is the so-called Communist Party of Canada which also speaks in the name of the workers, but in practice, trails behind the NDP. There is increasing resentment and disillusionment against the NDP and the so-called communists (who will be referred to as modern revisionists in the rest of the speech) in the workers' movement and especially in the trade-union movement.

Anarcho-syndicalism is now re-emerging as the ally of the NDP and modern revisionism in the working class movement in various parts of Canada, especially in the west. (It is not very strong yet but the propaganda machine in support of it is going full blast.) So-called "western radicalism" (anarcho-syndicalism), the curse and vice of the working class movement in the west, is fighting to provide an "alternative" to the NDP and the modern revisionists. Anarcho-syndicalism is the twin brother of modern revisionism and reformism in the same way terrorism is the twin brother of revisionism and reformism. At the beginning of the youth and student movement of the 1960's, as well as in the course of its development and at its height, anarchism, terrorism, reformism, etc. came up to engage in a trial of strength with Marxism-Leninism in the youth and student movement. Similarly now, when reformism is the order of the day for all sorts of opportunist in Canada, we see the beginnings of the re-emergence of anarcho-syndicalism in the work-

(continued on page 15)

PEOPLE'S CANADA / ON THE DAILY NEWS / LINE

National Daily Working Class Newspaper

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Canada and the U.S.

Single copy - from a vendor: 10¢. Single copy - via mail: 20¢. Monthly: \$5.00. Quarterly: \$15.00. Half-Yearly: \$25.00. Yearly: \$50.00.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Rest of the world

Single copy - from a vendor: 25¢. Single copy - via mail: 25¢. Monthly: \$6.00. Quarterly: \$18.00. Half-yearly: \$30.00. Yearly: \$60.00.

Please send all subscriptions to:
National Publications Centre
P.O. Box 777, Adelaide Station
Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

All cheques and money orders should be made payable to the
National Publications Centre

CHINA, THE SUPERPOWERS AND THE THREAT OF WORLD WAR

Text of the speech which was partially delivered by Comrade Hardial Bains in a mass meeting on February 14, in Toronto. The introductory remarks of Comrade Bains are included in the story below entitled, "China, the Superpowers and the Threat of World War—Meeting in Toronto Denounces the Two Superpowers." After the introductory remarks Comrade Bains' speech continued as follows:

In old China, class struggle was extremely acute, major struggles broke out which took the proportion of civil war by the peasantry against the feudal rule, by the people of China against imperialism and feudalism, and by the workers, peasants, urban petty bourgeois and some section of the national bourgeoisie against imperialism, bureaucrat-comprador capitalism and feudalism leading to the victory of the Chinese people against imperialism, bureaucrat-comprador capitalism and feudalism in 1949. During all these struggles, the state of China was either in the hands of the feudalists (as in the case in the nineteenth century) or shared by the bourgeoisie and the feudalists (after overthrow of monarchy in 1911) or in the hands of bureaucrat-comprador capitalists and feudalists (both in the service of the imperialists) after the 1927 counter-revolutionary coup-d'etat engineered by Chiang Kai-Shek. During this entire period, every struggle necessarily developed into struggle against the state as the state was in the hands of the reactionary classes, (who were in the service of the imperialists) who used it to suppress the just struggles of the Chinese people even to the extent that the reactionaries launched vicious suppression campaigns against the students who participated in the May 4 Movement in 1919, against the struggles of the peasantry during the period of second revolutionary civil war (1929-37) and against the progressive and patriotic people who were resisting the Japanese aggression (1937-45).

The People's Republic of China came into being as the result of the protracted revolutionary war waged by the Chinese people since the 1840's against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-comprador capitalism (especially since 1919) and only this People's Republic takes the side of the people whenever struggles have broken out since 1949. Various capitalist roaders and reactionaries attempt to infiltrate this People's Republic and try to use that portion they have usurped against the people and for this reason also (there are other basic

reasons) every struggle develops into political struggle. Whether the state remains in the hands of the people, and the dictatorship of the proletariat is consolidated is a matter of life and death struggle for the Chinese people.

Since 1949, Chinese people have waged several struggles on the economic front and on the political front, the aim of which is to further consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and defeat the attempt of the bourgeoisie to seize the state from within, convert it into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and use it as an instrument of capitalist restoration. Of the two big struggles which attracted world-wide attention, the first was the struggle to build the economic foundation of socialism in a big way both in the cities and countryside which culminated in the **Great Leap Forward**. China gave birth to **People's Communes** during the Great Leap Forward in 1958-- which was a big defeat for the capitalist roaders, the revisionists, who were taking the stand-point of the rich peasantry and advocating rich peasant economy for the countryside as the basis of restoring capitalism all around.

This struggle, the **Great Leap Forward**, even though struggle was on the economic front was actually a test of strength between the socialist road and the capitalist road, between the proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman Mao for building socialism in the countryside on the general principle of the worker-peasant alliance and the reactionary bourgeois line of Liu Shao-chi of "rich peasant economy", and between the two destinies of developing China as an independent socialist state and the line of dependent China existing at the mercy of imperialism and social-imperialism. Once defeated on the economic front, the capitalist roaders attempted to use those portions of the cultural superstructure which were not yet transformed into socialist culture (especially the culture in ideological, social, and art and literary forms) to prepare public opinion for capitalist restoration and actually making attempts at capitalist restoration. Chairman Mao led the struggle against this also, and initiated and guided the **Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution** which erupted like a huge volcano in 1966.

This revolution, even though called cultural, was also a revolution towards consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat by defeating the capitalist roaders led by the modern revisionists and was aimed at seizing those areas of the cultural superstructure which were in the hands of the enemy. This entire

period of 25 years has been a period of intense class struggles and the class struggle is, by no means, over. It is becoming extremely acute. Chairman Mao pointed out in 1966: "If the Right stage an anti-communist coup d'etat in China, I am sure they will know no peace either and their rule will most probably be short-lived, because it will not be tolerated by the revolutionaries, who represent the interests of the people making up more than 90% of the population." (1) So prior to 1949, it was the people, led by the Communist Party under the leadership of Chairman Mao (since 1921, especially since 1927), who were struggling to seize control of the state, establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and get on with the glorious task of building socialist China "where life (is) abundant and the culture flourish(es)" and contribute in a big way to the liberation of entire mankind. And now, it is the reactionaries, the overthrown classes, who are attempting to restore capitalism, reverse the course of Chinese history, and plunge China into darkness. Led by the modern revisionists and scabs like Liu Shao-chi and Lin Biao, these counter-revolutionary elements made attempts towards seizure of state power and establishing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the majority of the Chinese people. The struggle for political power has not disappeared but, instead, has become increasingly acute.

China is a socialist country; part of the developing world. There are two major labouring classes in China, the working class and the peasantry. The working class is mainly centred in the cities while the peasantry is, in the main, in the vast countryside of China. China's peasantry is the main population of China and comprises 80% of the entire population. Before liberation, the peasantry was the most suppressed and viciously exploited and the countryside was most ruthlessly plundered. For an agrarian country like China, domination by imperialism meant intensification of the contradictions in the countryside. The National question is, in essence, an agrarian question. This was the case in China. The imperialists with the support of a handful of bureaucrat capitalists and compradors groomed reactionaries in the countryside, forcibly maintained feudal relations of production and exploited the peasantry to the extreme. Chairman Mao correctly analysed the stage of revolution and looked at the peasantry as the main force of

(continued on next page)

Quotations From Chairman Mao On War And Peace

War is the highest form of struggle for resolving contradictions, when they have developed to a certain stage, between classes, nations, states, or political groups, and it has existed ever since the emergence of private property and of classes.

"Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War" (December 1936), *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 180.

"War is the continuation of politics." In this sense war is politics and war itself is a political action; since ancient times there has never been a war that did not have a political character. . . .

But war has its own particular characteristics and in this sense it cannot be equated with politics in general. "War is the continuation of politics by other . . . means." When politics develops to a certain stage beyond which it cannot proceed by the usual means, war breaks out to sweep the obstacles from the way. . . . When the obstacle is removed and our political aim attained, the war will stop. But if the obstacle is not completely swept away, the war will have to continue till the aim is fully accomplished. . . . It can therefore be said that politics is war without bloodshed while war is politics with bloodshed.

"On Protracted War" (May 1938), *Selected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 152-53.

History shows that wars are divided into two kinds, just and unjust. All wars that are progressive are just, and all wars that impede progress are unjust. We Communists oppose all unjust wars that impede progress, but we do not oppose progressive, just wars. Not only do we Communists not oppose just wars, we actively participate in them. As for unjust wars, World War I is an instance in which both sides fought for imperialist interests; therefore the Communists of the whole world firmly opposed that war. The way to oppose a war of this kind is to do everything possible to prevent it; before it breaks out and, once it breaks out, to oppose war with war, to oppose unjust war with just war, whenever possible.

Ibid., p. 152.

War, this monster of mutual slaughter among men, will be finally eliminated by the progress of human society, and in the not too distant future too. But there is only one way to eliminate it and that is to oppose war with war, to oppose counter-revolutionary war with revolutionary war, to oppose national counter-revolutionary war with national revolutionary war, and to oppose counter-revolutionary class war with revolutionary class war. . . . When human society advances to the point where classes and states are eliminated, there will be no more wars, counter-revolutionary or revolutionary, unjust or just; that will be the era of perpetual peace for mankind. Our study of the laws of revolutionary war springs from the desire to eliminate all wars; herein lies the distinction between us Communists and all the exploiting classes.

"Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War" (December 1936), *Selected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 182-83.

Our country and all the other socialist countries want peace; so do the peoples of all the countries of the world. The only ones who crave war and do not want peace are certain monopoly capitalist groups in a handful of imperialist countries which depend on aggression for their profits.

"Opening Address at the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China" (September 15, 1956).

To achieve a lasting world peace, we must further develop our friendship and co-operation with the fraternal countries in the socialist camp and strengthen our solidarity with all peace-loving countries. We must endeavor to establish normal diplomatic relations, on the basis of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty and of equality and mutual benefit, with all countries willing to live together with us in peace. We must give active support to the national independence and liberation movement in countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America as well as to the peace movement and to just struggles in all the countries of the world.

Ibid.

As for the imperialist countries, we should unite with their peoples and strive to co-exist peacefully with those countries, do business with them and prevent any possible war, but under no circumstances should we harbour any unrealistic notions about them.

"On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" (February 27, 1957), 1st pocket ed., p. 75.

We desire peace. However, if imperialism insists on fighting a war, we will have no alternative but to take the firm resolution to fight to the finish before going ahead with our construction. If you are afraid of war day in day out, what will you do if war eventually comes? First I said that the East Wind is prevailing over the West Wind and war will not break out, and now I have added these explanations about the situation in case war should break out. Both possibilities have thus been taken into account.

Speech at the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (November 18, 1957), quoted in "Statement by the Spokesman of the Chinese Government" (September 2, 1963).

People all over the world are now discussing whether or not a third world war will break out. On this question, too, we must be mentally prepared and do some analysis. We stand firmly for peace and against war. But if the imperialists insist on unleashing another war, we should not be afraid of it. Our attitude on this question is the same as our attitude towards any disturbance: first, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it. The First World War was followed by the birth of the Soviet Union with a population of 200 million. The Second World War was followed by the emergence of the socialist camp with a combined population of 900 million. If the imperialists insist on launching a third world war, it is certain that several hundred million more will turn to socialism, and then there will not be much room left on earth for the imperialists; it is also likely that the whole structure of imperialism will utterly collapse.

"On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" (February 27, 1957), 1st pocket ed., pp. 87-88.

Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again . . . till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law. When we say "imperialism is ferocious", we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialists will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, till their doom.

Fight, fail, fight again, fail again, fight again . . . till their victory; that is the logic of the people, and they too will never go against this logic. This is another Marxist law. The Russian people's revolution followed this law, and so has the Chinese people's revolution.

"Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle" (August 14, 1949), *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, p. 428.

Just because we have won victory, we must never relax our vigilance against the frenzied plots for revenge by the imperialists and their running dogs. Whoever relaxes vigilance will disarm himself politically and land himself in a passive position.

"Address to the Preparatory Committee of the New Political Consultative Conference" (June 15, 1949), *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, p. 407.

Every Communist must grasp the truth, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

"Problems of War and Strategy" (November 6, 1938), *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 224.

The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries.

Ibid., p. 229.

We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war, but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun.

"Problems of War and Strategy" (November 6, 1938), *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 222.

revolution with the working class as the leading force and the main areas of struggle being the countryside. Right after the victory of the new democratic revolution, the countryside again became the centre of struggle. Which way China Socialism or Capitalism really was the question **Which Way Rural China Socialism or Capitalism!**

There are two questions which need to be answered on this front. What attitude will workers have towards the peasantry? What kind of social system will be established in the countryside? Chairman Mao answered all these questions correctly and led the Chinese people on the great road of building socialism. Chairman Mao answered first the over-all question: How is the national economy of China to be built! The answer to this question will also provide guidelines as to what attitude the workers will take towards the peasantry and what kind of social system will be established in the countryside. Chairman Mao pointed out: **Take agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor.** This formulation is based on the Marxist thesis of "feeding the people" as the first motivation in political economy. By taking agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor, first attention will be paid to "feeding the people", that is raising the farm production. But farm production cannot be raised without modernization of the farms. Here, Chairman Mao, advocated two further general lines: collectivisation and mechanisation. To collectivise and mechanise, it is necessary that the industrial production of the country is at a higher level and industry, the "leading factor" assists the "foundation" the agriculture. Before liberation both the "leading factor" and the "foundation" were in the hands of the imperialists, bureaucrat capitalists and reactionaries and they used these to amass wealth for themselves.

Because the relations of production play such a decisive role in promoting production and because "revolutions are locomotives of history" and every revolutionisation of the relations of production in line with the developing productive forces spurs production and because finally, continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat is absolutely necessary to prevent restoration and to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat the Constitution of the Communist Party of China has written into it the necessity of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat:

"Socialist society covers a considerably long historical period. Throughout this historical period, there are classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, there is the danger of capitalist restoration and there is the threat of subversion and aggression by imperialism and social-imperialism. These contradictions can be resolved only by depending on the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and on practice under its guidance.

"Such is China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, a great political revolution carried out under the conditions of socialism by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent capitalist restoration. Revolutions like this will have to be carried out many times in the future."(2)

Lenin has pointed out: "Revolutions are the festivals of the oppressed and the exploited. At no other time are the masses of the people in a position to come forward so actively as creators of a new social order as at a time of revolution. At such times the people are capable of performing miracles, if judged by the narrow, philistine, scale of gradual progress."(3)

New China had one major revolution since 1949, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution which was initiated in 1966 and is still continuing in the form of a country-wide campaign against Lin Biao and Confucius. Besides this great revolution unparalleled in the entire history of mankind, there have been several revolutionary movements in People's China. All these revolutionary movements led to the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and a tremendous increase in production. In the history of the contemporary world, there is no country nor an organisation nor a revolutionary leader of parallel to China, the Communist Party of China and Chairman Mao Tse-tung. If a country under the leadership of a revolutionary party and a revolutionary leader organises just one major encounter with colonialism, imperialism or social-imperialism, that country, the party and the leadership gets known for its revolutionary exploits all over the world. There are several countries which have done that. But China, the Chinese Communist Party and Chairman Mao Tse-tung have to their credits two events, **The Long March and The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution**, unprecedented and without parallel in the entire history of mankind besides the innumerable revolutionary movements and campaigns the Chinese people waged from the period of May 4th Movement to 1949 and to date.

China is a socialist country; part of the developing world. In her socialist construction, the decisive question is of political economy, of revolutionising the relations of production. There are three aspects of relations of production: "the mode of ownership of the means of production, the mutual relations between people in the course of production and exchange, and the distribution of products..."(4)

"The relationship between industry and agriculture, two large producers of materials, basically reflects the class relations between the two labouring classes — the workers and the peasants — and is closely linked to the question of maintaining and implementing the Party's basic line and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat. To increase industry's aid to agriculture or not means essentially whether or not the working class uses advanced socialist ideology and the tremendous industrial power to guide and support the peasantry in keeping to the socialist road and bringing about the modernization of agriculture so as to consolidate the worker-peasant alliance in the economic field, ensure proletarian leadership of the peasantry."(5)

This relationship between industry and agriculture is developed by following the general principle worked out by Chair-

man Mao "take agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor."

Comrade Marx teaches: "In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations of production that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or — what is but a legal expression of the same thing — with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. There begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, esthetic or philosophic — in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge of such a period of transformation from its own consciousness; on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained rather from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social productive forces and the relations of production."(6)

In old China; "the sum total of (the) relations of production", "the real foundation" of society were all archaic and in sharp contradiction with the developing productive forces. The first aspect of the "relations of production", the mode of ownership of the means of production, needed to be transformed. All the means of production were either in the hands of the bureaucrat-comprador capitalists and feudalists or imperialist or in joint ownership of all three. Talking about the "asiatic mode of production", Comrade Marx explains that, "There have been in Asia, generally from immemorial times, but three departments of Government: that of Finance, or the plunder of the interior; that of War, or the plunder of the exterior; and finally the department of Public Works." Under the over-all feudal system was the individual peasant economy: "Among the peasant masses a system of individual economy has prevailed for thousands of years, with each family or household forming a productive unit."(7) This system became easy prey to the imperialists with the feudal lords sharing with the foreign imperialists the "plunder of the interior", paying no attention to the public works and incapable of "plunder of the exterior" themselves. One of the main features and requirements of modern capitalism (imperialism) is "the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through... the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries."(8) In this respect the requirements of the imperialists for maximum profit also were in line with those of the feudalists. The feudalists acting as agents and imperialists the masters, the Chinese people were being bled white.

Besides the imperialists and their agents owning the means of production, they also maintained the most backward "mutual relations between people in the course of production and exchange" whereby the feudal authority and feudal state was used to plunder the majority of the people. All the contradictions inherent in semi-feudal and semi-colonial society were aggravated to the maximum. Between agriculture and industry, the two basic branches of the economy which produce goods, the relation was one of agriculture serving industry (and whatever industry was there was owned by the foreign imperialists) and the countryside serving the needs of the foreign imperialists and their agents. The people were taxed to the maximum and public works were ignored. Masses of Chinese people were helpless in the face of natural disasters. Famines frequently broke out and the masses of people were helpless and perished in millions. All sorts of diseases were on the rampage. China was under extreme suffering.

The third aspect of the relations of production, the aspect of "distribution of products", was one of the Chinese people producing the products while the foreign imperialists and their agents expropriated them leaving very little behind for the majority of the populace.

In new China "the sum total of... relations of production", "the real foundation" of society has been transformed. China owns everything now. The Chinese people are the masters of their land and their own destiny. All aspects of the relations of production are transformed to fulfill the "securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques..."(9)

"The total product, and therefore the total production, of society may be divided into two major departments:

1. Means of Production, commodities having a form in which they must, or at least may, pass into productive consumption.
2. Articles of Consumption, commodities having a form in which they pass into individual consumption..."(10)

In China, both the departments are in the hands of the people, not only the "means of production" are owned by the state but these are also produced in China. All the developing countries are being black-mailed by imperialism and social-imperialism in terms of their means of production. Those countries in which the means of production are in the hands of the people, if the production of implements is not in their control,

then their independence is in danger and the imperialists and social-imperialists will subjugate them by making their means of production totally dependent on the machinery produced outside.

Generally speaking, there are five fundamental requirements for the production of means of production. These are as follows:

1. Machine building.
2. Technical and scientific research.
3. Training of personnel.
4. Energy and raw materials.
5. Accumulation of capital.

Imperialism and social-imperialism force the developing countries to become dependent for the above five on them thus forfeiting the first basic requirement towards safe-guarding independence, that is production of the means of production. China has become independent on all these fronts and does not depend on imperialism or social-imperialism in any of these aspects.

China is self-reliant in the crucial area of heavy industry and machine building. Before 1949 China had practically no machine building industry at all. Within this short period of twenty five years China has constructed many large scale industrial complexes, and tens of thousands of medium and small sized machine building plants. China can now make her own metallurgical, mining and electrical power equipment, and equipment and machinery for the petroleum and chemical industries. She can also build machinery and plants for light industry: textile factories, motor vehicle plants, shipyards, machine tool plants, instrumentation plants and so forth. In other words, China can produce her own means of production. In 1973 China's machine building industry made 5 and 5.5 times as much mining and metallurgical equipment as it did in 1965. The output of motor vehicles, machine tools and petroleum and electrical power equipment went up between 2.7 and 7 times that of 1965. Today in China practically every province, municipality and autonomous region has its own tractor plants, farm machinery industry and repair shops. Production of these items which directly assist the peasantry with production of the mechanised means of farming increased in number from 2.7 to over 7 times since 1965. In the decisive iron and steel industry China designs and builds its entire new plant, and renovates its old plant, up-dating and modernizing its units continuously. China now makes 1000 kinds of steel, with over 20,000 specifications of rolled steel for all aspects of production: motor vehicles, heavy machinery, precision instruments, railways and petroleum and chemical industries. China's heavy industry is outstanding in the production of the world's first 12,000 kwt steam turbine generating set with water cooled rotor and stator. China built two steam turbine generating plants in 1969, one 125,000 kwt and the other 200,000 kwt capacity.

After the brief remarks on China, I would like to dwell on the differences which began to emerge between the Soviet Union and People's China during the fifties and developed into a major struggle between modern revisionism and Marxism-Leninism. The Communist Party of Soviet Union came under the control of modern revisionists and capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union while Chairman Mao Tse-tung personally initiated and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, a great revolution to seize those portions of the superstructure which were still in the hands of the bourgeoisie and defeated China's Khrushchev, Liu Shao-chi. Some individuals are deliberately trying to confuse this historic struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism and are suggesting strange things and telling tales about China. The most pernicious propaganda launched on this front is by so-called "friends" of China who are spreading the counter-revolutionary rumours that China has given up the path of the Great October Revolution and that China's great progress in socialist revolution and construction lies in deviating from this path. Nothing can be farther from the truth. These individuals are saying that China did not follow the general line on transformation of the economic base from capitalist to socialist, that China is an "exception" to the general laws of political economy and that China has her own "brand" of Marxism-Leninism. This entire rumour-mongering is absurd to the extreme. I quote here from Chairman Mao on the socialist construction in Soviet Union under Lenin and Stalin and whether China learnt from this experience or not: "The great historical experience of the Soviet Union in building socialism inspires our people with full confidence in the building of socialism in China. However, even on this question of international experience, there are different views. Some comrades disapprove of our Central Committee's policy of keeping the development of agricultural cooperation in step with our socialist industrialization, although such a policy proved correct in the Soviet Union. They consider that the speed of industrialization as it is set at present is all right, but that agricultural cooperation should proceed at an extremely slow pace and need not keep step with it. This is to disregard the experience of Soviet Union."(11)

When the socialist experience was being acquired in the Soviet Union, Comrade Lenin pointed out that because the building of socialism in the Soviet Union was the first experience, the Russian communists were bound to make mistakes and he hoped that future revolutions will learn from this. Lenin said: "At any rate, the experiments we are making will be of benefit to coming proletarian revolutions, and they will be able to prepare better technically to solve this question."(12)

So on the question of international experience, the pernicious propaganda being carried out is both against learning from Soviet experience and Chinese experience, may more, pitting Chinese experience against Soviet experience and telling

the masses of people to learn from neither thus blunting the great weapon the international proletariat has of following the path of the Great October Revolution which is continued in the People's Democratic Revolution of China and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China. Of course, between the two revolutions there are similarities as well as distinct features but the basic general course of the Chinese revolution is the path opened up by the Great October Revolution.

Here I quote from one so-called friend of China: "Except for an interlude of **one month** at the founding of the state, the Soviet Union simply carried on Czarist imperialist policies concerning at that time, a weak and divided China; policies which included seizure of territories, armed attacks to preserve economic interests, collusion with the Japanese during their invasion of China, and looting of Manchurian industry following World War Two." (13) And just imagine how "foolish" the Chinese communists were, that in those individuals like Lenin and Stalin who "simply carried on Czarist imperialist policies concerning, at that time, a weak and divided China" they found the salvos of the Chinese revolution and to-date they are calling upon the entire Chinese people to read their works and learn from them!!! To what absurdity these individuals go!!!

Here I quote from another individual who also calls himself a so-called "friend" of China: "It should not be forgotten, either, that historical experience has demonstrated too clearly how a push-style seizure of power from above (as in Russia in 1917), can, in the nature of things, readily deteriorate into a dictatorship under a new class of commissars, with their own material class interests... Solzhenitsyn's *The Gulag Archipelago* may have its weaknesses—but it carries terrible warnings too." (14)

And then we have an example of another individual who first raises the phoney issue of whether or not one should follow what is called "China's model". Then he deviously suggests that there are some individuals who want to follow "China's model". The two quotations and the one example I have given have one thing in common, that is they all despise anyone following the road of the Great October Revolution. It is very significant to note that these individuals do not attack China directly, they merely attack the Great October Revolution, Lenin and more often Stalin and those who attempt to apply Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung thought to the concrete conditions prevailing in the imperialist countries.

The central issue is that the Great October Revolution opened up the path for social revolutions of the proletariat all over the world and the struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. China has followed the path of Great October Revolution and remaining loyal to the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism actually organized People's Democratic Revolution and has come a long way from semi-colonial and semi-feudal society to a socialist society setting a brilliant example for the nations and people of the world in their own struggles. At the present time the struggles of the nations and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America are developing against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and hegemonism of the two superpowers and the proletariat of the imperialist and social-imperialist countries is awakening. It is this very crucial time when the revolutionary people should strengthen their ranks and build unity in struggle that the pernicious attempt is being made to detach the Chinese revolution from the Great October Revolution and sow confusion. These individuals who are doing this have a sinister motive. These individuals make no distinction between the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin and the Soviet Union of Khrushchov and Brezhnev. Nor do they make distinction between the China of Chiang Kai-Shek and the China of Chairman Mao. They muddy everything up and then they attack the Great October Revolution. It is extremely important that clear lines are drawn between these individuals and the Marxist-Leninists.

Why did the differences arise between China and the Soviet Union? I would like to dwell on this question in somewhat greater detail. In a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Soviet Union, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China wrote in 1963:

"The working class in every socialist country and in every capitalist country must truly put into effect the fighting slogans, **'Workers of all countries, unite!'** and **'Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!'**; it must study the revolutionary experience of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, firmly support their revolutionary actions and regard the cause of liberation as a most dependable support for itself and as directly in accord with its own interests. This is the only effective way to break down barriers of nationality, colour and geographical location and this is the only genuine proletarian internationalism.

"It is impossible for the working class in the European and American capitalist countries to liberate itself unless it unites with the oppressed nations and unless those nations are liberated. Lenin rightly said, **'The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would actually be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of "Colonial" slaves who are oppressed by capital.'** (15)

"Certain persons in the international communist movement are now taking a passive or scornful or negative attitude towards the struggles of the oppressed nations for liberation. They are in fact protecting the interests of monopoly capital, betraying those of the proletariat, and degenerating into social democrats.

"The attitude taken towards the revolutionary struggles of the people in Asian, African, and Latin American countries is an important criterion for differentiating those who want revolution from those who do not and those who are truly defending world peace from those who are abetting the forces of aggression and war." (16)

Less than a year later, M. Suslov, presenting his Report to the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU on February 14, 1964, said: "The prime role in the world revolutionary process is played by the socialist countries. This is seen firstly in the fact that the working class, the working people of these countries are successfully resolving social problems and building a new society where oppression and exploitation are unknown and for which the peoples are taking the road of revolution. By creating the material and technical basis of socialism and communism, the socialist countries are inflicting one blow after another on imperialism in the decisive sphere of human activity, in the sphere of material production. When the workers and peasants in the capitalist countries see the achievements of the socialist states in economic development, in raising the standard of living, in promoting democracy and in drawing the masses into state administration they become convinced in practice that the basic requirements of working people can be satisfied only on the road of socialism. All this infuses the masses with the revolutionary spirit and helps to draw them into an active struggle against the capitalist system, for social and national liberation.

"Secondly, the farther we progress the greater becomes the role of the socialist states as a force directly opposing the aggressive counter-revolutionary designs of imperialism. Under conditions where the might of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist commonwealth holds the main forces of international reaction and aggression in check the working masses and peoples of the colonial countries have the most favourable opportunity for waging a struggle against imperialism and internal reaction. People who followed the development of international events in the post-war years could not fail to see that there is an extremely close link between the successes of the revolutionary struggle in the capitalist countries, the victories of the national liberation movement and the growth of the might of the world socialist system.

"Victory over capitalism on a world scale can be achieved solely through the joint efforts of the world socialist system, the working class movement and the national liberation struggle of the peoples. Each of these forces makes its own contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle. However, one cannot fail to see that the struggle of the world socialist system against imperialism is the focal point of world policy, of the whole of social development.

"The Marxist-Leninists can have no doubt as to the primary, increasingly decisive role which the world socialist system plays, and has to play, in bringing about the triumph of the new social system all over the globe. The historical mission of the socialist countries is determined by the objective laws of social development, by the irrefutable fact that the countries in which socialism has triumphed are today in the van not only of the socialist forces, but of the progressive forces of the world. They are not only a beacon lighting up mankind's road to social progress but a powerful material force embodying Marxist-Leninist ideas, a force which is fighting capitalism and is bound to defeat it in the decisive sphere of human activity, the sphere of material production.

"All the facts indicate that the socialist countries can within a historically short time surpass the capitalist countries economically as well. Let us recall that total industrial output in the socialist countries in 1962 was roughly eight times as great as it had been on their territory in 1937, whereas the capitalist countries registered only a 2.6 fold increase. The world socialist system has now attained a new stage in the economic competition with capitalism. In 1950 the socialist countries' share in world industrial production was about one-fifth; today it exceeds one-third.

"It is the internationalist duty of the Communists of the socialist countries to continue effectively building the new society, promoting their economy and strengthening their defences, consolidating the socialist community, and to strive to ensure that socialist ideas exercise an increasing appeal to the working people as they are translated into reality. Nowadays the merits of socialism are judged not only by theoretical writings, but, above all, by what is done in practice, by the way in which Communists actually solve the problems of building the new society. If we accomplish this task properly, we shall greatly promote the struggle for socialism in other countries, and if we don't, it will be a blow to that struggle." (17)

In their letter the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China clearly pointed out: "(4) In devising the general line of the international communist movement, the starting point is the concrete class analysis of the world politics and economics as a whole and of actual world conditions, that is to say, of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world.

"If one avoids a concrete analysis, seizes at random on certain superficial phenomena, and draws subjective and groundless conclusions, one cannot possibly reach correct conclusions with regard to the general line of the international communist movement but will inevitably slide onto a track entirely different from that of Marxism-Leninism.

"What are the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world? Marxist-Leninists consistently hold that they are:

- the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp;
- the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries;
- the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism; and
- the contradictions among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

"The contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is a contradiction between two fundamentally different social systems, socialism and capitalism. It is undoubtedly very sharp. But Marxist-Leninists must not regard the contradictions in the world as consisting solely and simply

of the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp." (18)

In his report to the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of CPSU, M. Suslov writes: "The radical changes that took place in the world after the Second World War are linked up chiefly with the rise and development of a world system of socialism. The countries of the socialist commonwealth are the main bulwark of all the revolutionary forces of modern times, a reliable champion of world peace. The struggle between world socialism and world imperialism is the principle content of our epoch, the pivot of the class struggle on a world scale." (19)

Soviet Union launched an armed invasion of Czechoslovakia in August, 1968 and emerged as a social-imperialist superpower. Soon after this invasion, Soviet revisionists called a conference of the revisionist's parties of the world and again declared: "Mankind has entered the last third of our century in a situation marked by a sharpening of the historic struggle between the forces of progress and reaction, between socialism and imperialism." (20)

At the 24th Congress of the CPSU held on March 30th, 1971, Brezhnev repeated the same analysis of the world situation in his Report of the Central Committee: "Life has provided confirmation of the conclusion drawn by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties that 'the world socialist system is the decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle'." (21)

The Communist Party of China firmly reiterated their analysis of the basic contradictions in the world in its Ninth National Congress Report: "...there are four major contradictions in the world today: the contradiction between the oppressed nations on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other; the contradiction between the proletariat and bourgeoisie in the capitalist and revisionist countries; the contradiction between imperialist and social-imperialist countries and among the imperialist countries; and the contradiction between socialist countries on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other." (22)

Please note that in the Ninth National Congress Report, the Communist Party of China made another concrete analysis of the concrete international situation. The rise of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism was a big blow to the socialist camp and this camp ceased to exist as it existed just after the Second World War for a time. At the present time, there are only socialist countries like China and Albania while there is no socialist camp. Furthermore, in a pamphlet entitled **Refutation of the New Leaders of the C.P.S.U. on "United Action"**, the Chinese communists clearly present the differences between the Marxist-Leninist line of the Chinese Communist Party and Khrushchovite revisionist line. (Excerpts from this pamphlet are reprinted on this page for our readers information—editor.)

Now do these individuals mentioned before make clear distinction between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism and uphold Marxism-Leninism and repudiate modern revisionism? Of course they don't. Their aim is to cause confusion and oppose the glorious path of the Great October Revolution.

PART 2

Let us now look at the theories which the two superpowers promote to deal with international questions, questions relating to the trend of countries wanting independence, nations wanting liberation and people wanting revolution. All of the theories which the two superpowers have support the opposite. They push these theories in order to justify their politics of world hegemony. Central to all their theories is the theory that the main motive force in the world today is the "combined action" of the two superpowers to dominate the world. But this "combined action" only leads to the two superpowers furiously contending with one another for world hegemony. This contention is the main aspect of the contradiction between the two superpowers. It is this contention which holds the seeds of future world war.

The entire ideological and theoretical basis of the politics of the two superpowers for hegemony is embedded in the economic base—that is the reflection of the desperate needs and desires of the capitalist system at its highest stage, which is the moribund stage. Imperialism means aggression and war, scrambling for colonies, seizing control of new areas of raw materials, and struggling for markets and domination of other countries. In brief, the two superpowers advance the following theories:

1. THE THEORY OF COMBINED ACTION

This includes:

- theory of "detente"
- theory of "balance" between the two superpowers
- theory of "global system" of peace
- theory of "coordination of common interests"

2. THE THEORY THAT IDEOLOGY IS "DEAD"

This includes:

- U.S. imperialist theory that ideology is "dead" in the Soviet Union
- Soviet social-imperialist theory that reason has "triumphed" in the U.S. foreign policy
- Soviet social-imperialist theory of "common human interests" above classes and ideology

3. THE THEORY OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES

This includes:

- "global problems" are to be "solved" by joint U.S. imperialist and Soviet social-imperialist manipulation of science and technology

(See the reference material which follows which deals with the THEORIES OF THE TWO SUPERPOWERS in greater detail.)

REFERENCE NOTES ON THEORIES OF SUPERPOWERS

PART 1

The ideologists for the two imperialist superpowers, U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, have created a number of theories in the field of international relations, economic development, and social change all of which are used to wage ideological warfare against the Third World countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, and against the peoples everywhere fighting for national liberation, independence and revolution. They aspire through their theories to paralyse the national liberation movements, liquidate revolution, spread pessimism and passivity through the ranks of the revolutionary peoples.

Central to all their theories is the theory that the main motive force in the world today is the combined action of the two superpowers. Ideologists for both U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism preach this theory, which is the underpinning of the Brezhnev-Nixon doctrine of "world order", "global unity" and "detente". The leading U.S. theoretician in international relations, Stanley Hoffman, writes in *Foreign Affairs*, 1972: "The central mechanism of deterrence is likely to remain for a long time bipolar. Only the U.S. and the Soviet Union have the capacity to annihilate each other — a capacity distinct from that which France, Britain, and China possess, of severely wounding a superpower but suffering either total or unbearable destruction in return. Only the superpowers can deter each other, not merely from nuclear war but also from large scale conventional war and from the nuclear blackmail of third parties. Their advance over other nuclear powers remains enormous, quantitatively and qualitatively..." (p. 621) He describes a system that is "of a central worldwide balancing mechanism." (624) He says "only the two superpowers are likely to remain, for a long time, capable of sending forces and supplies to distant parts of the globe..." (624) and further "that peace is ultimately indivisible" and therefore "what matters is, first and still, the Big Two, in pursuit of universal influence, and in possession of global military means." (631) These are the words of the U.S. imperialists in 1972, one year after the monetary crisis in 1971, itself a reflection of the weakened position of U.S. imperialism on a world scale as a result of the armed struggles of the Indo-Chinese peoples against U.S. imperialism, and other nations and countries fighting for their liberation and independence. Yet Hoffman is saying to the Third World countries that two giants stride the world and can impose their will upon it because they have the "global means" of waging war.

The very same theory is presented by the ideologists of the Soviet Union. At the time Hoffman wrote his "theory", the Soviet Weekly, *New Times* (No. 22, 1972) wrote an editorial regarding the outcome of the U.S. president's visit to Moscow. "The situation of the international climate, and the prospects of the solution of controversial questions depend on how relations are worked out between the great states." In July 1974 the same journal editorialises (No. 27) on the June 27 visit of President Nixon to Moscow: "All sober-minded, unbiased people — everyone except the disseminators of malicious inventions about some mythical 'superpower compact' and the gullible who allow themselves to be taken in by these fabrications — are aware that the tenor of contemporary international life as a whole, the peaceful development of civilization, the future of all humanity depend to a great extent on the state of Soviet-American relations. World peace stands to gain from good relations between the two great powers." In a U.N. address Nixon stated the same theme: "The fate of the world depends on the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union." A Soviet specialist, N. Akadiev, reiterates the theme with the claim that "the broad circle of international problems depends on the position of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R." (cited in *Albania Today*, "Identical Imperialist Political Concepts," by Shaban Murati, No. 6, 1972, p.51) J. Reston, a U.S. publicist for imperialism, speaks of the "tendency to the establishment of a new world order" and greets "the diplomatic activity directed toward influencing the development of this tendency."

These theories of "detente", of a "balance" between the two superpowers is actually written into a document signed by Nixon and Brezhnev. Point 2 of "Basic principles of mutual relations between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union" says "An indispensable condition for the maintenance and strengthening of the relations between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union is the recognition of the security interests of the two sides." Here quite clearly is the basis of the "global system" of "peace". In fact it is a counter-revolutionary alliance, an imperialist version of the 19th century Holy Alliance against revolution in Europe. Today however it is an alliance of the two super-imperialist powers against the vast majority of mankind living in the developing poor countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia. Again we can see the commonality of thinking on this issue between U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. On June 9, 1972 Soviet journalist, N. Inozemcev explained the "joint interest" clause in a *Pravda* article when he pointed out "with the joint efforts of the two sides, actual measures were taken ensuring their respect for the interest of each side." Former U.S. Secretary of State, Melvin Laird, spoke at the time of "hopeful agreements between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. in the frameworks of the coordination of common interests." (cited in *AT*, Ibid, p.52) Just what these "interests" are is clear: total domination of the "globe"; and in particular control of the raw materials and labor power of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The harmony of interests between the two superpowers in their alliance to oppose the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin

America in their struggle for independence, liberation and revolution was spelled out by Richard Nixon in his January 20, 1969 inauguration speech in which he said, "After a period of confrontation, we are ushering in the era of talks." For what is there to 'talk' about between countries of opposite social systems, between countries following a foreign policy of principled support for the struggles of Third World countries for their liberation against 400 years of colonialism and imperialism, and those who follow a policy of armed aggression, plunder and hegemony? There is of course no basis for "talk", except the "talk" of continual struggle against imperialism, the "talk" of armed struggle, of public opinion for national liberation, independence and revolution. So how can Nixon "usher" in an "era of talks" unless there is another superpower of similar outlook of life to "talk" with. J.F. Dulles, the architect of U.S. imperialist foreign policy during the period when U.S. imperialism was confronted by the socialist camp recognized that "talk" was futile. He said in 1957, "agreement means compliance of viewpoints." This explains the warm welcome given to Nixon's line of "talks" by the Soviet revisionists who called at the time for "joint efforts ... to solve the ripe international problems." What was the theoretical basis for two countries supposedly with opposite social systems, and with opposite outlooks with regard to the fundamental questions of national sovereignty, war, imperialism and so forth to have "talks" and to sign "agreements" recognizing each other's "global interests?"

The theoretical basis of such "agreements" and "talks" in international affairs is the line that ideology is dead. S. Hoffman writes in the same article outlining his theory of superpower political domination of the world, that "We congratulate ourselves on having carried out negotiations with Moscow without ideological obstacles." Nixon, echoing this theory, says "The effectiveness of ideology weakens throughout the world and above all in the field of the problems of foreign policy." Another U.S. imperialist theoretician of international relations, Zb. Brezezinski, the Columbia University CIA scholar and expert on the "balance of power" theory writes, "The radical difference of our epoch is the weakening of ideological conflicts." He says that "communism, until recently the most militant and principal ideology, is dead." What these ideologists of world hegemony and monopoly capitalism are quite clearly saying is the "ideology" is communism, i.e. the theory of dialectical and historical materialism, the theory of proletarian revolution, national liberation and the outlook of struggling to overthrow all reaction. And for them "communism" in the Soviet Union is "dead." Hoffman writes that "Khrushchev's proclamation of the 'non-inevitability of war' was a 'landmark' in preparing conditions for a 'bipolar' superpower block. (Ibid., p.628) The whole revisionist theory "peaceful co-existence", meaning opportunist collaboration with the forces of imperialism, echoes this "end of ideology" line of the U.S. theoreticians. Soviet Professor Y. Tunkin writes: "men of different classes and world outlooks unite on the common platform of the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population of the planet. Peaceful co-existence responds not only to the interests of the working class and all the labouring people, but also to the interests of the major part of the bourgeoisie." Clearly if one has common "interests", one can "usher in an era of talks". Kissinger said that "When national structures (i.e. social systems) and the concepts of legality on which they are based are essentially different, state officials can meet, but the possibilities of them convincing each other are limited, because they speak different languages." But today the revisionists and the U.S. imperialists do speak the same language, which explains why in 1969 Nixon can usher in his "era of talks" and why Brezhnev and he can sit down to sign agreements recognizing their "common global interests." While the U.S. ideologists proclaim the "death" of ideology in the Soviet Union, the revisionist ideologists proclaim the triumph of "reason" in U.S. foreign policy. In Memo, No. 4, 1972, G. Ponomarev writes: "It is admitted that the refusal of confrontation announced by president Nixon and his acceptance of entry into the era of talks, is a delayed and forced semi-admission of the failure of the policy of balance on the verge of war, and a failure of the nuclear threat strategy." In *Pravda* on July 13, 1972, V. Korionov says, "At the present stage the imperialist governments are compelled to recognize the foreign policy principles which have been put forward and are defended by socialism."

But with whom is the new "reasonableness" of U.S. imperialism exhibited? Everyone knows that within months of his "era of talks" speech U.S. imperialism organized a coup against the government of Samdech Norodom Sihanouk and invaded the Kingdom of Cambodia. They intensified their aggression against the Vietnamese people, the Arab people of the Middle East, launched a coup against the government of Chile — in short have pursued an even more intensified aggression against the peoples and countries in the Third World than before. So with whom can the U.S. imperialists "talk", with whom can they find "likeness of mind" to make agreements with against social-imperialism, because they share "common interests" even though they are both competing for world hegemony. Thus while "ideology" is proclaimed to be "dead" by the ideologists of U.S. imperialism, spokesmen for Soviet social-imperialism proclaim "common human interests" above classes and ideology. Soviet Professor G. Tunkin, writes in *International Review*, "The ideological struggle in international relations can be and is an object of regulation on the basis of international law." What the Soviet professor is saying is that the "global interests" are subject to "international law", that is can be the subject of "negotiation", of "talks." For what is being subjected to regulation is not "ideology", i.e. world view. This they already have in common. What is negotiable is how much of the world each will exploit, a negotiation carried out in a frenzy of arms race and competition.

A number of other counter-revolutionary theories are used by the superpowers to back up their line of "bipolar" superpower hegemony. If ideology is dead, what do the theorists of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism say takes its place. Ideology, it must be remembered, is Marxism, i.e. the theory of irreconcilable class war between oppressor and oppressed, between proletariat and monopoly capitalist, between the imperialist superpowers and the exploited masses of the poor colonial and semi-colonial countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America — that is between the overwhelming masses of mankind and the ruling classes of the two imperialist powers. The contemporary theorists of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism say that superceding "ideology" (i.e. class struggle) are certain common "global problems" which can only be sorted out by "cooperation" and "joint" use of the scientific and technological revolution. This is the corner-stone of revisionism and modern imperialist outlook — that is, the productive forces are decisive, while the masses are insignificant, in fact are a "population problem" to be "solved" as all other "global problems" are to be "solved" by joint U.S. imperialist and Soviet social-imperialist manipulation of science and technology, over which they are organizing a world monopoly. M.D. Schulman, an American ideologist and professor writes: "The world is transformed not by the revolution of Marx and Engels, but by the radical influences of present day technologies." In the book *Industrialism and Industrial Man* written by a number of U.S. sociologists they proclaim: "The giant of industrialism walks proudly on the earth transforming all the features of the old transitional societies. The world is entering a new epoch, the epoch of total industrialization. Both the East and West are approaching it." Another U.S. ideologist, Walter Lipmann, wrote: "The differences between capitalism and socialism cease being ideological and are increasingly becoming administrative — economic and technical."

The same line is advanced by the revisionist ideologists. *Pravda* writes, "The field of science and technology is the main field of the battle of socialism with capitalism." Soviet scholar G. Pokrovskij writes: "The revolution in science led to the possibilities of the effective roads of the unification of the various peoples and states." And V. Kortunov writes: "technical-scientific progress connects the foreign policy of various states with a complicated tangle of interests." Again we note the word "interests", and see the clear connection between science and technology (productive forces) standing above class struggle (relations of production) — i.e. science and technology being monopolized by two powers with the same ideology (that is, sharing the same interests) to dominate and exploit the countries and nations of the world, especially the poor masses of the colonial and semi-colonial world. What is the meaning of "unification of the various peoples and states"? Is this not the same theoretical content of the two U.S. ideologues W.R. Kinter and H. Sicherman in their book *Technology and International Politics* that "the technical-scientific revolution must lead to the erosion of the sovereignty of the states."? In practice this is precisely what both superpowers are doing, undermining the sovereignty of the countries and nations that each dominates in order to promote their "common" "global interests", about which they are so eager to "talk" and recognize.

An example of the practical application of this "theory" of "science and technology" as the determining factor of historical development in conjunction, and as part of the whole theory of international politics of "bipolar" superpower domination is the International Conference for Economic, Industrial, Scientific and Technological Cooperation held in Moscow at the same time as the third summit meeting of Nixon and Brezhnev, in June 1974. This meeting brought together direct representatives of U.S. finance capital together with the bureaucrat capitalists of the Soviet state and was jointly sponsored by the U.S.S.R. State Committee for Science and Technology and the Stanford Research Institute. What is meant by two capitalist superpowers by science and technology is made clear by the practice of the conference. Several multi-million dollar deals were signed between the Soviet State capitalist institutions and Coca-Cola Company, Dresser Industries, Inc (U.S.A.). Mr. A.W. Clausen, president of the Californian Bank of America (assets of \$49,400 million) is quoted in *New Times* No. 27, 1974, as saying "I am very pleased with the direction in which economic detente is moving for both of our countries. As you know there are many things that are helping to promote our partnership. In particular the establishment of the U.S.S.R.-U.S.A. joint trade and economic council, of which I am a director and co-chairman." He went on to brag of the Bank of America's "contribution" to "promote our partnership." "I think the chief thing is the extension of financing, which we have already begun. Just in the last few weeks we have signed the contract for the financing of a chemical fertilizer plant. Our bank is leading the banking syndicate which is extending a credit of \$180 million." He went on to brag how the Bank of America has been doing a good business in the Soviet Union for almost 20 years, i.e. since the revisionists usurped power in the Soviet Union and converted the socialist economy into a capitalist economy. Clausen went on to elaborate the 'joint' Soviet-Japanese project for "development of wealth" in Siberia to be sponsored by a consortium of international banks, headed by the Bank of America. For him all this is part and parcel of "detente". "Apart from purely business considerations, trade is an important factor of peace and good relations. If the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., the two biggest industrial nations of the world, can find common ground upon which to trade and exchange goods, this is an example for the rest of the world." But what took place was not an "exchange of goods", it was an investment of capital. What was discussed was not "trade" but export of finance capital: not a sharing of "tech-

PART 3

nology and science" but a division of markets for the investment of finance capital. W.C. Butcher, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York (assets \$36,800 million) joined his class brother in heralding this new age of "cooperation" and "détente". Thus we can see how the political "talks" have led to economic "talks". How the theory of détente justified by a theory of the "end of ideology" in foreign affairs, becomes an "economic détente", and a division of markets for investment of finance capital. When asked about the significance of the summit meeting he said that it would give further impetus to "cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States" and would assist in pushing the U.S. Congress to grant the Soviet Union "most-favoured-nation status" as a trading partner.

It is no coincidence that this high-powered conference of the ruling classes of the two superpowers should meet at the same time their political chieftains were conspiring together to further their political hegemony over the world. Brezhnev in toasting Nixon on June 27 warmly thanked the representatives of U.S. monopoly capitalism, "those farsighted representatives of the U.S. business world who correctly understood the mutual significance for both our peoples, and who are giving their government active support in this respect." The "mutual advantage" Brezhnev refers to is related to another aspect, the principal aspect of this "joint" "scientific and technological" cooperation in the world. Namely the "disadvantage" to be imposed by both upon the overwhelming masses of humanity who live in poverty in the ex-colonial and semi-colonial countries of the world, all the bullied small and medium-sized countries as well as the working classes of the United States and the Soviet Union, the oppressed nationalities of these countries who are the cheap labour power used to build the "joint projects" financed by monopoly capital. In the report on the conference the *New Times* commentator, V. Rosen, quotes a U.S. monopoly capitalist Dr. Armand Hammer as saying, "we have to eat an elephant, but we can't do it at one go, only piecemeal." And then Georgi Arbatov, Director of the U.S. Institute of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences adding that the elephant can be eaten from "different sides." An elephant is a work animal that lives in Africa and Asia. We shall analyze later exactly how these "theories" of the U.S. and revisionist ideologists are designed precisely to assist their imperialist masters to "eat the elephant", i.e. oppress the Third World's peoples.

Before doing so, however, let us conclude this section of our examination of revisionist and imperialist theories of international relations by looking at the whole concept of superpower summit politics which has dominated international relations since 1969. If we follow the thinking of the ideologists of imperialism and social-imperialism we see how their theory of the motive force in international politics being superpower "international cooperation" and mutual regard for "global interests" leads to a theory of the "death of ideology" (i.e. class struggle), and the need to explain the motive force of history as something apart from class struggle, something that unites all mankind, namely "scientific and industrial revolution." The practical consequence of this theory has been illustrated. But there is an extension to all these theories with the idea of "superpower" diplomacy, of "style" which rises above class, and is explained as pure "technique" (in much the way "technology and science" stands above relations of production). Hence we have the "personal" intervention of Kissinger during the Middle East war in order to advance the superpower line of "no war, no peace", a line of blocking the full struggle of the Arab peoples for their national liberation and independence from Zionism. International relations, now devoid of "ideology", can be "pure science". Thus a whole theory of technocracy in international relations becomes a justification for endless summit meetings which have become such a fetish in the theoretical literature of the U.S. imperialists and social-imperialists. Everything is reduced to a matter of "contacts" and "communication"; of personal style. Thus revisionism gives rise to the promotion of the reactionary theory of psychosociology, that the masses must remain passive while the technical experts in international relations "sort out" through their contacts among the superpowers various international crises.

Part and parcel of this much publicized "top level" negotiations is the promotion of an exceedingly treacherous theory that diplomacy in international relations today is being "democratized." J. Kandlov, Soviet scholar, writes: "Now a noticeable democratization of international relations in general and of diplomacy in particular is evident." J. Reston, U.S. ideologue, wrote in the *New York Times*, "diplomacy is now shown over television." Lester Pearson, former prime minister of Canada, writes in his book, *Diplomacy in the Atomic Century* that diplomacy has a propaganda function, and that the radio and television have made it possible to influence masses of people with "open diplomacy." These theories are designed to cover up the essence of superpower relations which are their utmost secrecy. A November 1972 NATO document made public reads: "Nixon made bargainings in Moscow last month without consulting the allies and without informing them in detail afterwards. There is the danger of bilateralism between the two superpowers leading to agreements at the expense of the European members of the alliance." (cited by Shaban Murati, "Diplomatic Counter-Revolution", *Albania Today*, May-June 1973, p.53). The essence therefore of the massive publicity given to the "high powered talks", the "summits", and the personal "style" of Kissinger and so forth is to do maximum public opinion for the view that the motive force in international politics is the two superpowers, that the masses have no role in history, and that the nations struggling for their liberation are powerless to effect their destiny without the help of either U.S. imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism.

We can summarize, now, the intensification of contention between U.S. imperialism and Soviet social imperialism. Despite all the talk of "détente" these words are merely a camouflage to hide the contention between the two superpowers seeking world hegemony. Europe is the focus of their rivalry. In their striving for hegemony they have both been bitterly contending for control over its southern flank — the Middle East, the Mediterranean and Balkan areas. When the second round of talks between the Soviet Union and the U.S. broke off in June 1973 this was followed by the October 1973 Middle East war and almost a major showdown between the two powers. Two weeks after the third round of "Détente" talks between the two superpowers in June and July 1974, the Cyprus crisis erupted, which clearly reflected the contention in that region. Sometimes they brandish their swords, sometimes they scurry around in intense diplomatic struggle. U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger made 7 trips to the Middle East in a year. Gromyko also made many trips and they almost fell over each other hustling from one capital to the other.

As the Soviets have been more exposed in the Arab countries the U.S. switched its tactics and became the "negotiator" of a "peaceful solution" to the crisis. The Soviet Union also switched its tactics and became a "friend" in the Arab fight against Zionism, while continuing to send emigrants to Israel for manpower, and thus reached into the U.S. sphere of influence. The Soviet Union and the U.S. have sent more than \$10 billion worth of different kinds of military equipment into the area since the October Middle East War. On January 23 Kissinger stated that a final peace negotiation would once again involve a Soviet-U.S. condominium set up originally in the Geneva Negotiations of December, 1973.

Contention in the Middle East has spread now to the west in Cyprus and the East in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. Naval military exercises are held from time to time by both powers in these two regions. Their contention for bases and a dominant position in the Indian Ocean has become sharper than ever.

Since early 1974 Soviet social-imperialism has become more blatant and aggressive in its designs on the "Tinderbox" of Europe and the Balkans. They tried to foster a pro-Soviet subversive group in Yugoslavia which was caught and punished by the Yugoslavian government. They forced one Balkan state to provide a military corridor. When Balkan states resist pressure, the Soviet Union organises military manoeuvres on its borders. The Soviets also "fished" in Cyprus and tried to use the situation to make a breach in NATO's southern flank.

The Soviets' contention in Europe is combined with lulling them with slogan's about "détente" and "security", with promises of natural resources and markets for capital expansion as bait to curry favour, "develop bilateral relations" and "all-European co-operation", and, at the same time, engage in political infiltration in the region.

As a counter, the U.S. readjusted its relations with West European countries and strengthened political and military alliances with them against the Soviet Union. Using contradictions in Eastern Europe they have intensified their "peaceful infiltration" there. Through bilateral "economic and technical cooperation." The "European Security Conference" and the talks on forces reduction in Central Europe, over the last year or so, reflects the two superpowers' rivalry, interpenetration and mutual exclusion in Europe.

Military confrontation between the two in Europe is becoming sharper. While holding talks in Vienna on forces reduction in Central Europe they continued to step up war preparations in terms of actual fighting with Europe as the hypothetical battlefield.

The Soviets have increased the size and quality of their forces in Europe. In addition to Central Europe they have strengthened their military deployment and command system against the northern and southern flanks of Europe. Joint Warsaw Pact military exercises almost doubled in 1974. The U.S. meanwhile began largescale renewal of its tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Western Europe to cope with the Warsaw Pact's conventional forces' superiority.

Most characteristic of this period of increasing contention between the superpowers is the feverish arms race, especially the nuclear arms race. The biggest farce in this regard is the so-called Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. A so-called "limitation" of 2,400 strategic delivery vehicles — intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched missiles and heavy bombers — of which 1,320 could be armed with multiple nuclear warheads (MIRV's). On December 3, 1974 William Beecher, U.S. Defence Department spokesman, said that in fact the U.S. only had a total of 2,205 launchers, 822 of which are armed with MIRV's, and the programme was to bring the number of MIRV armed launchers up to 1,286. In other words the "ceiling" was larger than current stockpiles and even its target figure. Right now Defense Secretary James Schlesinger says the U.S. is feverishly trying to catch up to the "limitation" figure.

On January 3, 1975 President Ford signed a \$95 billion defense budget which the administration will try to get through Congress, and President Ford launched his campaign for a \$300 million aid for arms to the Saigon puppets. On January 11 General George S. Brown, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff told a U.S. military audience that the "sheer massiveness" of the Soviet strategic program is staggering. He said "without successful negotiations or a matching strategic program of our own" the S.U. program could "seriously upset the future military balance." He said the numerical strength in Europe was being matched by increasing technical equality because of their "vigorous development and modernization program." (*New York Times*, January 12, 1975) Secretary of Defense, James Schlesinger said on January 14 that new "negotiations" to put the Vladivostok agreement between Brezhnev and Ford into a treaty, would begin January 31. He said that the Soviet Union

had deployed two new international missiles armed with MIRV's. He reiterated the statement about "limiting" MIRV's to 1,300 each, and warned that should the Soviet Union massively deploy these weapons this would be a "potential source of strategic instability" and the U.S. would "take counter-measures to maintain the strategic balance". He worried aloud about the possibility of a Soviet "selective strategic strike" against U.S. defense centres, which would cost 500,000 to 5 million casualties, in the hope that the U.S. would not respond fearing a retaliation by the Soviets against U.S. cities with casualties of over a 100 million. Schlesinger said that U.S. strategy envisioned the ability to launch such an attack against both Soviet defense sites and against cities.

In addition to the arms race, there is a sharpening of war talk, and a definite "cooling off" of so-called détente. An interview with Kissinger released on January 2, 1975 contained his infamous threat to use military action against the oil producers: "I am not saying that there's no circumstance where we would not use force. But it is one thing to use it in the case of a dispute over price, it's another where there's some actual strangulation of the industrialized world", and then "I want to make clear, however that the use of force would be considered only in the gravest emergency." (*Business Week*, January 13, 1975) On January 3, Kissinger told reporters: "I reflect the view of the President. I do not make a major statement of foreign policy on which I do not reflect his views." This is a continuation of the confrontation politics adopted by the Ford-Kissinger regime in September, 1974, against the Third World oil producers, and the Western European allies. This is the theory of "international resources", and "international order" in raw material distribution. He attacked the European resistance to come under the U.S. plan for a confrontation between the "consumers" and "producers" by saying that the Europeans "suffer from an enormous felling of insecurity", and, "sense of impotence." Yet five days later the U.S. was impotent as West Europe's 9 ECC members unanimously adopted a program to recycle 10-12 billion oil dollars in coordination with OPEC against the U.S. plan of a "producer" consortium confronting OPEC.

Kissinger also made several statements about the "cooling off" of détente. On January 8, Kissinger said that the U.S. and the Soviet Union are "going through a difficult period" and that a "chill" might be setting into relations. On January 11 the *New York Times* reported that Kissinger regretted that the Philippine to Indian Ocean Task Group (Enterprise and others) didn't sail through the Gulf of Tonkin to try and intimidate the liberation movement in Vietnam. On January 14, the Soviet Union nullified the much trumpeted Trade Treaty of 1972 because of U.S. insistence that the \$300 million trade credit be tied to Soviet-Jewish emigration. Kissinger said the U.S. regretted this "turn of events", that "our policy of détente remains in force", but that the U.S. would resist Soviet pressure "with great determination." Also on January 14, Schlesinger made his statements about increased Soviet nuclear arms build up, and the need to have a "two strike" nuclear strategy.

In the Soviet Union the armaments race is also going on. In the past 10 years the revisionists have spent \$100 billion (U.S.) for development of nuclear weapons. Even though their GNP is half that of the US, their armaments budget is the same or larger, amounting to 20% of their income. About 60% of industrial enterprises serve the military. In 1970, 20% of their military budget, \$16 billion, was spent on military research and development. The Soviet Union has reportedly increased the number of intercontinental missiles 15 times in 10 years; nuclear submarines 5.5 times in 4 years; naval tonnage almost 2 times in ten years; military planes by 50% from 1968-73; and the number and quality of tanks and other conventional weapons also are being built up. All this has disastrous effects on their economy reflected by their scramble for credit; they now owe other countries \$8 billion (US). As well they are impoverishing the working people of the Soviet Union and plundering the Third World to pay for this race.

They too are promoting national chauvinism and war consciousness among the people in order to prepare conditions for war. Brezhnev, in the 27th "Party Congress" called for literary and art works to reflect "patriotic themes." G.M. Markov, 1st Secretary of the Union of Soviet Writers told the 5th congress of writers that "literature has a special responsibility to army and navy personnel" and that "all efforts must be made to develop and strengthen the war tradition in Soviet literature." In the past few years a steady stream of novels, films, plays and paintings have glorified militarism. Social-imperialism champions, as Lenin says: "not 'defence of the fatherland' in the sense of combating foreign oppression, but the 'right' of the 'Great Powers' to plunder colonies and to oppress other nations." Both a literary magazine *October* and a film called, *Czechoslovakia, A Year of Test*, do propaganda for the invasion of that country in 1968; the film was awarded "the state prize for literature and art." A documentary film *The Ocean* portrays Soviet naval operations in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Barents Sea, the Arctic Ocean, the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea. A novel *Nuclear Submarines on the Alert*, lauds tsarist naval traditions and denounces the idea of "loafing about in one's own territorial waters". A full-length feature film *Tame the Flames*, advertises the militarization of the economy and Soviet nuclear "strength" and is lauded by *Pravda* as "our political film" of "historic significance". Another film *Courtesy Call* portrays military manoeuvres and war alerts and shows rows of rockets ready for firing. The long novel *Thunder of Rockets* relates the dream of a rocket commander. A nuclear war breaks out, he boards a plane, gives orders from the air to attack the enemy with nuclear warheads and wins victory.

Thus, in both the superpowers, the ruling classes are taking practical measures in all spheres to prepare to escalate their contention for world hegemony into a world war.

I will end my speech with two quotations:
FROM THE DOCUMENTS ON THE
FOURTH NATIONAL PEOPLE'S CONGRESS IN CHINA:

"The Congress pointed out that the present international situation, which is characterized by great disorder under heaven, continues to develop in a direction favourable to the people. All the basic contradictions in the world are sharpening. The contention for world hegemony between the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, is becoming more and more intense. The factors for both revolution and war are increasing. The people of all countries must get prepared against a world war." ()

FROM COMRADE ENVER HOXHA
FIRST SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

"We the people of the People's Republic of Albania, of a small country in the Balkans which has suffered much at the hands of the barbarous imperialist occupiers through the centuries and which has won its freedom and everything it enjoys today arms in hand, call on all common people of the world: 'Look out: U.S. imperialism and Russian imperialism are leading the world into another war more terrible than the two previous world wars. These two superpowers are responsible for the present great crisis, they are vying with one another for world hegemony, they are fighting to occupy markets; that is, to oppress and enslave peoples. It is precisely the two superpowers that arm anti-popular cliques and governments to use them as watchdogs and their people as cannon fodder for the inevitable shambles they are preparing, if they have a free hand.'"

REFERENCE NOTES ON THEORIES OF SUPERPOWERS

PART 2

The essence of the theory of superpower politics, the theory of the "necessity to keep the equilibrium between the superpowers" is the imperialist domination of the world, especially the imperialist domination of the masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Let us examine for example the theories of the U.S. imperialists with regard to their hegemony of the seas. Under the cover of their proclamations of "détente" and "the shift from confrontation to talks" the Soviet social-imperialists and U.S. imperialists have both been wildly expanding their arms race. Soviet vice-minister of defense, commander in chief of the Soviet Navy, Sergei Gorshkov, has written a book called *The Navy in Times of War and Peace*. He argues that the navy "will fulfill numerous, complicated and arduous tasks" in a nuclear world war, and therefore the Soviet Union must "constantly strengthen its sea power," and "move into the oceans." The theories he uses to justify a world navy are one: "the sphere of naval operation is the seas which make up seven-tenths of the surface of our planet." The seas contain "10 million tons of gold and 4,000 tons of uranium", not to mention their "great military significance." Thus he promotes the theory that "the sea bed knows no boundary; whosoever occupies it owns it." Two: he says the Soviet navy must "protect the interests of the country beyond its frontiers", for "defending state security" and "keeping in step with the political role of a world power." Thus we see how the theory of superpower politics is extended to justify a "political role of a world power" through an imperialist navy. Three: he says the navy can be used as a means of exerting pressure in international relations. "The navy has actually become a diplomatic means of intimidation and containment", he says with respect to superpower claims by Soviet social-imperialism to occupation of various Pacific islands "discovered" by the agents of the Russian tsars. He says "a series of islands between the Marshall and Caroline islands" and the "Russian islands" were discovered by the Russians, and "as the first discoverer of these places, Russia has every right to occupy them." (*Wsinhua News Bulletin*, May 10, 1974. "Soviet Revisionists' Confession of Quest for Maritime Hegemony", p.223) First a theory for superpower politics, a balance of power, joint solution of global problems, then a theory for a means to implement one's role as a superpower. Every imperialist power has had to develop maritime hegemony in order to impose its aggressive policies of plunder and domination of other countries. Spain and Portugal in the late 15th century used their maritime hegemony to dominate America and the East Indies. They were followed by the rise of Holland's maritime hegemony which replaced Spain and Portugal in the 17th century. Holland was followed by the rise of France and England in the 18th century, with the eventual triumph of English maritime power which lasted most of the 19th century. With the rise of German imperialism and U.S. imperialism and latterly Japanese imperialism, we again see the development of massive navies and a litany of "theories" about a "place in the sun", "international responsibilities", "global interests" and so forth. Why are these navies necessary to imperialist countries? Precisely because their purpose is to impose the will of the dominant power over other countries; they are the instruments of superpower politics. This has been the actual history of the world since the late 15th century, a period characterized by the colonisation and plunder of America, the depopulation of 100 million Africans through the slave trade, the domination of the ancient civilizations of Asia, and the robbery and plunder of these peoples which gave rise to capital accumulation, development of the capitalist mode of production and the development of modern imperialism. It was during this period that all the "international laws of the sea" were written by the various superpowers, especially the English and the Americans. This basic world history is essential to keep in mind when analysing the significance of Gorshkov's "theories" regarding the expansion of the Soviet navy, and in understanding the social-imperialist theories with respect to the Third U.N. Law of

the Sea Conference held in Caracas from June 20 to August 24 and attended by 130 countries. With regard to this conference he makes very specific reference in his book *The Navy in Times of War and Peace*. He says, "Today there still exists a grave threat of a further division of the world seas. The pronounced characteristic of the present stage is that some developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America insist that the existing law on the use of the world seas should be re-examined." For him the issue is "not to change the criteria of the international law of the sea" but "to strictly abide by the existing regulations." Here is the very common mindedness which enables the Soviet social-imperialists to "talk" to U.S. imperialism. Both agree that the language of 400 years of maritime superpower politics of first one colonial and later imperialist power over another is just and simply needs to be "enforced". The Soviet paper *Krasnaya Zvezda* writes: "The principles of the law of the sea stemmed from universally accepted rules in existing regulations (such as freedom of the high seas and other principles). No country should unilaterally refuse to abide by these rules." There are two basic issues at stake: one is the question of sovereignty over the sea-bed and the fisheries which the Third World and certain medium-sized advanced capitalist countries insist should be extended to a 200 mile limit. The other is the sovereignty of countries over the straits, and right to decide who shall use them, and for what purpose. On both questions the Soviet social-imperialists advance theories of hegemonism, of great power domination. In the journal *Morskoi Flot*, no. 3, 1974, S.V. Molodtsov, member of the Soviet Union delegation to the preparatory committee to the 3rd Conference writes that the issue of passage through straits "cannot be left to the arbitrary decision of the coastal states, nor be decided according to their will." Why is this? What is implicit in this position is that a superpower has extra-territorial rights, while small countries, and especially poor nations, do not have complete sovereignty. If a superpower in exercising its "global responsibilities" wants to send submarines underwater through a small countries straits, then they have every extra-territorial right to do so. "Freedom of the seas" means freedom of the militarily strong power to impose its will over a weaker country. It is the "traditional" theory of English naval hegemonism taken over from Holland, and passed on to U.S. imperialism. On the question of the exploitation of the fishery and seabed the Soviet delegate Volkov said in August 13, 1971 at the U.S. Seabed Committee that many countries, "often are incapable of fully exploiting the resources within their own territorial waters, let alone resources in waters distant from their coasts." What is the delegate of social-imperialism saying except that because of 400 years of plunder and domination most of the world's peoples and nations have been robbed of their wealth and left poor and underdeveloped. Now because they are poor, this fact becomes the basis for perpetuating the poverty and making it even worse through the concoction of a theory of "limited sovereignty". He says, "the sovereignty over the natural resources depends to a great extent upon the capacity of the industry of the developing countries to utilize these resources." Here we have the theory which justifies the "right" of the superpowers to exploit the resources and labour-power of the Third World countries. It is part and parcel of the revisionist theory of the "international division of labour", which in respect to sea resources says if a poor country can not fully exploit the resources of its sea bed, then the Soviet social-imperialists have the right to exploit it.

The identically same line is given by U.S. imperialism with respect to the oil resources of the Third World countries. President Ford, speaking at the World Energy Conference in Detroit on September 23, 1974 says that: "American foreign policy rests on two obvious present day facts: First, in the nuclear age there is no rational alternative to international cooperation. Second, the more the world progresses and modernizes, the more nations need each other." What this cooperation means is that the U.S. like its partner Soviet social-imperialism, candidate its will to other smaller countries, especially to the Third World countries. He threatened the small producing countries, "Throughout history nations have gone to war over natural advantages such as water or food, or convenient passages on land and sea. But in the nuclear age, when any local conflict may escalate to global catastrophe, war brings unacceptable risks for all mankind." Here the imperialist logic is that because war is a "global catastrophe" the Third World countries should passively accept the dictate of U.S. imperialism as to the price of oil. This is rationalized on the same theoretical premise the Soviets use for their policy of the seas, namely that resources are "international" property. "no one can foresee the extent of the damage nor the end of the disastrous consequences if nations refuse to share nature's gifts for the benefit of all mankind." But whose "gifts" are being "shared"? Ford is discussing the oil of the Middle East, Venezuela, Indonesia, not the oil of the United States. Like the Soviet Union social-imperialists, U.S. imperialism wants "a global energy program". To achieve this "global strategy", the Third World countries must reduce the price of their oil, and in addition the advanced capitalist countries must not make "unwisely scrambles" to secure their oil, i.e. make concessions to the Third World oil producing countries because this will destroy "all hopes for a global solution." (*New York Times*, Sept. 24, 1974) The theory is spelled out by S. Hoffman in his article "Weighing the Balance of Power" when he says "The problem is to avoid a fragmentation of the world economy, which would breed chaos" in the same way as fragmentation in the "strategic-diplomatic arena" would bring about chaos. In other words "diétente" means that the two superpowers are to maintain their domination of everyone else. There must be no economic "chaos"; "a single world system must still be the goal." (*Ibid.*, p.634) Kissinger echoes exactly the same theory in his threat to the Third World countries made on the same day at the United Nations that Ford issued his threat at Detroit. Kissinger's line was "The complex, fragile structure of global economic cooperation required to sustain national economic growth stands in danger of being shattered." (*New York Times*, Sept. 24, 1974) The weapon to be used against the Third World peoples is hunger. Both U.S. and Soviet social-imperialism are organizing a joint program to starve the Third World countries into submission, a program they are backing up with their superpower politics, and "global armies and navies".

The theories for this devious program are this: "Unlike food prices, the high cost of oil is not the result of economic factors, of an actual shortage of capacity or of the free play of supply and demand. Rather it is caused by deliberate decisions to restrict production and maintain an artificial high price level." What are the facts? First of all imperialism and social-imperialism deliberately undermine food production, particularly grain production, in Third World countries. The 1969 U.N. production figures show that the Third World countries account for 99% of coffee production, 97% of cocoa, 58% cotton, 57% tobacco and 92% peanuts — all products monopolized by U.S. and Soviet social-imperialism which control the prices. For example in coffee production, the second only to oil in world trade of primary products employing more than 20 million people in over 50 African, Asian and Latin American countries the price in 1971 was lower than in 1951! As a result of these depressed prices, enforced by the monopoly of the market by a few U.S. imperialist corporations between 1955 and 1969 a total of \$38,786 million was robbed from the coffee producers, or \$2,580 million a year, half of that going to the U.S. monopolies. But if we look at the figures for food production we find that the Third World countries do not produce enough to feed themselves: They grow only 30% of the world's wheat, 25% barley, 92% rice, 40% maize and 18% potatoes. This means that U.S. imperialism is able to use its monopoly of food production as an "aid" to blackmail the Third World countries. That is why in the same breath that Kissinger demands that the oil producing countries cut their price for oil, he calls for a program at the World Food Conference in Rome to "help developing nations, to increase substantially global fertilizer production; to expand international, regional and national research programs; to rebuild the world's food reserves; to provide a substantial level of concessionary food aid." In short to bring in a program of superpower blackmail of food production against the Third World countries.

This is exactly the theoretical position of the Soviet revisionists. They say there is an "international division of labour" in the world. That they are a "worker" country which produces industrial goods; and the Third World countries, especially India, the largest dependency on Soviet social-imperialism, are "peasant" countries who will produce agricultural products for export — agricultural products for industrial consumption such as cotton, hemp, jute, and export luxury food products such as coffee, sugar, tea, vegetable oil, etc. Because the social imperialists are "socialists" and are "friends" of developing countries, they do them a favor of "guaranteeing a market" at a "fixed price." This is the basis for the systematic robbery of Cuba's sugar production. In turn the Soviet Union sells its industrial products at inflated prices. This is the age-old policy of colonial plunder based on straightforward robbery of buying low and selling high. Between 1960 and 1971 the Soviet social-imperialists imported \$6,700 million worth of cotton fibre, natural rubber, non-ferrous metal and food. The Soviet press brags that "it is entirely wrong to regard aid to foreign countries as alms or waste of money... such aid is not given gratis" and "we have never sold commodities 'at a loss' in Asian, Near East or any other countries." With respect to the question of oil, the Soviet Union also shares the theory and practise of plunder of the Third World countries. While Ford raves about "disasterous consequences" if Third World countries "refuse to share nature's gifts", the Soviet revisionists promote their theory that Middle East oil is "international wealth." They claimed that "the Arab oil, though it is Arab wealth in form, is in reality international wealth." The Soviet Union is an oil rich country yet they extort tons of oil from the Middle East to pay for the military "aid" they receive from the Soviet Union. The chairman of the Soviet state committee for foreign economic relations said "Iraq supplied the Soviet Union with oil by way of compensation for expenditures on aid. We imported 4 million tons of oil from Iraq in 1972, and the import will be increased considerably in 1973." The policy is to pay for the oil and gas at a fixed price about 20% lower than the international price to pay off debts and trade deficits. The Soviet Union then re-sells this oil in Eastern and Western Europe at 4 and 5 times the price it pays for it. Thus superpower politics finds expression in a struggle for control of the Middle East oil and the European market, which is dependent upon Middle East oil for its supplies. We can see the relationship between a theory of "diétente", of the two superpowers resolving all international disputes themselves, and a theory of the "internationalization" of natural resources, of a "world system", of "global problems" which need solving through "global programs". All the theories are the ideological basis for the systematic plunder of the Third World countries, the bullying and intimidation and subordination of the capitalist countries in east and western Europe, as well as other small and medium-sized developed countries. The principal aspect to this superpower politics is the competition between them for world hegemony, each one trying to undermine its "partner's" hegemony. Thus U.S. imperialism moves into the Soviet sphere of Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union moves into Latin America. This is the upshot in practise of the "balance of power".

The theory the revisionists promote as part of their campaign of contention with U.S. imperialism in exploiting Third World countries is that of "an alliance of the socialist countries and national liberation movements." They promote the theory that the way to development for the Third World countries is to ally with the Soviet Union and depend on it for industrial production, markets for agricultural products, weaponry and so forth. Posing as a "socialist" country with the tradition of the Great October Socialist Revolution led by Comrades Lenin and

THESE THEORIES ARE THE IDEOLOGICAL BASIS FOR THE SYSTEMATIC PLUNDER OF THE THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES...

Stalin gives the social imperialists a certain ideological edge over U.S. imperialism now thoroughly exposed as an imperialist plunderer of the Third World. Therefore it is most important at this stage to fully expose the Soviet revisionist theories regarding "socialist economic integration" and "national rapprochement". The first theory relates to Soviet social-imperialist hegemony over its Eastern European revisionist "allies" and their reduction to neo-colonies of the Soviet Union. The second theory relates to the heart of the whole ideological foundation of social imperialism, namely Great Russian chauvinism, the black reactionary ideology of tsarism, and the ideological basis for the re-constitution of the old Russian empire on an even greater scale than dreamed of by the old tsars.

The theoretical basis for the neo-colonization of the Eastern European revisionist countries was dished out by Brezhnev as a rationale for the invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. In keeping with the superpower political doctrine Brezhnev had forewarned U.S. imperialism that the invasion was going to take place on the basis that Eastern Europe was the Soviet's "sphere of influence." The theoretical justification was expressed in Brezhnev's doctrine of "limited sovereignty", that is, because the world is divided into two superpowers, and because any "disturbance" or "equilibrium" between them would upset this balance and lead to a thermo-nuclear war, therefore the small and medium-sized countries had to "limit" their sovereignty, and come under the dictate of one or other of the two superpowers. The essence of this theory of international relations is to be seen in the economic program which has been developed at the 24th session of COMECON, based on the theory of "limited sovereignty" and "scientific and technological collaboration". We have seen how the theory of "scientific and technological revolution" as the motive force in history is being used to import U.S. finance capital into the Soviet Union. The same theory is used by the Soviet Union to accumulate capital at the expense of the Eastern neo-colonies. There are 44 multi-partite agreements all of which assert Russian hegemony over Eastern Europe and develop the Russian economy at the expense of their own. Most of the big industrial projects involving several Eastern European countries are being built within the Soviet Union such as a unit for the enrichment of asbestos with a 500,000 ton capacity per year being built in Kiembayev in the southern Urals; the cellulose combine in Ust-Ilimski Siberia; the metallurgical combine near Kursk with a capacity of 10 to 12 million tons of steel yearly; a plant for the enrichment of copper, phosphorites, etc. The "cooperation" involves the plunder of the capital accumulation of the neo-colonies. In addition the "integration", which is justified on the basis that the "scientific and technological revolution" leads to the breakdown of national sovereignty, borders and so on, means that the Soviet revisionists are using thousands of workers from Eastern Europe to move to the Soviet Union to work on these "integrated" projects. About 20,000 Bulgarians are working on the construction of the paper and cellulose factory in the vicinity of Archangel, on the construction of the metallurgical combine of Kursk, or are cutting wood in the forests of Kom. There are also several thousands of workers from Bulgaria, Poland and other countries working in the Soviet Union. This robbery of the labor-power of the Eastern European workers, a robbery which greatly retards the development of the economies of the countries from which these workers come, is heralded by the Soviet revisionists as "international cooperation".

Through this "international cooperation" the Soviet social-imperialists both appropriate the surplus created by the imported "fraternal" workers, and solve the problem of the labour shortage necessary to develop their raw materials in the distant areas of the Soviet Union. The neo-colonial essence of these 'joint projects' is summed up in the method of repaying the credits advanced by the "cooperating" countries. For example, Czechoslovakia will advance credits from 1974-8 for construction of the asbestos enriching combine, but the Soviet Union will not begin to pay back the credits until the plant is in full production in 1980, will pay it back in a longer period than it was advanced, and will pay it back in products produced by the new instruments of production, i.e. by supplying asbestos. The neo-colonial aspect of the relationship between Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union is indicated by the increase in the share of industrial production of the Soviet Union of the COMECON countries from 69.5% in 1968 to 76% in 1970. During the same period the share of the GDR fell from 8.7% to 3.4% and Czechoslovakia from 7.5% to 4.2%. (*Revisionist Economic Integration and its Contradictions*, by Kicco Kapetani and Veniamin Toçi, *Albania Today*, May-June 1974, p.36) The differentiation between the economies of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union is evident in the increase of basic funds of the Soviet Union being 2.7 to 3 times faster in the Soviet Union than in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the GDR. (*Ibid.*)

The Soviet Union also controls the economies of Eastern Europe through its monopoly control of basic raw materials, fuels, machinery, equipment and so on. Through its expropriation of capital from Eastern Europe, the Soviet monopoly capitalists accumulate capital for its export to Third World countries in the form of so-called aid, as loan capital and functioning capital. Always the objective is to seize the key sections of the Third World country's economy, to win political and military concessions for bases and so forth, and thus provide the Russian monopoly capitalists with a world empire greater than ever envisioned by the Tsars. With this neo-colonialism of course comes greater contradictions within the revisionist camp. The Soviet review *Mitavaja Ekonomikail Mezhnarodnoje Otnoshenijai* wrote: "Some of the COMECON member countries are not much predisposed to give up their industrial production. They proceed from various reasons, the principal one being their inclination towards the industrialization of their countries, and the modernization of the structure of industry." (*Ibid.*, 38) In addition the high prices charged by the Soviet Union for oil and other industrial products is caus-

ing severe crises in the revisionist camp which explains in part why the Soviet Union is having a difficult time mustering the "world communist movement" to Moscow for official approval of "détente" and the policies of Soviet social-imperialism.

As for the theory of "national rapprochement" within the Soviet Union itself we see the full extent of great Russian chauvinism which is the main ideological content of Russian imperialism. The revisionist clique writes time and again; "the national question, as it came down to us from the past, has been settled completely, finally and for good." Khrushchev launched the theoretical basis for the intensification of the Russification program during the 1961 22nd Congress of the CPSU when he called for a policy of "increasingly closer rapprochement of nationalities." Brezhnev has followed this line which he describes as a policy of "the further drawing-together of nationalities." The Soviet journal *Communist* boasts in its 4th issue last year that the Soviet Union is entering "the stage of achieving complete unification" among all the nations and that now "possibilities to conceive more specifically the process of rapprochement, even integration, among all nationalities." It adds that a "single socialist nation is taking shape" and is achieving "unification of language" through widescale use of Russian. They are not so blatant as to say that integration into the Russian nation is a good thing. Instead they talk about "forming a new historical community of people — the Soviet people."

That does not mean "elimination of the difference among nationalities and disregard of national characteristics, languages and culture." Yet the Soviet journal *Soviet Ethnology* says that "the concept of nation and tribes ... will increasingly give way to the concept of Soviet people." But how does the concept of Soviet people become an opposite to nationality? It is because for the modern revisionists "Soviet people" means Russification, a forced assimilation of peoples to the Russian language, and the liquidation of other nations and tribes.

The similarity between the old tsarist theories that "as long as a people preserves its faith, language, customs and laws it cannot be considered subdued" and the theory published in the No. 7 1972 issue of *Statistical Review*, a Soviet periodical, that "the people of different nationalities and tribes in their millions regard-Russian culture as their own", and that this is an important aspect of the "development of the multi-national Soviet socialist state," is different only in phraseology. The essence is the same old Tsarist Russian chauvinism. The essence of Russification is the Russification of the language of the Non-Russian peoples. Brezhnev's policy is that "every citizen (of the non-Russian languages) should master this language (Russian)" and that it should even be learned in "pre-school child care institutions." The purpose of this is clear: the language becomes the means of de-nationalizing, of Russifying the peoples of the Soviet Union. *The Handbook of World Population* published in the Soviet Union notes that in the Soviet Union today "groups of people who have changed their language, in course of time usually also change their ethnic (national) identity." (*Hsinhua News Bulletin*, May 12, 1974, p.6) Thus the theory of "national rapprochement" is nothing less than the theory of Russification.

Another method used by the revisionist clique to Russify the non-Russian tribes and nationalities living in the Soviet Union is through mass eviction of peoples from their native lands to live in Russian areas of the country. In a book called *Theoretical Problems of the Formation and Development of the Multi-national Soviet State* published in 1973, the authors admit that "people dispersed for a long time in an alien-national environment are experiencing the natural process of assimilation with this national environment." Statistics in the 1970 census indicate that 390,000 Moldavians or 14.6% of the population was deported from their country by 1970; about 5 million or 13.4% of the Ukrainian nation were similarly uprooted. In the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, the majority of these nations are now inhabited by Russian people. The census admits that with "each new census, the number of nationalities covered by statistics constantly declines". From 1959 to 1970 the number of Soviet nationalities declined from 126 to 119. What does this mean in terms of the actual daily suffering of the non-Russian masses: It means being uprooted from homes, having a foreign language imposed on oneself at the place of work or in the schools, it means violent repression against all forms of resistance. It means the daily shame of being condemned as an "inferior" nationality, of being denounced and imprisoned as "nationalist". These are all the trials and sufferings that have been imposed on conquered and oppressed peoples for centuries. What difference is there between the English uprooting of the conquered Irish people, and the "national rapprochement" of the Ukrainian nationality into an oppressed and degraded province of the "Soviet people", i.e. Great Russian nation. There is no difference except that Brezhnev carries out his shameful policies against the nationalities and tribes of the Soviet Union under the theories of "national rapprochement", "internationalism" and so on.

There is a clear pattern in all the theories advanced by the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists regarding international relations, relations between countries and nationalities. Their ideas comprise an integrated world view, a philosophical system, an ideology. John Foster Dulles advised U.S. imperialism that "We must be dynamic. We must use ideas in the capacity of arms." This is precisely what the ideologues of both superpowers are doing — using their counter-revolutionary theories as weaponry against all the peoples and nations of the world. The central thesis to this arsenal is that two superpowers dominate the world in an equilibrium that must not be disturbed by countries wanting independence, nations wanting liberation or people wanting revolution. This balance of power stands above classes, and is "free from ideology". According to this world view a "global system" determined by a scientific and technological revolution makes national sovereignty out-dated and "reactionary."

What does all this "theory" reflect? It reflects nothing more

than the self-interest of a very small class of militarists, capitalists, bureaucrats and various bad elements of two nations, the United States and Russia, imposing their selfish wills on the over-whelming masses of humanity, first and foremost the struggling masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America. These ruling cliques of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism for all their talk of "détente" and "global economic and diplomatic order" are sitting on a volcano of revolutionary upheaval. Why is this? The reason is that imperialism, despite its temporary resurgence as a result of the mighty socialist camp being turned into its opposite by the modern revisionists, is the eve of proletarian revolution. Everywhere imperialism creates its own gravediggers. The concentration of capital into fewer and fewer hands forces a mighty alliance, a united front, of all those who are oppressed, bullied, dominated, and exploited by this concentration of capital. The very day Kissinger rattles his sabre at the oil producing countries and the European powers, a new alignment of forces between the Arab producing states and the European consumers is organized. At the very time Soviet social-imperialism defends the old imperialist "laws of the sea" former English colonies, products of those laws, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, join their opposition to the positions to the two superpowers. Superpower politics, two power "détente" has created its opposite, a mighty and gathering alliance of all the oppressed nations, led by the masses of Africa, Latin America and Asia who have been struggling without let up for 400 years against the most brutal plunder, violent repression, indignities of national abuse imposed by superpower hegemonism. They have been propelled by imperialism to fight, and in the course of years of fighting have learned the great historic lessons of the Paris Commune and the Great October Socialist Revolution. Today they are teaching the masses everywhere the universal truth of "dare to struggle, dare to win." Since World War Two the great colossus of U.S. imperialism with its atomic bombs and Fort Knox stuffed with gold has been brought to its knees, mainly by the struggling masses of Asia — first in China, where the 8 million strong Chaing Kai-Shek army was crushed by the Peoples Liberation Army led by the Communist Party of China and Chairman Mao. Then in Korea where the fraternal Korean and Chinese people supported by the socialist camp led by Comrade Stalin defeated the so-called U.N. army of U.S. imperialists. Then during the 1960's in Indo-China where the Indo-Chinese people persisted to wage protracted struggle, and continue to do so against U.S. imperialism.

The fact is that U.S. imperialism was forced into an "alliance" with Soviet social-imperialism. Their concoction about "détente" is actually their admission of weakness, and obscures the fact that both superpowers have irreconcilable contradictions between them, each one seeking continually to have an advantage over the other. Furthermore, the decisive factor in history today is precisely struggle of the Third World's peoples against superpower politics. They are leading the united front against U.S. and Soviet social-imperialism — a united front which includes many different classes and countries. What propels history forward is the struggle against superpower politics.

The people of Canada live in a country that is dominated by U.S. imperialism. Every day the ideologists of this superpower promote their theories about how Canada can not be independent, how we must learn to live with "superpower politics" and reconcile ourselves to "limited sovereignty." Daily the masses are told that Canada's natural resources are really "international resources", and because of the revolution of science and technology we must depend on "international cooperation", i.e. the import of capital to develop these resources. Furthermore, Canada is made up of an oppressed nation of Quebec and many oppressed Native Indian tribes and nationalities. The same theories which the Soviet social-imperialists promote about "national rapprochement" and "integration" are promoted here. The lands are stolen from the people, the economic development of the country is stifled, and reactionary "cosmopolitan" culture is used to oppress the masses on a daily basis. But how do the Canadian masses react to the theories of passivity and hopelessness promoted by the ruling class, and especially U.S. imperialism? Everywhere there is an increase in resistance, a deepening of struggle, a sharpening of clarity about what are the real problems facing the masses and who is causing them. The inspiration for the Canadian people comes from the great wars of liberation launched by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The fighting vanguard of the Indo-Chinese people has kindled flames around the world against the theories of "détente", and these sparks have landed here in Canada too. They must be made to make fires against all the dead and reactionary ideas of passivity, of self-interest, of selling out, of national chauvinism and insensitivity towards the great epical struggles being waged by the overwhelming masses of mankind who live in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is the great theoretical guide to expose the reactionary theories of superpower politics, "détente", the end of ideology and all the rest of the ideological garbage that together makes the world outlook of U.S. and Soviet social-imperialism. The course of world history in this era of great revolutionary change moves very rapidly, in twenty years a mighty socialist country became a superpower imperialist state. But already, within five years of an unholy alliance between it and U.S. imperialism, a new force, its opposite has come into being — a mighty alliance of nations and countries fighting for their liberation and independence. And underneath the great revolutionary surging of the world's people against U.S. and Soviet social-imperialism and all reaction. This is the main trend today. The Canadian masses are part of this trend and will definitely make a contribution to the overthrow of the counter-revolutionary alliance of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

End item.

NO INFLATION IN CHINA

stable prices and the reasons

(From Peking Review, May 9, 1975)

Market prices in our country have long been kept stable in the last more than 20 years. In 1952 people could buy the following items for daily use with Renminbi (RMB) 15 yuan (according to the exchange rate between Renminbi and U.S. dollar released on April 29, 1975 by the People's Bank of China, 15 yuan is equivalent to 8.37 U.S. dollars.): 10 kilogrammes of rice, 5 kilogrammes of flour, 1 kilogramme of pork, half a kilogramme of sugar, half a kilogramme of table salt, 15 kilogrammes of vegetables, 1 metre of white cloth, 2 cakes of soap, 25 kilogrammes of coal, half a kilogramme of edible oil, half a kilogramme of kerosene and some other consumer goods such as aluminium ware, stationery and medicines.

In general these items can be bought with the same amount of money today.

The picture was an entirely different one in old China. In the 12 years between the outbreak of the anti-Japanese war in 1937 and the collapse of reactionary Kuomintang rule in 1949, bank notes issued by the Kuomintang inflated more than 140,000 million times and prices soared over 8,500,000 million times. The plummeting of the purchasing power of the *fapi*, the currency issued by the reactionary Kuomintang government, can be shown by the following examples: One hundred yuan of *fapi* could buy two oxen in 1937, but only two eggs in 1945 and only a sheet of toilet paper in May 1949.

STABILIZING AND ADJUSTING PRICES

The inflation handed down by old China was ended as a result of a series of effective measures by the Party and government following liberation. Prices of such articles in daily use as grain, cotton cloth, table salt and coal have been kept low and stable from the start. Prices of certain industrial goods for daily use like radios, plastic goods and enamel ware have gone down, while those for drugs have been reduced several times, with the average price today 80 per cent less than in 1950. With the growth of the petroleum industry in recent years, the state has reduced the price of gas for home use. Living expenses such as rent and water, electricity and transportation have not changed much. Rent generally accounts for only 3 to 5 per cent of the wages of workers and staff members.

China has adhered to the principle of "stabilizing the market and the price" ever since liberation. Prices are stabilized while the people's purchasing power has been steadily growing and their demand for commodities has been rising by big margins. China's total retail sales of commodities in 1973 rose more than sevenfold compared with the early post-liberation days. For example, taking 1952 as the base year, silk and woollen fabric sales increased more than 30-fold and knitting wool more than 20-fold. Compared with the early period of liberation, sales of wrist-watches, bicycles, sewing machines and radios also showed enormous increases, ranging from a dozen to 100 times.

While stabilizing prices, the state also properly adjusted prices of certain commodities in a planned way. Imperialism and the domestic reactionary ruling classes frantically exploited the peasants before liberation by buying farm products cheap and selling industrial goods dear, that is, by using the method of enlarging the "scissors" differences between prices of industrial and farm products. Since the founding of the People's Republic of China, the People's Government considers rational adjustment of the price ratio between industrial and farm products an important political question in consolidating the worker-peasant alliance, and it has many times raised purchasing prices of farm and sideline products and lowered selling prices of such agricultural means of production as chemical fertilizers, insecticides, farm machines and diesel oil for farm use. Compared with 1950, purchasing prices of farm and side-line products have been nearly doubled and

selling prices of chemical fertilizers, insecticides, diesel oil for farm use and other agricultural means of production have been reduced by from one-third to two-thirds. The price ratio between industrial and farm products has narrowed by 40.5 per cent compared with 1952. The peasants can exchange for a much bigger amount of industrial products than in the past with the same amount of farm products. For instance, herdsmen in Chinghai Province in western China could only get one and a half tea bricks or seven metres of cloth for 50 kilogrammes of wool before liberation. Now with the same amount of wool they can get 12 tea bricks or 70 metres of cloth.

The reactionary ruling classes also used regional price differences to oppress and exploit the working people in the old society. They pushed down the purchasing prices of goods at the places of production and raked in exorbitant profits by transporting them for sale in other places. They also amassed big fortunes by making use of seasonal fluctuations in prices. At harvest time, for example, they bought farm products at depressed prices and sold them at higher prices when the old stocks were nearly exhausted before the next harvest. After liberation the state commercial departments gradually narrowed regional price differences and abolished irrational seasonal fluctuations in the prices of major farm products. These differences and fluctuations were narrowed even more in remote border regions and mountain areas as well as places inhabited by national minorities. The prices of chemical fertilizers, insecticides, matches, and drugs of Western medicine are identical throughout the country.

While the purchasing prices of farm and side-line products have been raised, their selling prices on the market have always been kept stable. For instance, while the average purchasing price of grain has doubled as compared with that of 1950, retail prices have changed very little. Costs of storage, transport, processing and sales of grain are all state subsidized. The state also gives subsidies for vegetables, meat and eggs from year to year. These measures ensure stable retail prices and secure living for the people in town and country. State subsidies for these items run up to several thousand million yuan every year.

WHY ARE PRICES STABLE

Why has China been able to keep prices stable for a long time?

Developing the Economy and Ensuring Supplies.

Chairman Mao has pointed out: "The general policy guiding our economic and financial work is to develop the economy and ensure supplies." (*Economic and Financial Problems in the Anti-Japanese War.*)

Only when the economy develops and there is an abundance of commodities can prices be stable. Our farm production has grown continuously since the founding of the People's Republic of China. Grain output in 1974 was 2.4 times that in the days immediately after liberation. There have also been enormous increases in cotton, oil- and sugar-bearing crops, bast fibre crops, tobacco, tea and other industrial crops. On the basis of all-round development in farm production, both light and heavy industries have rapidly advanced. Commodities on the market rose from several-fold to more than tenfold. Commodities held in stock by commercial departments also showed steady increases. Such commodities at the end of 1974 had almost doubled compared with 1965, the year before the Great Cultural Revolution started. Stock increases were even faster for such major commodities as grain, cotton and other daily necessities. For every yuan of currency issued by the government, there are seven or eight yuan of commodities circulating in the market. Besides, every yuan is backed by four or five yuan's worth of commodities kept in stock. This is the material basis for stable prices.

Planned Adjustments of Currency in Circulation. Another important reason for

China's long-term price stability is centralized and unified state management of currency issuance and state planned release and withdrawal from circulation of currency. Currency issuance has always been limited to the needs of production development and enlarged commodity circulation. Revenue is not increased by means of issuing bank notes.

Renminbi is the only money in circulation in China. All economic dealings among enterprises, public undertakings, government offices, organizations and P.L.A. units above an amount specified by the state are settled through accounts in banks without using cash. No bills circulate in the market. Speculation in bills as practised in capitalist society has no place in China.

More than 90 per cent of the money released in China is for paying wages and purchasing farm and side-line products. Balance between the release and withdrawal from circulation of this part of the money is ensured through planning. The number of new workers and staff members to be added, wages paid and commodities needed every year all proceed according to state plans. In deciding total wages, the state considers the possibility of economic conditions and arranges the supply of commodities accordingly. Before the state releases currency to the rural areas for purchasing farm and side-line products, paying out financial funds in support of agriculture and issuing agricultural loans through banks, it arranges appropriate supplies of industrial products for daily use and agricultural means of production for the rural areas. This ensures the timely withdrawal from circulation of the money thus released.

Of course, the plan for the circulation of money, when implemented, may meet unforeseen changes. Such a new situation will be solved by adjusting state plans. For example, if the release and withdrawal from circulation of money cannot be balanced in the process, this can be adjusted on the one hand by increasing or reducing the amount of loans issued by banks and the amount of money released and on the other by withdrawing money from circulation through boosting the supply of commodities from stocks.

Unified Management of Prices. Prices in our country are managed by the state according to the principle of unified centralized leadership and local management at different levels. Production and sales units have no power to set prices.

The price level and amount of profits in capitalist society decide production, consumption and circulation. In exposing the capitalist mode of production, Marx pointed out: "Production of surplus-value is the absolute law of this mode of production." (*Capital*). Therefore, producing whatever makes more money, prices going up or down when there is a scarce or "plentiful" supply of commodities and artificial raising of prices and cornering the market become inevitable social phenomena. Taking society as a whole, production proceeds blindly. All this is the result of the contradiction between the private ownership of the means of production and socialized production in capitalist society.

Public ownership of the means of production has been established in socialist ownership by the whole people and enterprises under socialist collective ownership by working people and rural people's communes. Production is aimed not at individuals getting rich but at developing socialist economy and meeting the needs of the whole society. Production is managed and adjusted by state plans according to needs and possibilities, and the greatest portions of the commodities are in the hands of the state. Products turned out by the state-owned enterprises belong to the state while the farm and side-line products produced by the rural people's communes or their brigades and teams, except those for their own consumption, are purchased by the state at rational prices.

The establishment of the socialist system makes it possible for China to put commodity production and circulation and price setting under a unified state plan. With regard to the important commodities relating to the national economy and people's livelihood, plans for their purchase, allocation and sale are made and their prices set by the departments concerned under the central authorities. Prices of other commodities are set and managed by provincial, prefectural or county people's governments under the unified principles, policies and regulations of the central authorities. This eliminates blindness in social production and unrestricted ups and downs in market prices.

Free From Influence of International Market. We have adhered to the principle of "maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts" in socialist construction over the past two decades and more. We have never been frightened by imperialist "blockades and embargoes," nor have we submitted to the political and economic pressure imposed by social-imperialism. Proceeding from our actual conditions, relying on the strength and wisdom of our own people and on domestic accumulation and using our own resources, we are building an independent and relatively comprehensive industrial and economic system. From raw materials to finished products, the greatest part of our commodities is produced by ourselves. The commodities are sold mainly to the Chinese people, particularly the peasants. We have an enormously huge domestic market.

Adhering to the principle of self-reliance does not, of course, mean seclusion from the outside world. China has economic and trade activities with more than 150 countries and regions in the world on the principle of equality, mutual benefit and exchanging what each needs. This also has enhanced friendship between the Chinese people and the people of other countries.

Since the founding of New China we have adopted the policy of putting foreign trade under state control, abolished the various privileges enjoyed by imperialism in old China and freed foreign trade from dependence on imperialism. Plans for our imports and exports are rationally arranged according to the needs and possibilities for developing the national economy. Trade and foreign exchange are kept in balance. Gone for ever are the days of old China when the market was flooded with foreign goods and the country was ruthlessly exploited by imperialism through exchange of unequal values. Owing to the unfavourable balance of trade at that time, gold and foreign exchange reserves were completely depleted and debts piled high. Hence devaluation of the domestic currency and soaring of prices. Now all this has been wiped out for good.

China's imports and exports are under the unified management and accounting of foreign trade departments in accordance with state plans. Goods for domestic and foreign trade are separately priced which severs the direct price connection between domestic and foreign markets. Therefore, prices on the domestic market can be consistently kept stable despite sharp price fluctuations on the international market.

"The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything." China is a developing socialist country and the people's standard of living still has to be raised further. However, the people enjoy a secure life because prices have long been kept stable and low and the supply of the basic means of subsistence has been ensured. This is an achievement of the Chinese people who, under the guidance of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, have united in struggle and smashed the interference and sabotage by class enemies at home and abroad. **End item.**

(continued from page 5)

ing class movement rising to engage in a show of strength with Marxism-Leninism. Modern revisionists and anarcho-syndicalists work hand-in-hand even though the two despise each other. Betrayal by modern revisionism of the working class movement created the conditions for the re-emergence of anarcho-syndicalism.

The outcome of the anarcho-syndicalist line in the working class movement is first the splitting up of the movement which leads to its liquidation. It has the same effect as the modern revisionist line, but the anarcho-syndicalists come up with the so-called "left" image. An avid propagandist for this line in Canada today is Jack Scott. His basic argument in support of the liquidation of labour's day-to-day struggle against capital is as follows:

"...a series of spiralling wage demands that no longer have any meaning, since every increase disappears in increased prices and increased taxes, sometimes even before the wage increase goes into effect."

If Jack Scott's facts are taken to be true (that is, "...a series of spiralling wage demands that no longer have any meaning, since every increase disappears in increased prices and increased taxes..."), then the only truth that can be derived from these facts is that the workers should fight all the more for further wage increases and develop their militancy in struggle. Without fighting against the falling purchasing power of their dollar and for having a greater number of dollars in their pockets, workers will be reduced to no more than slaves. Jack Scott covers up his straight-forward liquidationist and class-collaborationist line by presenting a pie-in-the-sky solution: "The role of radicals should be to convince workers of the necessity to strike for higher objectives as the only solution to current problems." Again, if the words of Jack Scott are taken to be the true reflection of his feelings that he is interested to provide the "solution to current problems" then wouldn't it be better if the workers increased their militancy in fighting for better wages and working conditions as well as prepare conditions to "strike for higher objectives"? But Jack Scott's "higher objective", as we discover in many of his diatribes against the internationals, is "total break, organisationally and ideologically, with the internationals", the attainment of which will create conditions for further striking for "higher objectives". Under the hoax that "spiralling wage demands" "have no meaning" (he should ask some actual workers whether they have or not!), and that the workers should "strike for higher objectives" without paying any attention to the level of development of the working class movement and the extent to which the economic and political crisis has set in, Jack Scott is calling for the liquidation of the struggles of the workers. (For a relatively complete analysis of Jack Scott's anarcho-syndicalism, read Section C of the Explanatory Notes.)

The significance of the re-emergence of anarcho-syndicalism is two-fold: 1) It marks the beginning of the struggle of Marxist-Leninists to provide correct orientation to the working class movement with anarcho-syndicalism as merely an hysterical attempt by the bourgeoisie to stop that struggle, and 2) it also marks the end of the road for the treacheries and betrayals of the sham anti-revisionists. Genuine Marxist-Leninists must launch vigorous campaigns to criticise and repudiate anarcho-syndicalism and implement the Marxist-Leninist line on this decisive front of the working class movement. Over the years, Jack Scott and PWM exercised a tremendous negative influence in certain left-wing circles. It was Jack Scott's line of not fighting for wage demands but of convincing the "workers of the necessity to strike for higher objectives" which gave rise to petty bourgeois revolutionism and adventurism and it is the opposition to this line which will assist the correct orientation of the working class movement now.

In their lifetimes, Marx and his close friend and collaborator, Engels, waged a vigorous and sustained struggle against Proudhon, an anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist of their time. Lenin and Stalin, in their lifetimes, kept up this attack. In North America, and in various European countries, genuine Marxist-Leninists launched one struggle after another against various types of anarcho-syndicalism. There was the struggle against dual unionism, two unions, one revolutionary and the other reactionary, existing side by side. (For the Marxist-Leninist struggle against anarcho-syndicalism, read Section B of the Explanatory Notes.)

Workers from various parts of the world are brought together by modern production. It is this condition of modern production which creates a sense of solidarity and united struggle amongst the workers. When workers are forced to bargain individually with the employer it creates intense competition (a worker has to compete for a job, in the first place, because of the high level of unemployment within the capitalist system) and strife amongst the workers. The workers are forced to work for long hours under the most wretched working conditions and the employers retaliate against any worker or group of workers who wage a struggle for reform of the existing working conditions and demand a living wage. The capitalist employs his power of capital to his best advantage. He discriminates against one worker and favours the other. He buys off a tiny minority of workers and uses them as his agents at the work-place. In other words, apart from extracting maximum surplus value, he creates conditions for the perpetuation of exploitation, not at the current levels but always striving to bring it to higher levels so that he keeps extracting maximum surplus value from the workers at any given time. The workers are forced by these objective conditions to organise themselves into unions which cut down competition in their ranks and transform them from individual workers to the class of workers.

Unions provide the workers with class consciousness and class solidarity. Unions are "a nucleus of communism". The material conditions of the workers necessarily force them to seek alternatives within the capitalist system (reformism) and outside the capitalist system (proletarian revolution). The struggle for wages and the struggle to resist the deterioration of the workers' living and working conditions is only one front of the struggle. The other front for the class-conscious workers is to assist other workers to get organised and to participate in political struggle. Organising the unorganised worker is part of the struggles taking place on the economic front. All class-conscious workers (advanced sections of the proletariat) must join their political party and wage political battles. Organisations (like trade-unions) based on struggles of the workers on the economic front mobilise the main force of revolution. The proletarian party, based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, organises the leading force and provides correct direction and orientation to the economic organisations of the workers. The unions are absolutely essential to convert the faceless, un-organised and

directionless workers into a fighting army of labour against capital. The proletarian party is absolutely necessary to provide the proletarian army with a general staff and a host of sergeants who actually lead this army to victory over capital.

The trade-union movement irresistibly developed with the intensification of the exploitation of labour by capital. The trade-union struggle is the starting point of the movement to overthrow the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. The workers acquire this consciousness of struggle on their own. Capital attempts all the time to break up the unity of the workers and put an end to the dogged resistance of labour to capitalist exploitation and wage slavery. Labour responds to these attacks by developing further unity and militancy in struggle. The battle goes on. Some battles are won and others are lost, but through all these struggles the working class strives to become a fighting class and prepares for final assault on capital. Unions become centres of discussion where lines are drawn between the line of class struggle and the line of class collaboration and compromise and the workers learn to differentiate between what assists labour's struggle against capital and what blunts it.

The trade-union movement in Canada is, at the present time, dominated by reactionary leadership. The vast majority of the workers are not even organised into unions. The capitalist state is attempting to force the unions to become an appendage of its dictatorship and a force against the working class itself. The NDP is leading this struggle on behalf of the capitalists and the modern revisionists are gladly assisting them. Under these circumstances, not to participate in the day-to-day struggles of the workers or not to organise the unorganised is to leave the unions under the control and influence of social fascism and fascism. Genuine Marxist-Leninists must work within the existing trade-unions and organise the un-organised. The workers on their own are capable only of trade-union consciousness. This consciousness can be transformed into revolutionary consciousness only by building the Party of the proletariat based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Anarcho-syndicalism is opposed to the day-to-day struggles of the workers, supports the disruption of the working class movement and is against the building of the Party of the proletariat.

We are going through a period in which economic crisis is looming in Canada. In order to shift the burden of the economic crisis onto the backs of the workers, the capitalists must smash all the resistance of the workers to this shift and achieve "industrial peace". Conflicts between labour and capital in the industries are the concrete reflection of capital attempting to exploit and enslave labour to the maximum and of labour resolutely resisting this attempt. "Industrial peace" means "peace" through the enslavement of labour by capital so that capital can exploit labour to the maximum without facing any resistance.

The two contending sides (labour and capital) are getting ready for combat and the lines are being drawn on the economic front. The isolated struggles and skirmishes, at this time, are merely the reflection of the greater struggles that lie ahead. The monopoly capitalist line of "industrial peace" is coming into direct contradiction with the line of class war. The capitalists are bringing in the full weight of the state on their side and are using political deception against the working class. The workers have only their defence organisations, and for many workers (the majority), even defence organisations do not exist.

Are the capitalists capable of ensuring "industrial peace"? The answer is no, but they will do their utmost to bring it about. During the 1920's Mussolini was brought into power in Italy in order to ensure "industrial peace" and to make trade-unions serve the fascist state. Mussolini, eventhough he deployed brute force and brought untold suffering onto the working people failed to realise his cherished dream of liquidating class struggle and making the working masses into passive work-horses of the capitalist class. The corporative state of Mussolini failed to protect him from the wrath of class struggle. The capitalists in Canada will not achieve their fond dream of "industrial peace" either.

The targets of attack of the bourgeois state and of political deception are the trade-union movement and the unorganised workers. The capitalists would like to make the trade-union movement the appendage of the state while making it extremely difficult for unorganised workers to organise themselves. The state has on its side the labour aristocrats and various social fascist political leaders. In spite of all this "monumental" support, I am convinced that they will never achieve "industrial peace".

Is the working class movement capable of resisting the attacks of capital? The answer is yes! Not only is the working class capable of resisting these attacks but labour is also capable of launching an offensive and overthrowing capital. The working class is heroically fighting not only the direct onslaught of capital and the violence of the state but it is also fighting bourgeois trends and political deception in the working class movement.

Political deception and the attacks of the state are simultaneously used by the capitalists against labour. Take, for example, the role of the NDP in B.C. It came into power through political deception and is now using the state against the working class. Through its anti-labour legislation, Bill 11, the NDP established the Labour Relations Board (LRB) the main objective of which is "securing and maintaining industrial peace". The LRB is provided with sweeping powers. It is almost a legislative body itself which is authorised to make its own rules as it goes along, within the powers of Bill 11, of course (which are unlimited). As one class-conscious worker remarked: "The Labour Relations Board is the most efficient way of suppressing the struggles of the workers. The LRB has been given powers which even the Almighty may not possess." The LRB is the special committee of the state to oppose the basic interests of the working class and to make the trade union movement an appendage of the state.

Bill 11 is the result of the political deception of the NDP. Here, the NDP uses as its guide all the social democratic theories about the nature of the state. For the NDP, the state is above classes and is merely a bureaucratic set-up which can be used equally by the capitalists and the working class.

Right from the beginning of the first clause of Bill 11 to the last, political deception is obviously visible through and through. Sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 2 of Part I of Bill 11 states:

(1) Every employee is free to be a member of a trade union and to partici-

(continued on page 16)

(continued from page 15)

ticipate in its lawful activities.

2) Every employer is free to be a member of an employer's organisation and to participate in its lawful activities."

This is the NDP's concept of "equality" of "freedom" in front of the law. The NDP, which is supposed to be the party of the working class, is formulating laws which provide "equal" "freedom" to the employer and the employed! The motive of the workers in organising themselves into trade-unions is to 1) eliminate competition in their ranks and 2) wage a united struggle for better wages and working conditions. In other words, workers organise themselves to resist exploitation of labour by capital. On the other hand, employers organise themselves to eliminate competition at the time of bargaining and strive for maximum exploitation of labour by capital. The motives of the confounding parties are opposed to one another. How then can Bill 11 serve both the resistance of labour to capital and the exploitation of labour by capital? It has to serve one or the other. It can never serve both. In this instance, Bill 11 serves capital.

The employers own the means and implements of production. Labourers, on the other hand, possess only their potential labour power to sell. The employers can very well afford to delay hiring, postpone production or shut down operation altogether while the labourers must sell their labour power or else they will starve. How can there be any "equality" of "freedom" under these conditions? Freedom of one, in this case, means the enslavement of the other. Bill 11 ensures freedom of capital to exploit labour while there is no "freedom" for labour to resist this exploitation. (For detailed analysis of Bill 11 and the alliance of forces on this question, read Section A of the Explanatory Notes.)

Erroneous views have been advanced in the past by both the anarcho-syndicalists and the modern revisionists which hold that the struggles on the economic front are detached from the struggles on the political front. They further state that the struggles on the economic front are "lower forms" of struggle while struggles on the political front are "higher forms". It is also incorrectly stated that the political struggles "emerge" out of the economic struggles. A study of Bill 11 and innumerable other facts prove that this formulation is entirely incorrect. How did Bill 11 come into being? Through political struggle! And what is the aim of Bill 11? Its aim is to support the struggle of the monopoly capitalists on the economic front.

Bill 11 concentrates the economic rights of the capitalists and workers in juridical form. Bill 11 is the weapon of capitalists against the workers on the juridical front, while the workers have no weapon whatsoever except to defy it. The workers can retaliate by launching strike struggles and toppling the government or forcing some concessions out of it. There are two fronts of struggle: 1) economic and 2) political. There are other fronts too, for example, the cultural, juridical, military, etc., but all these fronts serve the economic base. Political struggles reflect the ripples, the conflicts and storms taking place on the economic front and reflect them in a concentrated form. So to make distinctions between the two in a manner to belittle one struggle over the other or magnify the significance of one over the other is pure sophistry and deception. Which kind of struggle is going to be decisive will depend on the concrete circumstance. It cannot be judged in the abstract on the apriori basis.

Comrades can see clearly that in passing Bill 11, the capitalists are facing a problem that is economic but they have applied political deception to solve it. The class-conscious workers will also have to fight both battles in the way that is most advantageous to themselves. They cannot afford to prefer one type of struggle over another on an apriori basis.

At this time of looming economic crisis, if the working class does not wage economic struggles then it will weaken its political struggle and will fail to accomplish its class aims. It is criminal for a class-conscious worker or a political activist to belittle the struggles on the economic front. It is equally criminal not to involve workers in political battles.

The anarcho-syndicalists concoct "moral objections" to various struggles and compel their followers to abide by their commandments:

"Thou shalt not fight for higher wages!"

"Thou shalt not work in the international unions!"

"Thou shalt not build the political party of the proletariat!"

"Thou shalt not participate in political battles!"

And there are various other commandments. Every tactical line is elevated to the level of principle by the anarcho-syndicalist and abandoned, while every strategic position is converted into moralism and propagated.

Some comrades and friends have asked me to comment on whether or not "it is correct to work in the internationals" or "fight for better wages and working conditions" or "fight for Canadian unions", etc. I have always maintained that the correctness or incorrectness of a tactical line is decided by whether or not it serves to advance the working class movement. Sometimes, a given tactic assists the growth and development of the working class movement, and at other times the same tactic becomes a roadblock and hinders it. It is correct to fight for better wages and working conditions and to work in the international unions at this time. The international unions cannot be transformed into fighting organisations without actually going in and waging struggles there. Those who claim that the pre-condition for the destruction of class compromise and class collaboration is the destruction of the internationals are the same ones who advocate the destruction of the capitalist system first and the waging of struggles for higher wages and better working conditions later. This is turning things upside down. We are not opposed to "Canadian unions" as such, but if the entire strength of the "left" is to be wasted in raiding internationals or protecting themselves from getting raided by the internationals then we will have no part of it. The principle of national unions for each nation is correct but it is not possible to defeat the internationals through moralisms and with the installation of "Canadian unions" through empty phrases. We stand for Canadian unions in the fields where the internationals are not present. We stand for organising the unorganised workers into already existing unions and if in some area there is no union, then establishing independent unions. Under certain circumstances, we will also work for the breaking up of the internationals. We stand for one labour centre nationally. The Canadian Labour Congress must be forced to accept all unions into one body.

Some comrades and friends have mentioned that my suggestion that those who still have illusions about the NDP and who wish to fight Bill 11 through government and "legal" channels should continue to do so is an act of capitulation to those forms of struggle and is tantamount to creating illusions about the worth of these struggles. I would like to stress here that those who have illusions about the NDP are not going to change their minds about the NDP or about these struggles by listening to our lecture or reading some pamphlets issued from the sidelines. People change their views by actually participating in direct struggles and learning through negative and positive experiences. The line of telling someone that we already know about the worthlessness of a type of struggle is a wrong line. What I have said is that it is a good thing that there exist certain elements in the NDP who are quite antagonistic to Bill 11 and are ready to wage some struggle against it through the NDP. What we want to accomplish by supporting these individuals is a fight against the anti-working class elements right in the heart of the NDP itself. If these elements are serious and are able to give to anti-working class elements in the NDP a good fight, then they will certainly make a contribution on that front. Furthermore any suggestion that these friends should leave the NDP right now without causing at least a bit of disorder within the NDP is to harm the interests of the working class movement and it can only isolate us from certain fighting elements within the NDP. I am not suggesting to any of our comrades that we should ourselves wage that kind of struggle. I am opposed to working within the NDP. I have always maintained that it is better to work for communism directly, but if certain elements are not yet ready to do so but have pro-communist sentiment then it is not correct to suggest that these elements should do nothing until the time they are ready to work for communism. There are struggles they can involve themselves in and make a contribution to the revolutionary process. I still maintain the same views.

The question has also been raised as to what, if anything, we will accomplish by opposing Bill 11. It is true that we are not strong enough at this time to topple the NDP regime, but there is no reason why we should not engage in some fight (even if it is on the ideological and propaganda front) for the time being. What we will gain by this agitation is an ability to launch further struggles plus certain influence in the working class movement. This much "gain" is good enough for the time being.

There are some comrades who think that any struggle short of insurrection is a waste of time. I hold that this is a very harmful attitude towards the working class movement. The movement can be advanced only if we are in the thick of struggles and learn the art of class struggle through waging various types of struggles. How to use even a minor sort of struggle for reform, for revolutionary purposes, is an art learned by revolutionaries through struggle. Our revolutionaries also must learn this art.

On the question of the tactical line, our comrades have to firmly grasp that in order to smash the citadel of the enemy, it is extremely necessary to be close to the citadel and actually have through-going knowledge of it. To come into contact with a fortress is not reactionary but revolutionary and to learn how to blow up the fortress and actually do so is not such a terrible thing either. The anarcho-syndicalists do not want to go near the fortress (and they gesticulate and wildly wave their arms at whosoever tries to go near it) because it belongs to the enemy, while the modern revisionists have actually become part of the enemy's defences. From the outside, the trade-unions appear to be the citadels of capitalism, and their leadership has been usurped by the agents of the enemy class, but the basic nature of the trade-unions is still against capital and this nature has not changed (and cannot be changed). Times do change and things have the tendency of turning into their opposites. As the economic crisis deepens and the capitalists further increase their efforts to make the trade-unions the appendage of the state, the broad masses of workers will fight ever more courageously and militantly and will convert the same trade-unions into fighting organisations. One tendency covers another. Beneath the treachery and betrayal of certain trade-union leaders lies the real fighting spirit of the basic masses of the organised and unorganised workers. There is a real volcano ready to erupt which the capitalists are trying to plug through the violence of the state and political deception. They will never succeed in this nefarious deed.

We are faced today with the simple and straight-forward question of organising the unorganised and leading the working class movement in its political struggle against the capitalist system. In this struggle, we must have clear heads and feet firmly on the ground.

Our Party has won some initial victories on several fronts. We have a daily newspaper which goes to various working class circles and its influence is growing. We have the Party with branches in all major cities with cadres capable of carrying forth a line and implementing it. We have working class cadres already engaged in work in the working class movement. We have some experience in organising the unorganised. We are relatively more united in thinking and action and stronger ideologically, politically and organisationally than before. We are very close to providing a detailed analysis of the economic situation in Canada. We have gained much experience through negative and positive examples during the period of disseminating Mao Tsetung Thought and waging the resistance movement against the attacks of the police and of the holy alliance of the "left". There is an economic crisis looming and workers are generally astir. With such an excellent situation inside the country, there is a still more excellent situation on the international scale. There is a growing struggle against super-power politics and generally the revolutionary trend is developing throughout the world whereby countries want independence, nations want liberation and people want revolution. Under these conditions, the responsibility of all genuine Marxist-Leninists, all class-conscious workers, and all revolutionary intellectuals is to get down to the nitty gritty of strengthening the working class movement by -

- 1) Working within the already existing trade-unions and fighting for the correct line there;
- 2) Organising the unorganised workers;
- 3) Strengthening the national working class newspaper, and;
- 4) Supporting all oppositional trends.

Comrades and Friends, in conclusion I would like to re-assert that no matter what the monopoly capitalist class does, it is doomed to extinction. This is the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat and comrades and friends must believe in the inevitability of the social revolution of the proletariat and struggle to bring it about.

THE WORKING CLASS WILL CERTAINLY WIN!

THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM IS BOUND TO BE OVERTHROWN!

ZANU — UNITED FRONT AND ARMED STRUGGLE

(continued from page 5)

VICTORY FOR PARTY WITH CORRECT IDEOLOGY

In the case of Africa, not a single country achieved independence without more than one nationalist party during the struggle for independence. The same is true of the revolutionary movements in the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, Vietnam, Cuba, etc. (In the People's Republic of China, there are still about five other parties apart from the Communist Party of China.) In each of these countries, what happened was that the party which persisted in the struggle and adopted the correct ideological and political line was in the end victorious. Why should such a principle not apply to Zimbabwe? Why should Zimbabwe be different from all these other countries? To force Zimbabwe liberation movements to have a fusion is to try to go against the historical trend. Unfortunately, historical process is inexorable.

THE QUESTION OF UNITED FRONT

ZANU has historically advocated and continued to favour the principle of a united front. Why do we favour a united front? And what kind of a united front do we have in mind?

Let us deal with the second question before dealing with the first. The kind of United Front ZANU wants must be based on three basic principles. The first principle is one of independence and initiative. By this we mean that each party must retain its organs and must have a free hand in developing its specific programme, especially with respect to military operations.

The second principle is that a united front must embrace all anti-imperialist and anti-racist forces in Zimbabwe. Such a united front must include all political parties in Zimbabwe (ZANU, ZAPU, ANC and FROLIZI), the workers, peasants, intellectuals, students, teachers, professionals, farmers, government employees, African businessmen, African church leaders, Chiefs and all anti-imperialist forces in the country. This principle enables each group to wage the struggle in the way it sees fit. Those who want to engage in peaceful and constitutional struggle will be free to do so. Religious groups would utilise whatever methods their religions permit them to use. Those who prefer armed struggle like ZANU would have a free hand in waging armed struggle.

The third principle is that the united front must be based on execution of a definite programme of action. Our minimum programme for a united front, for example, is that all parties support:

(a) the principle of immediate majority rule based on one man one vote;

(b) the principle of armed struggle as the primary means or form of struggle, constitutional and peaceful means of struggle being secondary.

ZANU favours such a unity programme because it ensures that: (a) armed struggle continues in Zimbabwe; (b) revolutionary forces hold the machinery they have built and the ground they have already won in the country, for this ground is our strategic point of departure and its loss will mean the end of everything that the African people of Zimbabwe, particularly ZANU, have sacrificed in the past ten years and in particular in the last two years. This is a fairly reasonable demand that progressive forces in the world should be able to appreciate and support.

To sum up, there were two kinds of unity being advocated at the Lusaka talks. One was capitulationist unity, and the other was revolutionary unity. Capitulationist unity entails the bringing together of the Zimbabwe people at any cost regardless of the dire consequences on the armed struggle in Zimbabwe. Whether unity would enhance the revolutionary prospect in Zimbabwe or not was immaterial. What was important was that the people would have one leader, one organisation and speak with one voice. This brand of unity is adventurist, retrogressive, reactionary and should therefore be resolutely, firmly and wholly opposed. It is unity to darkness.

The other kind of unity which ZANU supports is revolutionary unity—unity in action. This kind of unity seeks to unite the people of Zimbabwe in the struggle, struggle is the means of unity, is the aim of struggle. If unity is sought through struggle, it will live; if unity is sought through yielding, it will perish. ZANU is confident that the workers, peasants, intellectuals and students of Zimbabwe—the native forces of our revolution—whenever they are will firmly and resolutely resist any kind of unity that will not bring them genuine (and not nominal) independence and will carry the revolution to the end.

RAILROAD WORKERS

(continued from page 1)

"Our cause is just, our case is strong, our position is firm: We will not settle without full protection for our members' rights in the areas of wages, cost of living, health and welfare, including dental care, vacations, holidays, scope rules and, in these times of widespread unemployment and lay-offs, full updating of our job stabilization agreement."

What the railroad capitalists want is to give meager pay increases and make further attacks on their job security, and take away various rights that they have won during the past 30 and 40 years. In other words, in the face of growing inflation, they are asking the railroad workers to take a cut in real wages, promising 22% increase in wages over 3 years, well below the increase in the cost of living. Furthermore, they attack on the front of job security. This is a crucial question for railroad workers. There were 1,800,000 railroad workers nationally in 1927, while today there are just over 500,000.

The railway capitalists assert that the just demands of the unions would hurt both capital and labor during the economic crisis. They are attempting to impose a "pattern settlement" on the whole industry like the one seven other unions now have. Their offer is for a three year contract of 10%, 5%, 3%, 4%; a "cap" or upper limit on the cost of living escalator with provisions that it can be partially rescinded if the cost of living goes down, and a moratorium on the question of work rule changes (sub-contracting, etc.) for three years during which the companies could continue their present job elimination practices.

The railroad capitalists launch a two-fold attack against the railroad workers. First is the attack on their standard of living. Second, they attack the workers' rights to fight for job security and a living wage. The railroad capitalists relied on their government to suppress the struggles of the workers. On April 16, two days before a strike was supposed to take place, President Ford invoked Section 10 of the notorious, anti-worker Railway Labor Act. Under the gangster logic that "this dispute in the judgement of the National Mediation Board, threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive a section of the country of essential transportation service..." Ford and the state machine showed what class interests they are servants to, and suppressed the railroad workers strike. 60 days are up, and the so-called "cooling off period"—or initial period of suppression—is over. BRAC is planning now to continue with the plans to strike. Already, Ford has released a statement to the effect that a strike must not be allowed. And the Chicago Tribune is already talking about once again invoking the Railway Labor Act through a congressional amendment, in order to, once again, fascistically suppress the workers rights to strike.

NATIONAL PUBLICATIONS CENTRE
is now receiving orders for the May issue of

MASS LINE

Theoretical Journal of

The Communist Party of Canada
(Marxist-Leninist)

Editor: Harold S. Bains
Publishing Date: April 29, 1975

Send orders to:
NATIONAL PUBLICATIONS CENTRE
P.O. BOX 727, JARVIS DE BR.
TORONTO, ONTARIO,
CANADA.

Please send editorial submissions and other inquiries to:
The Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist)
National Headquarters
1144 Ontario Street East
Montreal, Quebec

The railroad capitalists and the government use not only a two-pronged attack against the workers standard of living and rights to strike; they also use two-faced tactics of fascist suppression and political deception.

While from one side of their mouths come the orders for suppression of the strike, from the other side comes the political deception such as "working together in the mutual interests of capital and labor" through "industrial peace" in order to avoid "interruption of interstate commerce." What brazen lies! The railroad workers are faced with job insecurity; their 1974 purchasing power was 5.4% below the December 1973 level, while the cost of living has already increased this year at a rate of more than 10%; meanwhile, the thirteen major railroads, during the third quarter of 1974, registered profits 80% higher than during the same period in 1973. The railroad capitalists are interested in nothing else but increasing their profits while keeping workers' wages to a minimum. It is for this reason that the railroad capitalists might call once again for President Ford to invoke the Railway Labor Act.

The Railway Labor Act was put on the books in 1926 and has been used many times since as an anti-strike law. Looking into the use of this anti-labor Railway Act makes it crystal clear that no laws exist above classes, and that the laws in capitalist America are to serve the monopoly capitalist class against the working class.

William Z. Foster, an outstanding communist leader in the United States until his death in 1961, commented in 1927 in reference to the Railway Labor Act:

"In fact, the law contains one definite anti-strike provision. Section 9, Paragraph 8 of the law says:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employe to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor or service by an individual employe an illegal act, nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employe of such labor or service without his consent."

"This sinister paragraph while affirmatively conceding the right of the 'individual' to quit work, negatively denies that right to groups of workers. In order to stress that it is the individual and not an organization that has this right, the word 'individual' in the law is written in italics.

"Under this provision, undoubtedly, the courts will rule that the unions have no legal right to strike against arbitration awards or during the compulsory no-strike periods while mediation and investigation proceeds. Any federal judge will issue an injunction against a striking union in such circumstances."

As Foster shows, here we have the political deception as well as the anti-democratic practices of the railroad employers and their government. By supposedly giving rights to the "individual", the capitalists want to deny rights to the collectively organized workers. It is a simple fact, that an "individual" worker has no way of winning a decent standard of living by withholding his labor power as one man standing alone. Workers band together in their trade unions in order to stand united against the monopoly capitalist class. The reason trade unions are important as defense organizations is that 1) they can cut down on the competition between the workers; and 2) they can advance the fight

THE WORKERS' ADVOCATE

Newspaper of the Central Organization
of U. S. Marxist-Leninists
P. O. Box 11942, Ft. Dearborn Sta.
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Subscriptions: \$3.00 for 12 issues.

Railroad Worker (continued from page 17)

for higher wages, job security, etc.

It should be obvious why the railroad capitalists, through their government, attack the workers while at the same time suggesting there should be "industrial peace." If we further look into the arguments of certain railway capitalists, this will become clear.

In articles in company magazines the commentators again and again lauded the past year as one of outstanding "cooperation" between labor and capital to their "mutual" benefit. Gus Welty, labor editor for the company magazine RAILWAY AGE, in a typical article on January 27, 1975, gives this flimsy argument for class peace: "Has nothing really changed? Are railroads and rail unions natural enemies bent on mutual destruction?" (as though workers' economic struggles were self-defeating). He praises the "almost unbelievable" maintenance of peace thus far and outlines the companies' strategy for continuing this state of affairs through the "current unpleasantness":

"A BASE TO BUILD UPON: Last year was so strife free as to be almost unbelievable, if you look back at rail management/labor history since the end of World War Two and especially since the late 50's. Project 70's (a scheme for labor-capital collaboration on rate increases, speed-up, retirement reform, etc. -Ed.) proved it would work, and management and labor got to know a lot more about each other. There was so much of a positive nature happening that it came almost as a surprise when January 1, 1975 passed without a wage-benefit agreement. . .

"If labor and management get through the current unpleasantness without losing respect for each other and without either party coming out with a feeling of being 'had', then they can continue the working together that has been so well begun. . ."

Which really serves the interests of the workers - struggle or "working together"? Analysing the relationship between wages and profits, Karl Marx said,

"Since the capitalist and workman have only to divide this limited value, that is, the value measured by the total labor of the workingman, the more one gets the less will the other get, and vice versa. Whenever a quantity is given, one part of it will increase inversely as the other decreases. If the wages change, profits will change in an opposite direction. If wages fall, profits will rise; and, if wages rise, profits will fall." (from WAGES, PRICE AND PROFIT - Marx.)

During the current economic and financial crisis of monopoly capital with the decline in industrial production, and thus the decline in railroad freight, the companies' operating revenues have naturally declined. The companies want class peace to make the workers absorb the burden of the economic crisis while the companies maintain their superprofits.

Let us look at several ways in which the capitalists are shifting the burden of the economic crisis onto the railroad workers' backs to try to maintain or increase profits.

1. Through inflation and rising prices. Under the pressure of inflation and rising prices (from April 1974 to April 1975 the cost of living rose 10.2%) the purchasing power of the dollars the railroad workers are receiving in wages is lessened. Unless the workers get wage increases in proportion to inflation, they are actually suffering a wage cut. Now, the railroad capitalists claim that inflation and rising prices hurt them too (thus the "mutual" interest). But here the class nature of the state machine stands clearly exposed. On the one hand the Railway Labor Act suppresses the right of workers to strike for wage increases to keep up with inflation. On the other hand the Interstate Commerce Commission quickly granted a 10% rate increase for the railroads in mid 1974 and then another 7% rate increase later. Not only this, but the railroads also easily obtained relief from rising diesel fuel prices with permission of the I. C. C. to add

a surcharge onto freight rates to compensate for the higher prices. ("...under expedited procedures... approved by the Commission... a 2.1% surcharge went into effect; by mid-August the surcharge had gone to 3.5%." RAILWAY AGE, p. 7, January-27, 1975)

2. Layoffs. When business slows down the railroad capitalist feels absolutely no responsibility to support the worker whom he yesterday exploited mercilessly to gain billions in profits, and throws him on the streets. Under the present Railroad Unemployment compensation laws the maximum an unemployed railroad worker can draw is \$12.70 five times a week, or about \$63 a week. Again there is no "mutual" interest nor any excuse for class peace.

3. Job elimination through technical innovation and speed-up. While the capitalists who own the railroads talk about technical innovations on the railroads as being great for the workers so far as reducing toil, and for efficiency in the "public" interest, the fact is that, under capitalism, the one and only reason for the investments in technical innovations is to maintain or increase profits at the expense of the workers. Thus workers lose jobs and the capitalists make more profits.

Look at how far this has gone in the last twenty years or so.

From 1950 to 1972 (the latest year for which complete figures in U. S. STATISTICAL ABSTRACT are available) the amount of ton-miles carried on the railroads increased from 591,550 millions to 782,598 millions, or an increase of 32.2% work done.

Now in the same amount of time the average number of workers decreased from 1,237,000 to 537,000, or a decrease of 56.6%.

Now, if one takes these figures together they show that in 1950 the workload was 477,000 ton-miles per year per worker. Whereas in 1972 this amounted to 973,000 ton-miles per year per worker. Thus in 1972 the workload was 204% of the 1950 workload per worker! Over one half the railroad jobs gone while production is up 32.2%. This is the kind of "working together" that the capitalists like.

4. Government grants and loans. The monopoly capitalist bank owners have allowed many of the U. S. railroads to fall into disrepair because they preferred to invest their railroad profits in more highly profitable, speculative enterprises such as coal fields, timberland, various industrial ventures and even gold mines, etc. Now, many of the U. S. railroads are nearly inoperable, especially in the heavily industrial East, and are declaring themselves "bankrupt". Using this cover of "bankruptcy" they can, (a) throw thousands of railway workers out of jobs during this economic crisis without having to pay any severance pay as normally required of a solvent road; (b) whip up enough hysteria about the possibility of job loss through railroads folding to demand that Congress turn literally billions of workers' tax dollars back over to the companies. The "working together" advocated by the railroad capitalist is for workers' money to line the pockets of the railway capitalists while thousands of workers are cut loose without any severance pay.

The mic crisis of the U. S. monopoly capitalist class deepens the capitalist owners of the U. S. railroads, who are the biggest and most voracious monopolist banks, will stop at nothing to dump the full burden of their economic crisis onto the railroad workers' backs so as to maintain their profits. In this effort they have the full backing of the capitalist government and both capitalist political parties.

The pipedreams of the railroad capitalists for "industrial peace" and "mutual benefit" are bound to fail. The preparations of the BRAC workers to strike are proof of this fact. The BRAC workers should be supported in their fight for higher wages and job security. Any attempts by the railroad capitalists and the government to suppress the struggle of the railroad workers by using anti-labor laws or any other method should be denounced by all sections of the workers and progressive people.

ECONOMIC CRISIS (cont. from p. 3)

"was factually or legally impossible for the actor to commit the crime, if the crime could have been committed, had the circumstances been as the actor believed them to be."

There are many other provisions in this piece of fascist legislation which can be used against trade unions and other democratic circles.

These different forms of government legislation are presently being used or are planned for use against the working class, particularly during this time of economic crisis. The intent of the capitalists is to prevent the workers from fighting against the effects of unemployment and inflation.

These two weapons--unemployment and inflation--are being used by the monopoly capitalist class in order to shift the burden of the economic crisis onto the backs of the workers. These weapons are not used arbitrarily according to the subjective whims of some capitalists, but are inherent in the monopoly capitalist system, and are used in periods of crisis in order to secure maximum profits for monopoly capitalists. It is absolutely essential that the workers use the trade unions to fight against unemployment, for job security and higher wages, against bad working condition. Furthermore, it is necessary for the unorganized workers to get organized into their defense organizations, and for all sections of the working class to make sure that none of their rights to fight capital, such as the right to strike or the right to organize, are legislated away or suppressed in any way. In the final analysis, in order to do away with the exploitation and increasing impoverishment, the capitalist system brings to the workers, the working class must have its own Marxist-Leninist Party and overthrow capital.

As Comrade Marx pointed out over 120 years ago in *Wages, Price and Profit*

These few hints will suffice to show that the very development of modern industry must progressively turn the scale in favour of the capitalist against the working man, and that consequently the general tendency of capitalistic production is not to raise, but to sink the average standard of wages, or to push the value of labour more or less to its minimum limit. Such being the tendency of things in this system, is this saying that the working class ought to renounce their resistance against the encroachments of capital, and abandon their attempts at making the best of the occasional chances for their temporary improvement? If they did, they would be degraded to one level mass of broken wretches past salvation. I think I have shown that their struggles for the standard of wages are incidents inseparable from the whole wages system, that in 99 cases out of 100 their efforts at raising wages are only efforts at maintaining the given value of labour, and that the necessity of debating their price with the capitalist is inherent in their condition of having to sell themselves as commodities. By cowardly giving way in their every-day conflict with capital, they would certainly disqualify themselves for the initiating of any larger movement.

At the same time, and quite apart from the general servitude involved in the wages system, the working class ought not to exaggerate to themselves the ultimate working of these every-day struggles. They ought not to forget that they are fighting with effects, but not with the causes of those effects; that they are retarding the downward movement, but not changing its direction; that they are applying palliatives, not curing the malady. They ought, therefore, not to be exclusively absorbed in these unavoidable guerilla fights incessantly springing up from the never-ceasing encroachments of capital or changes of the market. They ought to understand that, with all the miseries it imposes upon them, the present system simultaneously engenders the material conditions and the social forms necessary for an economical reconstruction of society. Instead of the conservative motto, "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work!" they ought to inscribe on their banner the revolutionary watchword, "Abolition of the wages system!"

Unavoidable Imperialist Economic Crisis

As early as 20 years ago, Chairman Mao had already foreseen the inevitability of the economic crisis of U.S. imperialism. He said: "The economic power of U.S. imperialism, which grew during World II, is confronted with unstable and daily shrinking domestic and foreign markets. The further shrinking of these markets will cause economic crises to break out." ("The Present Situation and Our Tasks," *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. IV, p. 172, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961.) This thesis of Chairman Mao's is of great significance as a guide to our analysis of the political and economic crisis of the present-day capitalist world, especially the two superpowers.

WHAT IS THE TROUBLE, AND WHO IS THE TROUBLE-MAKER IN THE EAST INDIAN COMMUNITY?

Dear Reader:

The East Indian Defence Committee is producing this pamphlet in two parts in order to clarify to the Canadian people and people of various immigrant communities the problems which the East Indian community is facing. For some time now, the capitalist media has carried racist and fascist propaganda against the East Indian community. The purpose of this propaganda is two-fold: To cause confusion on the problems facing the East Indian community and to prepare reactionary and racist public opinion against the East Indian community. The purpose of this two-part pamphlet is to clarify the issues and oppose the racist attacks on the East Indian community.

We have chosen the title: **WHAT IS THE TROUBLE AND WHO IS THE TROUBLE-MAKER IN THE EAST INDIAN COMMUNITY?** This title was chosen for one reason and one reason only — to show that the East Indian community is hardworking and if left alone there will be no problems in the community. We, as part and parcel of the Canadian people, are capable of looking after our own affairs. It is usually remarked by the media: *THERE IS "TROUBLE" IN THE EAST INDIAN COMMUNITY AGAIN.* Furthermore, they fascistically declare: *MARXIST-LENINISTS ARE THE "TROUBLE-MAKERS" IN THE EAST INDIAN COMMUNITY.* Through this two-part pamphlet, we will show that there is no "trouble" in the East Indian community. The trouble is with the Canadian government at various levels. It is the Canadian government which is in trouble and for this reason is causing trouble in the East Indian and other communities across Canada. Because it is the government at various levels which is causing trouble, it can be said squarely that it is the Canadian government at various levels and their hirelings who are the trouble-makers in the East Indian community. It is the Federal government and its agencies, like the immigration department and the police forces to the level of city mayors and local police forces, who are causing trouble in the East Indian community. It is they, the various levels of government, who are the real trouble-makers and it is they who must be opposed.

There was a lot of "trouble" in the East Indian community between 1908 and 1915. There had been a lot of "trouble" in the East Indian community up until 1968, when the Marxist-Leninists started organising in the East Indian community. We ask: If the Marxist-Leninists cause "trouble" and are the real "trouble-makers", then why was there trouble between 1908 and 1915; as there were no Marxist-Leninists in the East Indian community then? There are a hundred and one facts that prove that the Marxist-Leninists and genuine East Indian patriots are the unifiers and defenders of the East Indian community while the Canadian government, its agencies, plus the High Commissioner of India's office and its agencies are the real trouble-makers. No amount of fascist propaganda is going to cover-up the fact that the "Green Paper" singles out East Indians for attack or that the Canadian government has always treated our people as fourth-rate citizens and have opposed the immigration of East Indians to the extent of opposing our people bringing their relatives and at one time, in 1908, even conspiring to throw all East Indians out.

In the second part of our pamphlet, we will provide a detailed history of the treatment that the Canadian government has meted out to East Indians from 1902 to date. No amount of propaganda can white-wash the infamous episode when Hopkins, an RCMP functionary, hired Bela Singh, a traitor to the East Indian community to shoot and kill East Indians in the Sikh Temple in 1914. The killers were then let go, scott-free, and provided with enough money to flee the country. When Mewa Singh, an East Indian patriot witnessed all this and then punished Hopkins by killing him, he was cruelly and brutally assassinated by the government of this country. The same things are being repeated at this time. The government is buying out traitors who are attacking the Marxist-Leninists and progressive people while the courts, instead of charging these traitors to the East Indian community, are hurling all sorts of trumped-up charges against the victims. What happened on March 30th, April 20th and at other times in Vancouver cannot be covered up.

Traitors to the East Indian community are spreading the nonsense that Marxist-Leninists are trying to take over the Sikh Temple, a religious organisation, and are causing "trouble" there. The traitors were causing trouble in the Sikh Temple long before the Marxist-

Leninists ever participated in the affairs of the Sikh Temple. Secondly, even though Khalsa Diwan Society is the religious organisation, the traitors never hesitate to use it for their own political ends all the time. When Dave Barrett, Mrs. Gandhi etc. are invited to the Sikh Temple and presented as "leaders" of the community, is this using the Temple for religious purposes? When these traitors issue statements against Hardial Bains and the East Indian Defence Committee from the premises of the Sikh Temple, are they using the Sikh Temple for religious purposes? These traitors are carrying on fascist propaganda that Marxist-Leninists do not believe in "GOD", and for this reason they have no place in the community and its institutions. Is this not fascism against the Marxist-Leninists that they are being attacked on the basis of their views? Everyone has the right to hold whatever views they wish to hold. Our people have the right to believe in God or to not believe in God. These thekadars of "God" (meaning contractors of "God") are putting themselves in a position of dividing our community on this basis. This shows that they have become totally bankrupt and fascist. It is well-known that the East Indian Defence Committee is organised to oppose racist attacks. There are all sorts of people in it. There are Marxist-Leninists as well as religious people, workers, and intellectuals, also small businessmen and professionals. It is this Committee which also came forward to support a slate of candidates against another slate for the election of the Khalsa Diwan Society on January 19, 1975. It is this Committee which is in the fore-front of struggle against the splitting and dividing of the community by the agents of the government.

By raising the issue of "God", the traitors to the community are exposing themselves to be real anti-East Indian and agents of the government. While these traitors say they are the thekadars of "God", they also pretend that they are "communists", no less!!! Their 'communism' is the fascism of the Hitler, Mujibur Rehman and Shrimati Gandhi type. In their hysteria and self-exposure, they are running hither and thither whimpering: "We are also 'progressive' but it is the staunch opposition by Marxist-Leninists which has exposed our real ugly fascist features. They (the Marxist-Leninists) have forced us to become fascists." We ask: if you were patriotic and interested in the welfare of the community, how did the Marxist-Leninists turn you into the opposite direction? Everyone knows one thing for sure — the belief of these traitors in religion is a sham; the belief of these traitors in anything progressive is a sham. What is real in them is their anti-community and anti-people reactionary nature. That is what is real.

This real nature of theirs coincides with the interests of the various levels of government and it is for this reason that they are supported by the government while being resolutely opposed by the East Indian community. No doubt, there are people temporarily associated with them who are good but are confused. The East Indian Defence Committee will do everything to win over these people in due course of time.

The two-part pamphlet will deal with all the previously mentioned issues. **Part I** of the pamphlet will include the events which took place between March 9 and 30th, in terms of the support provided by the people for the activities of the East Indian Defence Committee. On March 9th, the East Indian Defence Committee asked Comrade Hardial Bains to address their general meeting and present the line and orientation for the work of the EIDC. Sardar Bela Thandi and Comrade Hardial Bains addressed a press conference as well as addressed the gathering (for the content of this meeting see the statement of the EIDC issued in Toronto on March 12, 1975 and printed in this pamphlet on page 6). The next day, Vancouver Province and Vancouver Sun both carried news-items claiming that Hardial Bains had given a call for the organising of "vigilantes" against the racists. The following day, various so-called "leaders" of the community denounced Hardial Bains for this call which had never been issued. The entire hysteria was well-orchestrated by the media, police and so-called "leaders" of the community. Between March 9th and 23rd, every reactionary howled against Hardial Bains and the EIDC. The High Commissioner of the Indian reactionary government to Canada made a special visit to Vancouver to assure the mayor and the traitors to the community of his support against Hardial Bains and EIDC. Reactionary radio shows blared day in and day out racist and anti-communist propaganda. Two Conservative M.P.'s called for the deportation of Hardial Bains. During all this

hullabaloo, of course, the windows of the EIDC office were smashed. The community was highly enraged and indignant at this reactionary attack on Hardial Bains and the EIDC. Canadian workers and other people voiced their opinions against the attacks on Hardial Bains and the EIDC. The EIDC again invited Hardial Bains to address a meeting on March 23rd, in Vancouver and provide a line and orientation against this propaganda (see the remarks made by Comrade Bains during this meeting printed on page 10). Soon afterwards, a mass rally was organised to carry out propaganda against the racist attacks on the East Indian community and to show that the East Indian people are Canadian people and all share weal and woe with one another. **Part I** of this pamphlet carries the proceedings of the meeting held in Vancouver March 30th, 1975 (see page 13) Included in this pamphlet is also a press communique released by the EIDC and Khalsa Diwan Society (elected on January 19, 1975 but not recognized by the traitors of the community) issued on April 6, 1975. The second part of the pamphlet will go into detail about the activities of the government at its various levels and their agents, against the East Indian community.

We thank all the people who have supported the struggle of the East Indian community against the racist attacks. We would like to emphasize in the end that racism as such is not the issue in Canada. The main problem in Canada is the U.S. imperialist domination of Canada and the capitalist system itself. So the task of the Canadian working class and people is to oppose U.S. imperialist domination and overthrow the capitalist system. We fully support this fundamental right of the people to do so and we are a part and parcel of this mighty contingent against U.S. imperialism and monopoly capitalism. U.S. imperialism and the monopoly capitalist class persecute us through racist attacks, a much more pernicious form of class exploitation and repression. Our contribution to the historic struggle against U.S. imperialist domination of Canada and against the monopoly capitalist class will be successful if we unite as one against racist attacks. The Canadian working class and people can fight the U.S. imperialists and the Canadian monopoly capitalist class if they continue opposing the shifting of the burden of the economic crisis onto their backs. If we oppose the racist attacks and the working people oppose the shifting of the burden of the economic crisis and together we support one another, only then will the militant and fighting unity of the people deepen and broaden to a higher scale. There are some individuals who are talking about racism as being the "issue" to divert the working people of Canada from opposing U.S. imperialism and the Canadian monopoly capitalist class. They present the nonsense that "all nationalism is reactionary" in order to split and divide the immigrant communities in their struggle against racist attacks. We are firmly opposed to these individuals.

The immigrant communities should close their ranks and fight as one against racist attacks. They should oppose the ultra-left clap-trap of "socialism will end racism" or "all nationalism is reactionary" or "racism is inherent in capitalism" which all amounts to liquidating the struggle against racist attacks. The unity of the East Indian community is being forged with the working people of this country while in the process of fighting racist attacks. It is this fight against the racist attacks which all immigrant communities and the native people should take up in all earnestness. While uniting to fight the racist attacks on the basis of uniting one's own community, we should also provide a helping hand to all others who are doing the same in their communities. Furthermore, we must unite firmly and closely with the entire working people who are fighting against U.S. imperialist domination of Canada and the monopoly capitalist system itself. This is the line of militant unity and solidarity of the East Indian Defence Committee and the Indian Workers Movement. We call upon all the working people to support this line.

In closing, we thank all our friends from all circles for their support for our struggle against racist attacks and we call upon them to continue supporting our struggle. East Indian Defence Committees are being organised all across Canada. The headquarters remain in Vancouver. Please write or phone us for any further information.

Yours, in the struggle against our common enemies
East Indian Defence Committee

Room 106, 335 West Pender
Vancouver, B.C.
Phone 688-7421

Statement Issued by East Indian Defence Committee March 12

continued from page 1

we will take the culprits to court". This clearly shows that the police do not want to protect the East Indian community. When the police fail to do something, then the family calls the so-called 'leaders' of the community. They usually give the line: "It must be your own fault" and "Further, even if it is not your fault, we cannot do very much about it except that you should have faith in the police and the government of this country". Meanwhile, racist attacks go on. Then the family contacts the East Indian Defence Committee. EIDC right away investigates the case, assigns duty to members to guard the place and fight back if any attacks take place during that period. Besides this, the EIDC calls upon the family to participate in self-defence, not to be afraid and to stand up and fight. This is the manner in which EIDC operates at this time and has operated in the past. If there is any court case, EIDC assists the family and looks after the proceedings.

3. During the press conference and after, the question was raised to seek out the racists and hit them hard. Comrade Bains explained that as far as EIDC is concerned, it will not participate in seeking out the racists at this time. The policy of EIDC is to encourage self-defence and fighting back. If some individuals seek out the racists and thrash them, that is their own policy and not the policy of the East Indian Defence Committee.

4. There is no antagonism between Canadians of East Indian origin and other Canadians. The problem is not one of "whites" attacking the "coloureds". The problem arises on account of the capitalist system, and racism is inherent in it. During the periods of crisis, the government and its bodies escalate attacks against the people and the worst hit are those who are national minorities. It was pointed out that this ruling class has always used racial discrimination against others, and the best example to illustrate this is that of the people of Quebec. Even though they are "white", the ruling class of this country has always discriminated against them. Comrade Bains gave the example of official propaganda which is used against our people. He said that the mayor of Vancouver has declared himself to be the enemy of the East Indian community. In doing so, he has become the enemy of the East Indian people. Comrade Bains explained that our community makes up less than 2% of the total populace in Vancouver. But whenever the mayor talks about the problems of the city of Vancouver, he singles out our people and blames them for the problems caused by the capitalist system itself. This shows the guilty conscience and sinister motive of the mayor.

5. As far as the fascist propaganda unleashed against the East Indian Defence Committee is concerned, that we advocate "Taking the law into our hands"—there can be further from the truth. On the contrary, it is the government and its agencies which is using arbitrary methods to persecute our people. Hundreds of examples can be given whereby perfectly legal visitors to this country from India have been arbitrarily deported, our people deprived of jobs and discriminated against in housing and education. In short, it is the government and its agencies which is taking "the law into its hands" against our people. What the East Indian Defence Committee advocates is the basic and inviolable right of all East Indian people and all Canadians to defend themselves against any threat to their person, property, family and community. This is not "taking the law into one's hands", this is defending ourselves in the face of the governmental and institutional attacks. And it is confounding right and wrong to suggest that those who are victims of racist attacks are the ones "taking the law into their hands".

6. As far as the East Indian Defence Committee is concerned, it is the responsibility of the police to defend our community. But neither the government, nor its institutions, nor the police is providing any protection. Nay more, they are the source of attack on our people. If the government and its institutions protects our people from racist attacks, then the East Indian Defence Committee will cease its activities on this front but **NOT UNTIL THAT TIME!** Here is a challenge to those who believe in the "law" to get the law working against the racists. We also believe in that law which protects our people and works against the racists, but we do not believe in the law which is responsible for attacks on our people. We will always oppose such a law.

7. Those "leaders" of the East Indian community who issued a statement denouncing Comrade Bains for defen-

ding the community are the creation of the government and its institutions. These individuals are bribed and are agents of our enemies in our community. One can only pity them to see their disgusting performance on radio and TV prostrating in front of the racists, begging mercy and promising them they will themselves oppose the East Indian people, will do their best to split the community and liquidate their anti-racist struggle. These people are like Thieu of Vietnam, and Lon Nol of Cambodia, and Indira Gandhi of India. For a few cents they have sold themselves and their people. We can only say this much to them: you will not go unpunished. You will certainly pay for your crimes. These individuals were just a few months ago deaying that racist attacks take place, and now they have compared the East Indian Defence Committee with the racists and equated the two. What treacherous activity against our people. These individuals cried hoarse on radio and TV that EIDC has no support amongst the people, then why are you moaning and groaning, beating your breast in order to serve the enemies of our community? But these claims are not the facts of life and prove the opposite, which is leading you into hysteria. You know very well that the East Indian Defence Committee is the only organisation with over 800 members in the Vancouver area alone and which has branches all across Canada.

The East Indian Defence Committee takes this opportunity to reiterate its firm resolve to mobilise our people against the attacks of the government and its institutions on our people and the racist attacks of their agents on our homes, property, children, old people and women.

We call upon all our people to fight ever so more vigorously against the racist attacks on our people!

We call upon all the Canadian people to support our struggle!

Racist attacks on our people will be defeated!

OUR PEOPLE WILL WIN!

After the March 9th meeting of the East Indian Defence Committee and after the fascist hysteria generated by the bourgeois press, the police and the reactionaries inside and outside the East Indian community, the East Indian Defence Committee organised two rallies on March 23rd and on March 30th to oppose the fascist hysteria and to mobilise further support against the racist attacks. Comrade Hardial Bains was the main speaker in both the rallies and vigorously led the programme on the two occasions. Hundreds of people (over 400 East Indians and 100 Canadians on March 23rd and over 800 East Indians and over 200 Canadians on March 30th) attended the two rallies and provided vigorous support against racist attacks on the East Indian community, against threats of deportation against Comrade Hardial Bains, and against the confusion being generated by the media. The two rallies brought the struggle of the East Indian people against the racist attacks to a new and a higher level.



LETTER FROM LOK AWAZ ON PAGE 19

Comrade Hardial S. Bains addressing the mass rally organised by the East Indian Defence Committee in Vancouver, BC on March 23, 1975.