

CHINA TODAY 7

From the Restoration of Capitalism to Social Imperialism in China

Part II: Social-Imperialist Foreign Policy

German edition May 1981, published by the Central Leadership of
Kommunistischer Arbeiterbund Deutschlands (KABD)
(Communist Workers' League of Germany)

English edition October 1987, published by the Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany

Publishing house: Neuer Weg Verlag und Druck GmbH, Germany

Improved English edition 2019 (part of quoted material translated from the
German replaced by English-language sources)

Contents

I. The Revisionists Have Abandoned the Socialist Foreign Policy of Mao Tsetung's China and Transformed It into a Social-Imperialist Foreign Policy

1. The "Proposal for a General Line" Defends the Principles of Socialist Foreign Policy
2. Mao Tsetung's China Supported the Socialist Countries, the International Labour Movement and the Oppressed Peoples
3. The Policy of Peaceful Coexistence and of Tactically Utilizing the Contradictions between the Imperialists Served the Security of China as the Bulwark of World Revolution
4. Criticism of Some Mistakes in China's Foreign Policy before Mao Tsetung's Death
5. The Counterrevolutionary Aims and Consequences of the Right-Wing "Three Worlds Theory" of Deng Xiaoping

The Economic Cooperation with the Imperialists Serves the Restoration of Capitalism in China and the Promotion of the Export of Goods and Capital

China's Counterrevolutionary Political and Military Cooperation with US Imperialism, Common Market and Japanese Imperialism

Chinese Social Imperialism – a Threat to World Peace

Promotion of the "Defense of the Fatherland" and Sabotage of the Liberation Struggles of the Oppressed Peoples

KBW Leadership Takes over the Policy of "Defense of the Fatherland"

II. Proletarian Internationalism and the Struggle against Revisionism and Liquidationism

1. The Development of Chinese Social Imperialism Sharpens the General Crisis of Capitalism
2. The Common Struggle of the International Working Class in Alliance with the National Liberation Movements Calls for Struggle against Revisionism and Liquidationism
3. For the Unity of the Revolutionary Forces on the Basis of the Teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao Tsetung

Appendix

Declaration of the Central Leadership of the KABD on the Chinese Revisionists' Show Trial against the So-called Gang of Four

Resolution of Protest of the Central Leadership of the KABD on January 21, 1981, to the Embassy of the Government of the People's Republic of China

Notes

I. The Revisionists Have Abandoned the Socialist Foreign Policy of Mao Tsetung's China and Transformed It into a Social-Imperialist Policy

1. The "Proposal for a General Line" Defends the Principles of Socialist Foreign Policy

The revisionists' seizure of power has led to a fundamental change in China's foreign policy, for a country's foreign policy is closely related to its home policy:

"One must not consider home policy and foreign policy as two separate issues. Home policy and foreign policy are two aspects of a dialectical unity in mutual relationship, at times one being the main aspect, at times the other." (1)

It was the historical merit of the Communist Party of China led by Mao Tsetung, in its "Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement" against the treason of the Khrushchev revisionists in 1963/64, to hold on to proletarian internationalism and to defend and put into practice the revolutionary principles of a socialist country's foreign policy. This was violently attacked and slandered by the modern revisionists.

After the proletariat in one country has victoriously overthrown the bourgeoisie and established its own rule, the dictatorship of the proletariat, a new stage of revolution begins. The proletariat and the Communist Party are faced with new and responsible tasks. After the victory of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, Stalin said:

"The victory of socialism in *one* country is not a self-sufficient task. The revolution which has been victorious in one country must regard itself not as a self-sufficient entity, but as an aid, as a means *for* hastening the victory of the proletariat in all countries. For the victory of the revolution in *one* country, in the present case Russia, is not only the product of the uneven development and progressive decay of imperialism; it is at the same time the beginning of and the pre-condition for the world revolution." (2)

In line with this basic thought of the socialist country backing up the proletarian world revolution, the "Proposal for a General Line" says:

"In our view, the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries should have the following content:
to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and co-operation among the countries in the socialist camp in accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism;
to strive for peaceful coexistence on the basis of the Five Principles with countries having different social systems and oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war; and
to support and assist the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations.
These three aspects are interrelated and indivisible, and not a single one can be omitted." (3)

Thus proletarian internationalism and peaceful co-existence are a dialectic unity and may not be separated from each other. The *basis* of socialist foreign policy, however, can never be peaceful co-existence – as the Khrushchev revisionists claimed, but must always be proletarian internationalism. Imperialism can be defeated and world revolution can be victorious only by the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the imperialist countries, in alliance with the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples.

The construction of socialism in one country is a favourable condition for the struggle of the international working class and the liberation struggle of the peoples. After the victory of revolution in several countries, the socialist system exists side by side with the imperialist system; therefore the imperialists will not surrender voluntarily. The struggle between the two systems can be solved only by the proletarian revolution. But as long as both systems exist side by side, the socialist country has to make compromises and, on the basis of peaceful co-

existence, establish relations with countries of different social systems – even with the imperialist countries – take advantage of the contradictions between the imperialists and advance the process of world revolution. Thus the Communist Party of a socialist country is faced with the following tasks:

“adhere to the Marxist-Leninist line and pursue correct Marxist-Leninist domestic and foreign policies;
consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and the worker-peasant alliance led by the proletariat and carry the socialist revolution forward to the end on the economic, political and ideological fronts;
promote the initiative and creativeness of the broad masses, carry out socialist construction in a planned way, develop production, improve the people’s livelihood and strengthen national defence;
strengthen the unity of the socialist camp on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and support other socialist countries on the basis of proletarian internationalism;
oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war, and defend world peace;
oppose the anti-Communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary policies of the reactionaries of all countries; and
help the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed classes and nations of the world.” (4)

These are the demands by which the Communist Party of every socialist country must be measured.

2. Mao Tsetung's China Supported the Socialist Countries, the International Labour Movement and the Oppressed Peoples

While the revisionists in the Soviet Union betrayed the principles of revolutionary foreign policy, the CP of China remained faithful to them up to Mao Tsetung's death. For the revolutionary workers' parties and the liberation movements, the "Proposal for a General Line" was an important guide in their revolutionary liberation struggle. On the basis of the "General Line", the revolutionaries of many countries resolutely fought with revisionism. It was also a very important foundation for the struggle which the KABD and its forerunners led against the revisionism of the degenerate CP of Germany (KPD) and the German Communist Party (DKP), which had been founded in 1968 with the tolerance of the West German bourgeoisie. (See *Revolutionärer Weg*, No. 19, in: W. Dickhut, *State-Monopoly Capitalism in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG)*, Vol. II, pp. 428 ff.) The guidelines issued by the 9th Congress of the CP of China in 1969 are in full accordance with the principles of this "General Line". Let us compare these guidelines of foreign policy with the revolutionary practice by quoting the representatives of several countries. The report to the 9th Congress says about the tasks in the field of proletarian internationalism:

"Today, it is not imperialism, revisionism and reaction but the proletariat and the revolutionary people of all countries that determine the destiny of the world. The genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties and organizations of various countries, which are composed of the advanced elements of the proletariat, are a new rising force with infinitely broad prospects. The Communist Party of China is determined to unite and fight together with them. We firmly support the Albanian people in their struggle against imperialism and revisionism...." (5)

At the 6th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania in 1971, E. Hoxha said about the fraternal help of the People's Republic of China for Albania:

(The development of Albania's economy) "is made much easier by the great, unsparing, and internationalist aid which the fraternal People's Republic of China is giving our country for this five-year-plan. This is a further tangible expression of that sincere and revolutionary friendship which links the Albanian people with the Chinese people, which unites our two Marxist-Leninist Parties. The Albanian people and their Party of Labour are profoundly grateful to the Chinese people, to the glorious Communist Party of China and to Chairman Mao Tsetung for the fraternal aid they are giving us for the construction of socialism, to make our socialist Fatherland prosperous and powerful." (6)

This statement made by E. Hoxha is a historical fact, even if he does not want to admit it today, as he has made a turnabout of 180 degrees, attacking Mao Tsetung Thought in a liquidationist manner and taking a revisionist point of view.

At the 9th Congress of the CP of China, it was stated on supporting the liberation struggle of the Indo-Chinese peoples:

"we firmly support the Vietnamese people in carrying their war of resistance against US aggression and for national salvation through to the end...." (7)

A joint communiqué of the party and government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the party and government of the People's Republic of China, issued on the occasion of a visit to Peking, says:

"In fulfilment of the behest of the venerated and beloved President Ho Chi Minh, the Delegation of the Vietnam Workers' Party and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam expressed sincere and heartfelt thanks to the venerated and beloved Chairman Mao Tsetung, the Communist Party of China and the Chinese Government and people for the support and assistance they had given with a full measure of brotherly love to the Vietnamese people, which were important contributions to the historic victory of the Vietnamese people's cause of resisting US aggression and saving the nation." (8)

The documents of the 9th Congress continue as follows:

“we firmly support the revolutionary struggles of the people of Laos, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, India, Palestine and other countries and regions in Asia, Africa and Latin America...” (9)

An example of the help and unselfish support of the Chinese people for the African peoples is the construction of the Tanzam Railway by the People’s Republic of China. This railway was built under extremely hard conditions and completed ahead of time in 1975. At a visit of government delegations of the two countries to Peking, the leader of the Tanzanian delegation, Habib Jamal, declared:

“that a protocol was concluded in 1967 between the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania in which the People’s Republic of China, at the request of the Zambian and Tanzanian Governments, agreed to assist in the construction of a railway linking Tanzania with Zambia, and at the same time provide Tanzania’s sister state Zambia with an unfettered outlet to the sea at the port of Dar-es-Salaam....

Your massive assistance to the cause of developing countries, while engaged in a much needed reconstruction at home, is a clear demonstration of the commitment of the Chinese people to international solidarity in the struggle for the construction of a just and peaceful world order in which imperialism, fascism and colonialism will have been banished for ever.” (10)

Led by Mao Tsetung, the People’s Republic of China resolutely supported the developing countries in their striving for independence of imperialism, especially of the two superpowers. In the UN it clearly sided with the developing countries and took party for their interests. In the struggle against the superpowers on the questions of maritime law and the prices of raw materials, the delegate of the People’s Republic of China upheld the interests of the developing countries and encouraged them to unite in their struggle against the superpowers. The People’s Republic of China itself granted foreign aid on favourable terms (see box on next page).

On behalf of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the head of state of Mali, Moussa Traore, said at a banquet on June 21, 1973:

“Who can understand better than China the aspirations of the developing countries? In fact, the past of the People’s Republic of China and the motives of her struggles have naturally created between her and the developing countries a current of understanding conducive to the development of co-operation and solidarity.

The effective aid given by China to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America in their struggle for independence, the respect for their sovereignty or their territorial integrity stems from this clear understanding of the aspirations of the developing countries.” (12)

Additionally, China continuously exposed the practices of the imperialists, especially the two superpowers – talking about peace and detente while stepping up the arms race – and it appealed to the peoples to be vigilant. It tore off the “socialist” cloak of Soviet social imperialism and uncovered its hegemonial plans. In front of the whole world, it denounced the genocidal war of US imperialism in Indochina. Every plot of the superpowers against the peoples of the developing countries was uncovered and exposed.

Although China, for tactical reasons, supported the union of several imperialist countries in the EEC in order to utilize their contradictions to the superpowers, it denounced, at the same time, the reactionary policy of these countries, such as the militarism and chauvinism of West German imperialism. On the occasion of the Soviet-German treaty in 1970, the Peoples Republic of China declared:

Eight Principles for China's Aid to Foreign Countries

1. The Chinese Government always bases itself on the principle of equality and mutual benefit in providing aid to other countries. It never regards such aid as a kind of unilateral alms but as something mutual.
2. In providing aid to other countries, the Chinese Government strictly respects the sovereignty of the recipient countries, and never attaches any conditions or asks for any privileges.
3. China provides economic aid in the form of interest-free or low-interest loans and extends the time limit for the repayment when necessary so as to lighten the burden of the recipient countries as far as possible.
4. In providing aid to other countries, the purpose of the Chinese Government is not to make the recipient countries dependent on China but to help them embark step by step on the road of self-reliance and independent economic development.
5. The Chinese Government tries its best to help the recipient countries build projects which require less investment while yielding quicker results, so that the recipient governments may increase their income and accumulate capital.
6. The Chinese Government provides the best-quality equipment and material of its own manufacture at international market prices. If the equipment and material provided by the Chinese Government are not up to the agreed specifications and quality, the Chinese Government undertakes to replace them.
7. In giving any particular technical assistance, the Chinese Government will see to it that the personnel of the recipient country fully master such technique.
8. The experts dispatched by China to help in construction in the recipient countries will have the same standard of living as the experts of the recipient country. The Chinese experts are not allowed to make any special demands or enjoy any special amenities. (11)

“The eradication of German militarism and Nazism is the basic demand of the people of the European countries after World War II and the fundamental principle stipulated in the Potsdam Agreement. But West German militarism and Nazism are quickly reviving under the wing of U.S. imperialism. At present, apart from having completely restored and expanded its industrial basis for munition production, West Germany is intensifying its preparations for illegal production of nuclear weapons. The federal troops of West Germany have become the backbone of the aggressive NATO bloc. The West German monopoly capitalist clique has never for a moment abandoned its revanchist policy of aggression and expansion. It is vainly trying to stage a comeback and revive Hitler’s fond dream of the ‘German Reich’ by way of becoming an ‘economic big power’, a ‘political big power’ and then a ‘military big power’.” (13)

In the “Polemic on the General Line”, the CP of China stated the principles concerning compromises of a socialist country with imperialist countries and on the struggle of the working class in these countries:

(Such a compromise) “does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions....” (14)

Accordingly, the report to the 9th Congress said:

“We firmly support the revolutionary struggles of the people of Japan and the West European and Oceanian countries; we firmly support the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries....” (15)

A particular support and encouragement for the revolutionary liberation fighters all over the world is Mao Tsetung’s declaration of May 20, 1970. Its importance and effect can hardly be esteemed highly enough, the more so as it was verified in a splendid way by the victory of the Indochinese peoples over US imperialism five years later. The declaration ends with the famous words:

“A weak nation can defeat a strong, a small nation can defeat a big. The people of a small country can certainly defeat aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, dare to take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country. This is a law of history.

People of the world, unite and defeat the US aggressors and all the running dogs!” (16)

3. The Policy of Peaceful Coexistence and of Tactically Utilizing the Contradictions between the Imperialists Served the Security of China as the Bulwark of World Revolution

A socialist country, as a matter of principle, strives for taking up and maintaining peaceful relations with as many countries as possible:

- because only in peacetime it can build up a powerful socialist state
- because only in peacetime the peoples of the world can live together and cooperate successfully
- because, as a socialist country, it has not and will never have any hegemonic claims towards any other country.

It is inherent to the system that socialist states can only pursue a peaceful foreign policy, whereas imperialism will always exercise aggressions and aims at destroying the socialist countries.

Accordingly, Mao Tsetung pointed out at the 8th Congress of the CP of China in 1956:

“We must endeavour 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.” (17)

And Lenin said:

“the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series

of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.” (18)

The policy of peaceful coexistence developed by China was based on the guidelines set up by Lenin and Stalin and contained the following five principles:

- mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty
- mutual non-aggression
- mutual non-interference in internal affairs
- equality and mutual advantage
- peaceful co-existence.

This peaceful coexistence can be forced upon the imperialists only by struggle and, in turn, serves to fight imperialist aggression and war policies. For years the big imperialist powers, with US imperialism at their head, had tried to isolate socialist China. The consistent peace policy of the People’s Republic of China, its determined advocacy of the interests of the peoples made this policy fail. In 1971, the People’s Republic of China was admitted to the UN and took up first diplomatic contacts with the United States.

China has been sharply attacked by the social imperialists and revisionists for this compromise with US imperialism. They said that the foreign policy towards Soviet Russia was warmongering and that China collaborated with US imperialism at the cost of the liberation struggle of the peoples. The latest attacks on this compromise by the PR of China are launched by E. Hoxha, the chairman of the Party of Labour of Albania. In his book, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, he stated:

“But how can a compromise with American imperialism or Soviet social imperialism be in the interest of socialism and the world revolution, when it is known that these two superpowers are the most ferocious enemies of the peoples and the revolution? Not only is this compromise not necessary, but, on the contrary, it endangers the interests of the revolution. To compromise, or to violate principles on problems of such importance, means to betray Marxism-Leninism.” (19)

Can and must there be, under no conditions, any compromise with the two superpowers, because they are the “most ferocious enemies of the peoples and the revolution”? Such criticism is hollow dogmatism which does not understand what Mao Tsetung said in accordance with Lenin. The report to the 10th Congress of the CP of China in 1973 states, after exposing the aggressive plans of the superpowers and supporting the liberation struggle of the peoples, the following about compromises:

“We should point out here that necessary compromises between revolutionary countries and imperialist countries must be distinguished from collusion and compromise between Soviet revisionism and US imperialism. Lenin put it well, ‘*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 compromise. One must learn to distinguish between a man who gave the bandits money and firearms in order to lessen the damage they can do and facilitate their capture and execution, and a man who gives bandits money and firearms in order to share in the loot.*’ (‘Left-Wing’ Communism, an Infantile Disorder)” (20)

After having heard the results of the 10th Congress, E. Hoxha made the following statements, which are quite opposite to his later frontal attacks on Mao Tsetung and Marxism-Leninism in his alleged diary *Reflections on China*:

“It seems to us that the 10th Congress speaks clearly about the foreign policy and the tasks of the Communist Party of China and correctly defines the great danger of the two imperialist superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, ‘the struggle against the two’, which want to ‘bite China and dominate the world and the peoples’, lays down that ‘proletarian internationalism must be strengthened and defended, unity with the proletariat, the peoples and the oppressed nations must be strengthened’, etc.” (21)

But let us look at the facts. We shall investigate a concrete example of the policy of the People’s Republic of China and then assess the compromises made.

Especially under attack was the establishment of relations with the USA, which began with inviting Nixon to Peking. In the Shanghai communiqué of February 28, 1972, which summarizes

the results of the visit, the USA acknowledge the government of the People's Republic of China as the legitimate representative of the Chinese people and consent to relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence. China, in turn, declares in the communiqué:

“The Chinese side stated that it firmly supports the struggles of all the oppressed people and nations for freedom and liberation and that the people of all countries have the right to choose their social systems according to their own wishes and the right to safeguard the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of their own countries and oppose foreign aggression, interference, control and subversion. All foreign troops should be withdrawn to their own countries. The Chinese side expressed its firm support to the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia in their efforts for the attainment of their goal and its firm support to the seven-point proposal of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam ... and to the Joint Declaration of the Summit Conference of the Indochinese Peoples.” (22)

The contents of these documents as well as the fact that Nixon visited China show the victory of Mao Tsetung's revolutionary foreign policy: US imperialism is *forced* to acknowledge the People's Republic of China, it *must* abandon its course of isolating China. It must grant the People's Republic of China its legitimate seat not only in the UN, but even in its Security Council. China takes up these relations in order to utilize the contradictions between the two superpowers. However, it keeps up determined support of the struggle for liberation of the peoples of Indochina and other countries.

Contrary to all slanders and attacks by the social imperialists and revisionists, the establishment of relations with US imperialism did not impede the support of liberation struggle, but, on the contrary, promoted it: At the same time Nixon was in China, the representatives of the People's Republic of China in the UN advocated the interests of the developing countries in the question of maritime rights and exposed the plots of social imperialism as well as US imperialism. Thus China, from the start, made use of its newly gained positions as tribunes for exposing the two superpowers. In a declaration of the foreign office of the People's Republic of China, dated March 10, 1972, the liberation struggle of the Vietnamese people is supported and US imperialism attacked:

“The current wanton bombings by US aircraft on Vietnamese territory only indicate that US imperialism is sinking ever more deeply and inextricably in the quagmire of its war of aggression and is putting up a death-bed struggle.

US imperialism must immediately stop its bombings and attacks on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the other Indochinese countries and stop all its acts of aggression against this area; the US Government must withdraw from Indochina the US and vassal troops totally, unconditionally and before a set terminal date and must cease to support the puppet cliques in the Indochinese countries so that the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia may settle their respective internal questions themselves free from foreign interference.” (23)

We can see that Chinese foreign policy under the leadership of Mao Tsetung was anything but collaboration with US imperialism at the cost of the peoples. It was the keystone of this policy to support the revolutionary struggle of the peoples according to the policy of proletarian internationalism. In addition, it was, however, correct and necessary to make compromises, even with US imperialism. This was necessary because the international political situation had changed. In the sixties, the revisionists had seized power and capitalism had been restored in the Soviet Union, and thus the Soviet Union had become a new imperialist superpower. The social imperialists feverishly made preparations of war, which mainly aimed at China. The CP of China realized this danger, prepared the people for it and skilfully utilized the contradictions between US imperialism and social imperialism in order to prevent them from jointly acting against China. At its 2nd Central Delegate Congress at the end of October, 1974, the KABD analysed the situation as follows:

“The irreconcilable contradiction between U.S. imperialism and socialist China has not disappeared. Nixon's visit to Peking stems from the predicament of the U.S.A., having to put an end to the Vietnam War because of the exigencies of domestic and foreign policy.... China knows what it has to expect of the imperialist superpowers. Currently, the threat posed by a

military adventure of social-imperialism is greater, and China is preparing to defend itself. The defense effort at home goes hand in glove with a foreign policy directed at preserving peace.” (24)

Five years later, E. Hoxha does not want to know anything about this. When he criticizes China’s assumption of diplomatic contacts with US imperialism, he tries to gloss over the fact that, after the Chinese revisionists had seized power, China’s foreign policy turned from proletarian to bourgeois. By doing so, he attempts to give his liquidationist attacks on Mao Tsetung Thought the necessary persuasive power.

“How right China’s tactics were at that time in its foreign policy towards U.S. imperialism was demonstrated by subsequent events. Since the opportunity for joint action of the superpowers against China had come to nothing, the social-imperialists shifted their foreign-policy activities first to Africa. In Angola, for the first time they made use of the method of military invasion with the help of Cuban mercenaries. Then they took advantage of the difficult situation of the military in Ethiopia, bringing military advisors and Cuban mercenaries as well as large quantities of weapons of every kind into the country in order to intervene in the conflict with Somalia and in the civil war in Eritrea against the liberation front. This deepened the contradictions particularly between the superpowers.” (25)

E. Hoxha lifts the rock only to drop it on his own feet. His dogmatic refusal of any compromise with US imperialism means nothing but underestimating and supporting Soviet social imperialism. This can be clearly shown by the attitude of the Party of Labour of Albania towards the Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea. The periodical *Albania Today*, published in Tirana, says:

(The benevolent attitude of US imperialism toward the People’s Republic of China) “is also shown by the fact that today the American government wants to put China, which attacked Vietnam, on the same level as Vietnam itself, *which, they claim, attacked Cambodia.*” (Emphasis by the ed.) (26)

4. Criticism of Some Mistakes in China’s Foreign Policy before Mao Tsetung’s Death

Up to Mao Tsetung’s death, China’s foreign policy was essentially in accordance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and it was a great support for the cause of proletarian world revolution. For this reason we defend it against liquidationist attacks. We must say, however, that several different mistakes were made. In some cases a concrete situation was not correctly assessed; other mistakes were fundamental ones. They were made especially in 1974 to 1976, when after Deng Xiaoping’s reinstatement a two-line struggle developed once again, which also affected foreign policy.

As the two-line struggle is the objective law of the development of inner-party contradictions, Mao Tsetung cannot be made responsible for its emergence. As a member of the Central Committee and particularly as its chairman he has, however, a joint responsibility for some mistakes.

One example of a concrete wrong assessment is the policy towards Iran and the Shah, who had been brought to power by a CIA coup in 1953 and who lived up to his reputation as a faithful agent of US imperialism until he was overthrown by the Iranian peoples.

Contrary to this, Zhou Enlai declared at a banquet in honour of the Shah in 1972:

“Under the leadership of His Imperial Majesty Pahlavi, the Shahanshah of Iran, the Government and people of Iran have made continuous efforts and achieved successes in safeguarding state sovereignty, protecting national resources, developing national culture and building their country. The Chinese Government and people sincerely wish you continuous new victories on your road of advance.” (27)

In *China Today 2* we stated:

“The international revolutionary proletariat must and will support the national movements in the developing countries which are objectively revolutionary in nature and aimed directly against imperialism, in particular against the superpowers; it will support the people’s struggle for social liberation in those developing countries which have reactionary regimes and are objectively the outposts of the imperialist powers.” (28)

The Shah was objectively an outpost of imperialism, and his “national struggle” was not directed against imperialism, but aimed only at getting more crumbs from the table of the imperialist rulers. This necessary distinction is also in accordance with the fundamental line which the CP of China under the leadership of Mao Tsetung had in this question. That is why it supported, for example, the social liberation struggle of the peoples against reactionary regimes in Thailand, Indonesia, Brazil, India, etc. This does not exclude diplomatic relations on the basis of a peaceful coexistence.

Fundamental mistakes were made especially in 1974 to 1976. In *China Today*, besides the fundamental discussion of the “three worlds theory”, we proved how Deng Xiaoping at the UN special meeting as early as April 1974 tried to transform the *tactical* conception of Mao Tsetung, which was correct at the time, into a right-wing opportunist *strategic* conception of the “three worlds”. Without mentioning the leading role of the working class and the sharpening class struggle in the imperialist countries, including the US and the USSR, he claimed that the peoples of the “third world” were “the *main force* combating colonialism, imperialism, and particularly the superpowers.... They constitute a *revolutionary motive force* propelling the wheel of world history.” (Emphasis by the ed.) (29) This Mao Tsetung had not said, for it contradicted Marxism-Leninism and also the “Polemic on the General Line”, whose 4th Commentary says:

“No one can deny that an extremely favourable revolutionary situation now exists in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Today the national liberation revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America are the most important forces dealing imperialism direct blows. The contradictions of the world are concentrated in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The centre of world contradictions, of world political struggles, is not fixed but shifts with changes in the international struggles and the revolutionary situation. We believe that, with the development of the contradiction and struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in Western Europe and North America, the momentous day of battle will arrive in these homes of capitalism and heartlands of imperialism. When that day comes, Western Europe and North America will undoubtedly become the centre of world political struggles, of world contradictions.” (30)

In the “Polemic” the term “most important forces” only means that these liberation movements are dealing the strongest blows to imperialism *in the present situation* (“today”) – in accordance with the experience that imperialism, since its emergence, has been effectively defeated at first not in its centres, the big industrial nations, but at its weakest spots. (31)

Saying that not the *workers of all countries* but the national *liberation movements as a whole* are the “revolutionary motive force” is, however, a grave betrayal of the international labour movement and an attempt to split the working class in the imperialist countries from the liberation movements in the developing countries.

A false position was also taken by Zhou Enlai in his report of the government to the 4th National People’s Congress at the beginning of 1975, in which he, too, spoke of the “third world” as the “main force in combating colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism”. (32)

Imperialism, however, can be destroyed only by the proletarian revolution with the working class as its leading force, in alliance with the oppressed peoples. Referring to the imperialist countries of Western Europe and Japan, Deng Xiaoping went on:

“The hegemonism and power politics of the two superpowers have also aroused strong dissatisfaction among the developed countries of the Second World. The struggles of these countries against superpower control, interference, intimidation, exploitation and shifting of economic crises are growing day by day. Their struggles also have a significant impact on the development of the international situation.” (33)

As a consequence, the “countries and peoples of the third world” are told to join with the countries tyrannized by the superpowers and with the peoples of the whole world. In this he not only denied the working class as the leading and main force in the struggle to overthrow imperialism, but

also falsified the nature of the contradictions between the various imperialist states of the so-called first and second world as well as between the oppressed nations and the imperialist countries of the so-called second world. Today, after the revisionists have seized power and the right-wing opportunist views have been systematized into the “three worlds theory” as a strategic conception, we know that Deng’s attempts at that time to enforce right-wing opportunist views were an expression of the developing two-line struggle within the CP of China. Even if the revisionists make the totally wrong assertion that the theory was by Mao Tsetung, they must, nevertheless, admit that in enforcing this line to transform China’s foreign policy, they also met with resistance.

“In our own country, there are persons who frantically oppose Chairman Mao’s theory of the three worlds. They are none other than Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao, Chiang Ching and Yao Wen-yuan, or the ‘gang of four’” (34)

It was without doubt correct tactics for China, in order to utilize the contradictions between the imperialists, to support the association of various imperialist Western European countries in the EEC and later EC in propaganda, diplomacy and trade relations. Utilizing such contradictions between imperialists is especially important as long as the working class in the imperialist countries is in the strategic defensive and as long as China was in growing danger of being attacked by the Soviet social-imperialists. It served the security of China as a bastion of the proletarian world revolution. Basically the CP of China saw the character of this imperialist alliance in the EC clearly as an instrument of exploitation and oppression, against which the working class in the state-monopoly countries of Western Europe must lead a determined struggle. Thus, for example, *Peking Review* 4/1972 says:

“The great revolutionary leader Lenin pointed out: **‘Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism.’** By stretching its hands out to all parts of the world in frenzied aggression and expansion as the self-appointed world gendarme, U.S. imperialism has placed a heavy load on its own back and seriously weakened itself financially and economically. In the meantime, Japan, West European countries, and other capitalist countries, by taking advantage of this, have swiftly restored and developed their strength. The profound change in the balance of forces between the United States and these countries has inevitably sharpened their contradictions and competition. In the past few years, social-imperialism has also been fiercely contending with U.S. imperialism for world hegemony. All this has posed the United States with its toughest postwar challenge.” (35)

It was, however, wrong later on to describe the EC and EEC in *Peking Review* as an alliance of the Western European countries for the defense of their independence. In 1973, at a visit of the French President Pompidou in China, Zhou Enlai even said that the EC was an alliance of the peoples – not the monopoly capitalists!

“We support all just struggles of the peoples of the world and support the people of European countries in uniting themselves to safeguard their sovereignty and independence. We are for the view that the cause of European unity, if it is carried out well, will contribute to the improvement of the situation in Europe and the whole world.” (36)

In contrast to that we stated in our “Declaration of Principles” which was passed by the First Central Delegate Congress of the KABD in 1972:

“German imperialism is joining more closely with the other imperialist countries on a European level and strengthening international capital involvement. The EEC, encompassing almost all of Western Europe, is growing more and more from a capitalist economic alliance to an imperialist bloc of the Western European monopoly bourgeoisies. This bloc, in which the West German imperialists are trying to maintain the lead above all against France, serves the monopoly capitalists in West Germany to expand and secure their spheres of influence and markets all over the world. The EEC is increasing its rivalry with US imperialism.

In the NATO the Western European and the US imperialists possess a military instrument for the oppression of the European and other peoples.” (37)

After Deng Xiaoping's speech, in which he appealed to the "third world" to unite with the imperialist countries of the so-called "second world", in February 1975 the economic and trade agreement of Lomé was made between nine EEC countries and 46 African, Caribbean and Pacific developing countries. It represented a milestone for the expansion of the imperialist countries united in the EEC. By this agreement they secured for themselves a big market, good investment possibilities for their export of capital, and raw material sources. Even if this agreement should have brought some improvements to the developing countries, as *Peking Review* writes, it nevertheless means falsifying the imperialist character of the economic relations between the EEC and the developing countries when in a commentary, "The Second World develops the economic relations to the Third World", in *Peking Review* it says:

"If the second and third world countries, on the basis of mutual respect for sovereignty and equality, persevere in 'dialogue' and develop their relations, this will benefit the worldwide struggle against superpower hegemonism." (38)

The core of the right-wing opportunist views concerning class struggle in the Western European countries, however, was to support opportunist organizations and parties which propagated the struggle for the defense of national independence against Soviet social imperialism and the "defense of the fatherland". In West Germany above all the KPD/ML and the so-called "KPD", which is now dissolved, gained support by receptions in Peking and publication of their line in *Peking Review*. Among others a statement of the KPD/ML was published in which the group declared social imperialism instead of West German imperialism to be the main enemy of the working class in our country:

"today 'the imperialist Soviet Union is the most dangerous enemy of all the German people'." (39)

Ernst Aust is the chairman of this organization, which today calls itself "KPD" and which after Mao Tsetung's death uncritically supported the liquidationist attacks of E. Hoxha on Mao Tsetung Thought. He stated in his speech in Kiel in 1975:

"Any war which should break out between the two superpowers and which the FRG should be dragged into would be for us as German working people an antifascist, anti-imperialist liberation struggle right from the beginning." (40)

An "anti-imperialist liberation struggle", in spite of West German imperialism being an imperialist great power itself, notorious for its particular aggressiveness. To the same effect the former, meanwhile dissolved "KPD":

"The idea of the just war of defense must be propagated...." (41)

The support of this line by the CP of China was a fundamental mistake, contradicting the principles of proletarian internationalism.

"Opportunism and social chauvinism have the same politico-ideological content – class collaboration instead of the class struggle, renunciation of revolutionary methods of struggle, helping one's 'own' government in its embarrassed situation, instead of taking advantage of these embarrassments so as to advance the revolution." (42)

Why was there no public debate after the deposition of Deng Xiaoping in April 1976 about his opportunist views on foreign policy? We can only assume the reason why. One must take into account that the campaign against "the Right deviationist wind" did not start until the beginning of 1976. Consequently, it was certainly correct in the struggle against Deng's revisionist line to concentrate first on his attacks against the basic line of Mao Tsetung for the continuation of class struggle in building socialism. This campaign could not be completed until Mao's death, so that it was an important test for the new leaders of the CP of China whether they would deepen or end it. There were strong forces within the Central Committee which even after Deng's dismissal resisted deepening the criticism of his revisionist line. One must regard, for example, that the 11th Central Committee's Secretariat, which was newly formed after Deng's rehabilitation, consists in its

majority of former members of the 10th Central Committee, that is, members who had already been elected to the Central Committee in 1973. It is in any case a fact that the lacking public criticism of right-wing opportunist views and mistakes in foreign policy before Mao's death later helped the revisionists to claim that Mao Tsetung was the originator of the "three worlds theory", even though they had no proof for this whatsoever.

5. The Counterrevolutionary Aims and Consequences of the Right-Wing Opportunist "Three Worlds Theory" of Deng Xiaoping

After Mao Tsetung's death and the second rehabilitation of Deng Xiaoping, right-wing opportunist views were systematized in the "three worlds theory" as a self-contained ideological-political line. This was a preparation for China's counterrevolutionary cooperation with the main imperialist countries.

In words, the struggle against the two superpowers went on, but this was only to deceive the Marxist-Leninists all over the world. The "three worlds theory" is in fundamental opposition to the four basic contradictions in the world, as analysed in the "Proposal for a General Line" and at the 9th and the 10th Congress of the CP of China. (See *China Today 2*, p. 19)

It denies class struggle, the leading role of the working class, and the proletarian revolution. It ignores the role of the socialist countries as bases of world revolution and is directed against the national and social liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. In *China Today 2* we thoroughly analysed the ideological-political content of this theory and proved that Deng Xiaoping was its originator and not Mao Tsetung. In the following, our main aim is to show its aims and consequences. By the restoration of capitalism in China the nature of the contradiction between China and the Soviet Union has changed. A second social imperialism independent of the Soviet Union has developed. In place of the contradiction between socialist China and the social-imperialist Soviet Union there is now fierce rivalry between the two social imperialists.

The new Chinese bourgeoisie dreams of conquering a place in the sun in the struggle for the redivision of the world. The pursuit of maximum profits forces them to economic, political and military expansion. China, however, is a developing country, poor in capital, and – up to now – has not had an offensive army because its socialist foreign policy was peaceful.

They run into further obstacles in their attempt to realize their expansionism. When capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union there was a world-wide economic boom, but today world economy is on the threshold of a world-wide crisis. This forms the material basis for a fierce struggle to redistribute the markets, resources and spheres of influence between the two superpowers, and for the suddenly increased danger of a third world war.

Unlike the Soviet Union the Chinese revisionists do not have the possibility of neocolonialist exploitation of other countries like the CMEA states. The decisive obstacles, however, are the class struggle of the Chinese working class under the leadership of the revolutionary cadres who were tempered in the Cultural Revolution against the new bourgeoisie, and the revolutionary struggle of the international working class and the oppressed peoples. The peoples of the world have learned in many struggles against imperialism to differ between words and deeds. The Chinese revisionists therefore set their stakes on a counterrevolutionary alliance with the Western imperialist countries and try to strengthen their influence among the developing countries under the banner of struggle against Soviet hegemonism:

“This calls for all peaceloving countries to strengthen, not to relax, their joint efforts to punish the Soviet aggressors by applying sanctions against the Soviet Union, pushing back its expansionist offensive and frustrating its global strategy.” (43)

The Economic Cooperation with the Imperialists Serves the Restoration of Capitalism in China and the Promotion of the Export of Goods and Capital

In his speech at a meeting of the activists of the Moscow organization of the CPSU, Stalin explained the two contrary lines of foreign policy:

“One thing or the other:

either we continue to pursue a revolutionary policy, rallying the proletarians and the oppressed of all countries around the working class of the U.S.S.R. – in which case international capital will do everything it can to hinder our advance;

or we renounce our revolutionary policy and agree to make a number of fundamental concessions to international capital – in which case international capital, no doubt, will not be averse to ‘assisting’ us in converting our socialist country into a ‘good’ bourgeois republic.” (44)

After the seizure of power by the revisionists, “international capital” soon adjusted to the restoration of capitalism in China, hoping to make maximum profits, to gain a big market and access to the rich raw materials in China. Naturally socialist China had maintained trade relations before, but under strict control of the state’s foreign trade monopoly.

With the help of numerous credits and huge projects from the imperialist countries, the revisionists hoped to accelerate the accumulation of capital and to create within a short time the economic and technological basis for a modern armaments industry. This sell-out to the Western imperialists derides the principle of self-reliance, which was esteemed highly under Mao Tsetung and inspired the Chinese working class to enormous construction achievements. Five years later the revisionists, however, had to admit:

“The planned scale of capital construction has proved to be beyond the nation’s economic and financial capabilities....” (45)

Many major projects were stopped or postponed, and the emphasis of economic development was shifted to light and export industry. It is the Chinese working population who have to pay for the profits of the Western bankers in form of interests and who have to provide the money to pay the suspended projects. It is mere hypocrisy when the revisionists assert that they are driven to these steps by concern for the standard of living of the working population.

“The country’s economic situation is excellent. This is only one side of the picture. On the other side, there is a hidden danger in the economy, that is, the big financial deficit, over-issuance of currency and rising prices. If resolute measures are not taken to cope with this, both the peasants and workers will lose the economic benefits gained since the Third Plenary Session of the 11th Party Central Committee held in December 1978 and the situation that is turning for the better with each passing day will suffer another setback.” (46)

What are the real reasons for these measures?

1. The rise in prices, caused to a great part by the national debt, sharpens the contradiction between the new bourgeoisie and the working class.
2. The revisionists hope for more short-term profits by accelerating the development of light and textile industry. Apart from this they have to expand export in order to accelerate the accumulation of capital. Although in 1980 mechanical engineering took a greater share, the stress lies on light and textile industry.

“Light and textile industries need less investment, a shorter period of construction and less energy, but yield higher profits and earn more foreign exchange; they are the key sectors which should receive more investment and use more foreign funds. Top priority should be given to those enterprises that produce goods for export.” (47)

Meanwhile the new bourgeoisie tries to advance on the world market in many branches of economy. Thus the city of Shanghai exported complete plants.

“By the end of May (1980), export agreements had been signed with merchants from the US, from Canada, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia and other countries.” (48)

Another means of accelerating capital accumulation are the already mentioned “joint ventures”. So far they are concentrated on

“mainly the branches light industry, textile and electronic industry as well as engineering and hotels.” (49)

In order to obtain maximum profits, the new bourgeoisie plans to mine China’s rich raw materials with the participation of foreign capital.

“In the energy industry, we should make the fullest use of our rich coal resources, exploit them in co-operation with other countries and conclude long-term export contracts.” (50)

At the same time the joint ventures serve to promote capital export. Thus it says in the law on “joint ventures with Chinese and foreign investment participation”:

“A joint venture is encouraged to market its products outside China... Its products may also be distributed on the Chinese market. *Wherever necessary, a joint venture may set up affiliated agencies outside China.*” (Emphasis by the ed.) (51)

In 1980 the “Bank of China” and “China Resources & Co.” together with the “First National Bank of Chicago” and the “Industrial Bank of Japan” founded a consortium for the promotion of capital export.

“This society will be mainly in charge of promoting trade and investments in the Pacific region, China, Japan and the US. Its bank affairs will *at first concentrate on the Pacific region and later on be extended to other parts of the world.*” (Emphasis by the ed.) (52)

With this state-promoted capital export, China intends above all to widen its markets and its spheres of influence abroad, founded on its own rich raw materials and its large and relatively cheap labour force. At the same time the new bourgeoisie hopes to further its export by this means and especially to expand into the developing countries more and more. This is supported by their global definition of the “third world” as the “main force in the struggle against imperialism, especially the two superpowers”. By taking advantage of the great authority of the People’s Republic of China in the developing countries, which is based on its unselfish help during the time of Mao Tsetung, the revisionists must try to get into the big business of neo-colonialism. The collaboration with Western imperialists serves as a political and military flank for this social imperialist expansion.

“That is the revisionist road: from the restoration of capitalist exploitation in their own country to the economic penetration of other countries, including military aggression.” (53)

China’s Counterrevolutionary Political and Military Collaboration with US, Common Market, and Japanese Imperialism

Lenin stated, “Politics is the most concentrated expression of economy”. As a consequence of the restoration of capitalism and on the basis of the economic cooperation with the Western imperialists, China has also developed its political and military collaboration with them. Previously it was necessary to make tactical use of the contradictions between US imperialism, EC imperialism and Soviet social imperialism; but now this policy has been transformed into a counterrevolutionary collaboration.

At a press conference in Bangkok, Prime Minister Zhao Ziyang said:

“China will never become a superpower and will never seek expansion abroad.” (54)

Even if China will not become a superpower today or within the next few years, this statement nevertheless serves to cover up the aggressive aims of the new Chinese social imperialism, whose motive force is the striving for maximum profits. The struggle against Soviet hegemonism serves as an argument for the counterrevolutionary alliance with the Western imperialists.

“In reality neither the United States nor Western Europe by itself has the ability to meet the Soviet global menace. It is in the interest of both to contain Soviet expansion, so that they must adopt a common strategy and coordinate action.” (55)

“Normalizing Sino-US relations and developing cooperation are not measures of expediency for both China and the United States, but result from an overall assessment of the world situation and from a long-term political and strategic point of view.” (56)

In order to mask the imperialist character of this temporary alliance in front of the Chinese people, the Marxist-Leninists and the peoples of the world, the Deng Xiaoping clique does not shrink back from denying the imperialist character of the USA, the EC and Japan and calling their aggressive goals “peace policy”, “recovery of rightful positions”, and things like that.

“One of the superpowers has been trying to maintain the status quo through tactics of ‘peace’, and the other, to intensify the upheavals and to fish in troubled waters.... Over the years, Washington has put forth a variety of peace proposals to solve the Middle East question.” (57)

“This has opened up broader vistas for Western Europe ‘to recover its rightful position in world affairs’.” (58)

A particular excess is a complaint of *Beijing Review* about the anti-Chinese views of Reagan’s former counselor for foreign affairs, R. Cline:

“this scholar-turned-politician has become so overbearing and prejudiced that he sounds *as if an old-line imperialist has been resuscitated* to lecture the present-day public.” (Emphasis by the ed.) (59)

Obviously this imperialism must, in general, have become reasonable, having realized that Soviet hegemonism cannot be met without collaboration with China. What difference is there between the present Chinese revisionists and Khrushchev, who maintained that in the US a “reasonable” group with a clear and sober view of reality had come forward and who, for example, attested the former US President Eisenhower that he “also worries about ensuring peace just as we do”? (60)

However, the propaganda about the “peace power US” stands in contradiction to the call for and support of further accelerated rearmament:

“The Carter administration had started off pushing for nuclear strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union and putting the building up of its nuclear forces on the back-burner, with the mistaken idea that Moscow would slow down its efforts to swell its nuclear arsenal. The US killed research and manufacture of the B1 strategic bomber, held back research and development of its MX mobile intercontinental guided missile and production of the neutron bomb.” (61)

Meanwhile the Chinese revisionists can forget their worry:

“The United States has accordingly increased its 1980 defence budget.” (62)

In order to reestablish for Western Europe the “rightful position in world affairs”, they also support without restriction the growing political and military offensive of the “third power policy” under the leadership of the West German and French imperialists.

“To enlarge their nuclear arsenal the French have pushed their neutron bomb experiment with determination. Britain has decided to renovate its nuclear missile submarine force and the ceiling is being lifted on West German naval armaments. But Western Europe cannot, in the short run, develop enough military clout to do without the United States.” (63)

For the Western imperialists, especially for US imperialism, China has thus become an important reserve and advantage in the conflict with Soviet social imperialism. The Chinese revisionists in turn hope to gain a stronger position in the struggle against their present main rival and the aid of the Western imperialists for the “modernization” of their army.

At the 10th Party Congress in 1973, Zhou Enlai had stated in the report of the Central Committee:

“China is an attractive piece of meat coveted by all. But this piece of meat is very tough, and for years no one has been able to bite into it.... We must uphold Chairman Mao’s teachings that we should *‘be prepared against war, be prepared against natural disasters, and do everything for the people’* and should *‘dig tunnels deep, store grain everywhere, and never seek hegemony’*, maintain high vigilance and be fully prepared against any war of aggression that imperialism may launch and particularly against surprise attack on our country by Soviet revisionist social imperialism.” (64)

The Chinese people’s army was in no way too weak to defend China against any potential aggressor, because it had the support of millions of the working population organized in the people’s militia. Why else have the Soviet social imperialists not yet dared to attack China? In spite of this, China’s new rulers are dissatisfied with the state of their army:

“As regards China’s military strength, it is relatively backward in its equipment.” (65)

And the Chinese bourgeoisie knows very well what it is talking about: When at Deng’s orders parts of the army attacked the territory of Vietnam, it proved to be very unqualified for such an act of aggression. What the new bourgeoisie complains of is the lacking capability of this army to attack other countries and to provide the military means for realizing their expansive desires.

At the end of May 1980, the US gave their approval to permit the export of anti-ballistic missiles, helicopters, electronics and computers. In June 1980 “additional contacts between the defence establishments of the two countries” were agreed upon. (66)

Chinese Social Imperialism – a Threat to World Peace

Deng Xiaoping and his consorts talk a lot about the struggle against the threat of a third world war and about Soviet hegemonism and present themselves as a power for the defense of world peace.

“The people of China and the people of the rest of the world firmly demand peace and oppose a new world war. Faced with the gigantic task of speeding up our socialist construction and modernizing our agriculture, industry, national defence and science and technology, we in China urgently need a long period of peace. Like us, most countries in the world are against war.” (67)

It is a fact that in the last year, after the Soviet invasion in Afghanistan and the aggression of US imperialism against the Iranian peoples, the danger of a third world war has increased suddenly. The material basis for this is the development towards an overall international economic crisis and, as a consequence, the enormously increasing imperialist competition.

In the first place, the rivalry between the two superpowers for world domination is the source of this increasing threat of war. The so-called peace proposals made by Brezhnev at the 26th Congress of the CPSU cannot distract from this fact. US imperialism has started an offensive under the slogan “struggle against international terrorism” in order to regain the initiative in the struggle for the redivision of the world. The superpowers are systematically making preparation for military conflicts to defend and expand their spheres of influence. The threat of World War III is heightened by the development of the third power policy of the EC under the leadership of West German and French imperialism.

Socialist China under the leadership of Mao Tsetung was a bastion for the defense of world peace, because, first of all, it practiced proletarian internationalism.

Skilfully making use of the contradictions between the imperialists and combining the policy of peaceful coexistence with the struggle for the general prohibition and complete abolition of nuclear weapons, China also unmasked the fraud of détente and disarmament.

But can world peace be defended when today the Chinese leadership relies on US imperialism, the EC and Japan and even supports their aggressive aims?

“Normalizing Sino-U.S. relations and developing cooperation are not measures of expediency for both China and the United States ... but are beneficial to peace and stability in Asia and the world as a whole.” (68)

In the “Proposal for a General Line”, the CP of China under the leadership of Mao Tsetung condemned such ideas in principle:

“The people of the world universally demand the prevention of a new world war. And it is possible to prevent a new world war.

The question then is, what is the way to secure world peace? According to the Leninist viewpoint, world peace can be won only by the struggles of the people in all countries and not by begging the imperialists for it. . . . Any policy to the contrary definitely will not lead to world peace but will only encourage the ambitions of the imperialists and increase the danger of world war.” (69)

The truth is that the new Chinese bourgeoisie is not at all concerned about the defense of world peace. Since China’s economic and military potential is still too weak to allow her to wage a third world war on her own, she calculates on taking part in it side by side with US imperialism. By weakening her imperialist rivals, especially Soviet social imperialism, she hopes for a place in the sun when the world is redivided by new mass slaughters. This is why even today China openly incites military actions of US imperialism against Soviet social imperialism.

“In the United States voices are growing louder for political and military countermeasures to cope with the ‘iron encirclement’ from the north.” (70)

“The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan gravely threatens the oil-producing Gulf area and the Indian Ocean oil routes and cannot but arouse opposition from the United States, Western Europe and other countries concerned.” (71)

After the Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea, carried out at the order of Soviet social imperialism, the Chinese attack on Vietnam showed the aggressiveness of the clique around Deng Xiaoping. The Chinese social imperialists, like all imperialists, will not shrink back from at least making the attempt to realize their aggressive aims on the backs of the proletariat and oppressed peoples of the whole world.

Promotion of the “Defense of the Fatherland” and Sabotage of the Liberation Struggle of the Oppressed Peoples

In the documents of the 10th Congress of the CP of China, the following is said about the threat of a third world war:

“The danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today.”

It will be possible to prevent such a war, so long as the peoples, who are becoming more and more awakened, keep the orientation clearly in sight, heighten their vigilance, strengthen unity and persevere in struggle. Should the imperialists be bent on unleashing such a war, it will inevitably give rise to greater revolutions on a worldwide scale and hasten their doom.” (72)

The Chinese revisionists have betrayed the proletarian revolution and dream of taking part in the struggle for the redivision of the world side by side with the US imperialists. Therefore in the “three worlds theory” they openly appeal to the working class in the Western European countries, as an alternative to the struggle for revolution, to follow the social-chauvinist policy of “defense of the fatherland” in the struggle against Soviet hegemonism.

“... provided a country, developed or otherwise, becomes a victim of invasion and annexation by an imperialist power, the national war it wages against such invasion and annexation is a just war and ought to enjoy the support and assistance of the international proletariat. . . . In present-day Europe, national wars against large-scale aggression, enslavement and slaughter by a superpower are not only possible and probable; they are inevitable, progressive and revolutionary.” (73)

This fundamentally contradicts Marxism-Leninism. Lenin stated in his work, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*:

“The character of the war (whether it is reactionary or revolutionary) does not depend on who the attacker was, or in whose country the ‘enemy’ is stationed; it depends on *what class* is waging the war, and on what politics this war is a continuation of. If the war is a reactionary, imperialist war, that is, if it is being waged by two world groups of the imperialist, rapacious, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie, then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the *world proletarian revolution* as the *only* escape from the horrors of a world slaughter.” (74)

In particular, on the slogan “defense of the fatherland” by the proletariat in such a war he writes:

“In short: a war *between* imperialist Great Powers (i.e., powers that oppress a whole number of nations and enmesh them in dependence on finance capital, etc.), or *in alliance* with the Great Powers, is an imperialist war. ... in *this* war ‘defence of the fatherland’ is a deception, an attempt to justify the war.” (75)

That is clear indeed. In order to deceive the Marxist-Leninists all over the world, the revisionists falsify the character of World War II by denying its two stages and by describing it as an anti-fascist war for the defense of national independence from the beginning and by propagating it as an example of “defense of the fatherland” in a third world war.

“When the war of aggression finally broke out, the working class in all lands played an active part in defending national independence and combating fascism and heroically contributed to the victory in the war.” (76)

What, however, did Mao Tsetung say after this war had broken out in September, 1939?

“On whichever side, the Anglo-French or the German, the war that has just broken out is an unjust, predatory and imperialist war. The Communist Parties and the people of all countries should rise up against it and expose the imperialist character of both belligerents, for this imperialist war brings only harm and no benefit whatever to the people of the world....” (77)

Only with the attack of German imperialism on the socialist Soviet Union did the character of the war change, and so Mao Tsetung is perfectly right in writing in 1941:

“On June 22 the fascist rulers of Germany attacked the Soviet Union. This is a perfidious crime of aggression not only against the Soviet Union but against the freedom and independence of all nations. The Soviet Union’s sacred war of resistance against fascist aggression is being waged not only in its own defence but in defence of all the nations struggling to liberate themselves from fascist enslavement.

For Communists throughout the world the task now is to mobilize the people of all countries and organize an international united front to fight fascism and defend the Soviet Union, defend China, and defend the freedom and independence of all nations. In the present period, every effort must be concentrated on combating fascist enslavement.” (78)

Both comments are fully in accordance with the politics of the Communist International. They are no contradiction, but a unity.

There is no doubt about the imperialist character of the war in case of a direct confrontation of the superpowers or a Soviet Union attack on Western Europe. When the Chinese revisionists propagate the “defense of the fatherland” in this war and falsify history, this only serves their social-imperialist aims.

Various organisations in Western Europe which, in the past, adopted the “three worlds theory” but considered the “defense of the fatherland” an incorrect and rightist interpretation of the “three worlds theory” will have to make up their minds as the danger of war grows: *Either* they practice principled self-criticism and condemn the “three worlds theory as a strategic conception” *or* they will inevitably develop into an agency of China’s social-imperialist foreign policy with all its anti-proletarian consequences.

Just as the revisionists, in the interest of their social-imperialist aims, do not shrink back from propagating the “defense of the fatherland” in an imperialist war, they have also betrayed the oppressed peoples’ liberation struggles, although they hold that the “third world” is the main power in the fight against imperialism, especially the two superpowers. We have stated in our theoretical organ, *Revolutionärer Weg*, No. 19:

The competition between the monopolies reflects in the power struggle between the various factions of the puppets.

This has repercussions all the way into the state apparatus of oppression, as the many different military coups in developing countries show. Since the puppets of the imperialists often are entirely unable to rely on a social basis in the people and instead base their power solely on their apparatus of suppression and its bloody terror, the intensification of the struggle of the imperialists over raw materials, markets and capital investments in the developing countries is accompanied by the undermining of this apparatus of suppression, its division into various factions – the U.S., Soviet, German, Japanese...

That creates favorable conditions for revolution in the developing countries.” (79)

In complete contrast to such a Marxist-Leninist assessment, the Chinese revisionists totally subordinate their statements on the liberation movements to their imperialist rivalry with the Soviet Union and their alliance with US imperialism. It does not matter anymore whether the liberation movements are objectively revolutionary, directed against imperialism, or reactionary, only aiming to strengthen the influence of US imperialism. We will confine ourselves to prove this with some examples.

When the Shah was overthrown in Iran, US imperialism lost its most important implement for enforcing its interests in the Middle East. Using all means, US imperialism is trying, in fierce rivalry with Soviet social imperialism, to get this country under its control again. The Chinese revisionists write about the heroic struggle of the Iranian peoples to overthrow the Shah, a struggle which did not spare any victims:

“The long-time unrest has created serious economic difficulties for Iran.” (80)

It was clear that the overthrow of the Shah was directly levelled at the interests of US imperialism. But instead of supporting the liberation struggle of the Iranian peoples and instead of calling to be on the alert against the various tactics of US imperialism, *Beijing Review* states:

“This worsening of US-Iranian relations has caused deep concern among various countries in the world.... If this state of affairs intensifies, US-Iranian relations will worsen. This, obviously, would not be in the interests of either the United States or Iran.” (81)

“Beware of Soviet attempt to exploit U.S.-Iranian crisis.” (82)

What does that mean other than sabotage of the liberation struggle of the Iranian peoples?

The matter is similar in *Turkey*, where the peoples rose up against imperialist exploitation and fascist terror. After the military coup and the establishment of a military dictatorship with direct support from NATO, *Beijing Review* avoided to comment the situation in Turkey. Before that you could read in *Beijing Review* No. 19/1980:

“Troubles in both Turkey and Iraq are also Soviet-inspired.” (83)

In this sense China also unconditionally supports reactionary forces in *Afghanistan* which collaborate with US imperialism and are not interested in the independence of the country, but only want to replace Soviet social-imperialist occupation by dependency on US imperialism. The rearmament of reactionary regimes which are outposts of the Western imperialists, for example *Saudi Arabia*, is supported.

“To safeguard their own security, some Arab countries took steps to improve defense capabilities. Saudi Arabia and several other Arab countries have talked about establishing a system of regional defense.” (84)

A special example is El Salvador, a focus of imperialist rivalry and the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. Chinese revisionism is even exposed by the way *Beijing Review* uses language. Liberation fighters become “anti-government forces”. As the paper cannot help stating the rivalry between the SU and the USA, while forgetting the influence of the third-power policy of the EC expressed by the “Socialist International”, *Beijing Review* turns into a mouthpiece of the US imperialists by taking over their arguments for a broader support of the military dictatorship dependent on them.

“A few weeks ago, U.S. newspapers and government spokesmen began telling the world about the Soviet Union, Cuba, Viet Nam and some other countries channelling arms to the anti-government guerillas in El Salvador. The disclosures were accompanied by a world-wide propaganda campaign listing acts of Soviet interference in El Salvador.... The United States simultaneously announced that it was resuming military aid to El Salvador as part of the new U.S. foreign policy.... The U.S. government declared it would go on supporting El Salvador’s economic and political reforms while continuing to condemn ‘Right-inspired violence’ and the ‘terrorist activities’ of the Left. In addition, more economic aid, worth nearly \$100 million, is promised to shore up the tattered Salvadorian economy.” (85)

KBW Leadership Takes Over the Policy of “Defense of the Fatherland”

After the student “Communist Party of Germany” (“KPD”) had been dissolved, the Communist League of West Germany (KBW) became the main representative of the Chinese revisionists’ policy in West Germany. After the petty-bourgeois leadership admitted their failure in practice as a result of a left-wing sectarian policy pursued for years, especially when trying to gain influence in the working class, and as a result of a double split of the KBW, they are now propagating “the main side is theory” and unconditionally supporting Deng Xiaoping’s revisionist line. This is the road many liquidationist circles are taking. The core of this policy is, besides supporting the liquidationist attacks on the Cultural Revolution and Mao Tsetung Thought, the adoption of the social-chauvinist policy of “defense of the fatherland” – a consequence of the “three worlds theory” and precondition for being recognized and supported by the Chinese revisionists. It is true that in 1975 the KBW held the view that the “world is divided into three parts”, but in the dispute with the fatherland defenders of the “KPD” and KPD/ML they rejected the “defense of the fatherland” in a war of the Western imperialists against the Soviet Union, which was advocated by Deng and his supporters. In 1978, the KABD wrote in *Rote Fahne* about the development of the KBW:

“The leadership of the KBW is a supporter of the ‘three worlds theory’ in a special way. The speech of their chairman, Schmierer, published in September, re-emphasized this ‘specialty’. The point is, in short, that following this theory will not be without consequence for the political line in our country. And this logical consequence means ‘defense of the fatherland’, which, however, the KBW leadership doesn’t want to admit. Continually trying to patch up this contradiction is a hopeless attempt. In the end, there will be only two possibilities: Either turn your back to the ‘three worlds theory’ or take over all its consequences. There is no such thing as the golden mean. Marxism-Leninism cannot be reconciled with opportunism.” (86)

On the background of the basic discussion within the German Marxist-Leninist movement in the mid-1970s and the fact that at that time the leadership and members of the KBW took a correct stand concerning the “defense of the fatherland”, the leadership of this organization today must proceed step by step in order to bring the line of “defense of the fatherland” through to their members.

As a first step, Schmierer declared in December 1980, after the second split of the KBW, that the “defense of the fatherland” must be rejected in a war between the two superpowers for the domination of Europe, but that it was too early to say anything about the concrete character of a coming war and the position of the working class and the communists in it.

“As it looks at the moment, this war will begin as a war of the two superpowers for the domination of Europe, and it will be correct to apply the tactics of revolutionary defeatism.... We cannot come to any unity concerning the tactical position of the working class towards the

actual war which will take place as long as the answer can be based only on possibilities and probabilities but not yet on facts.” (87)

This was connected with the following totally unfounded statement: “*Even with the monopolies in rule, the enemy from outside can become the main enemy of the people’s sovereignty.*” (88)

Take heed – here it is assumed that West German monopoly capital exercises state power, but that, nevertheless, the “enemy from outside” can become the “main enemy”. It is obvious that Schmierer avoided to prove and concretize this, because in making such a statement he revised the Marxist-Leninist principle that the definition of the main contradiction and the main enemy cannot be separated from the question which class exercises economic and political power in a state.

As late as September, 1980, the secretariat of the CC of the KBW declared:

“If it should come to a war between West German imperialism and one of the two superpowers it remains the task of the proletariat to create conditions for the seizure of political power by means of struggle against the imperialist war and with the aid of revolutionary defeatism. Basically, this task does not change if the war should start with an invasion on the part of the superpower.” (89)

The next step was then taken in 1981, having been prepared by several articles in the central organ, in the April edition of the theoretical organ of the KBW, *Kommunismus und Klassenkampf* (Communism and Class Struggle):

“The next delegate conference of the KBW will have to take first measures in systematically examining the program of the KBW. Aim and purpose of this examination cannot be to change or improve the program in one or the other detail. Instead, the results of this examination, including the controversial issues, must be summarized in a resolution or report and submitted to open debate, in order to take up once again, after eight years, a broader debate on programmatic issues among the Communists.” (90)

The article goes into numerous fundamental points of criticism on the petty-bourgeois line of the program, which have been expressed inside and outside the KBW, in order to make the impression of a “democratic debate”. But the heart of the new discussion of the program is the attack on Mao Tsetung Thought and the further orientation of the KBW on “defense of the fatherland”. For example, the article says:

“The guidelines for the struggle against imperialist war are underdeveloped in the program of the KBW, and, as far as they are developed, they make allowance for the opinion that even in the struggle against imperialist war, West German imperialism must always be the main enemy.” (91)

To play down West German imperialism is a necessary precondition for openly propagating the “defense of the fatherland”. Thus Schmierer claims in this article that today the monopoly bourgeoisie of the FRG is still mainly dependent on US imperialism.

“In my opinion, the FRG is neither an oppressor *nation* nor an oppressed *nation*, but rather a state of the ruling monopoly bourgeoisie which is dependent on US imperialism, and, on the other hand, considerably restricted in its freedom of action by social imperialism.” (92)

Let us contrast this with his point of view in 1975:

“Today West German imperialism has been restored and is strong again, and for the proletariat there can neither be a ‘just war of defense’, for the proletariat is not the ruling class but the ruled class, nor a national war of liberation, for West Germany is not oppressed but rather oppressive itself.” (93)

In the past five years, however, West German imperialism has not become weaker but rather stronger in economic, political and military power. Although the third-power policy followed by West German imperialism within the EC has its limits because imperialist rivalry is mainly carried out in blocs under the leadership of the two superpowers, there is no doubt that West German

imperialism is an independent imperialist great power and is marked by special aggressiveness. We have thoroughly analyzed and proved this in our theoretical organ *Revolutionärer Weg*, Nos. 16-19.

The claim that the monopoly bourgeoisie is dependent on US imperialism serves to “show that the FRG today is not a state that tries to conquer other countries...” This leads to the following arguments:

“In a war of conquest, only the defeat of one’s own bourgeoisie and the struggle to attain this can promote the political positions of the working class and the conditions for proletarian revolution. It is a different thing if the war is not a war of conquest but a war against being conquered by a superpower. Then the position mistakenly taken by Rosa Luxemburg during World War I can prove to be correct.” (94)

At that time Lenin had fundamentally criticized the position taken by Rosa Luxemburg in the so-called “Junius Pamphlet”. What he said also applies today without restriction in case of an imperialist war between the Soviet Union and the Western European countries or the USA:

“Another fallacious argument is advanced by Junius on the question of defence of the fatherland. This is a cardinal political question during an imperialist war. Junius has strengthened us in our conviction that our Party has indicated the only correct approach to this question: the proletariat is opposed to defence of the fatherland in this imperialist war *because* of its predatory, slave-owning, reactionary character, *because* it is possible and necessary to oppose to it (and to strive to convert it into) civil war for socialism. Junius, however, while brilliantly exposing the imperialist character of the present war as distinct from a national war, makes the very strange mistake of trying to drag a national programme into the *present non-national* war. It sounds almost incredible, but there it is.” (95)

In complete contrast to this, Schmierer lets the cat out of the bag:

“It is not the question if wars are possible which the West German people are dragged into and which are not mainly caused by imperialist aims of the West German bourgeoisie to conquer other countries. Then it would be a case of reactionary defeatism, and the tactics of the proletariat would not be revolutionary defeatism, but rather to transform the war of defense into a revolutionary war of defense. Waging this war will then create the best conditions for the seizure of political power by the proletariat.” (96)

It is the proletarian-internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist to expose this counterrevolutionary policy of the Chinese revisionists and their supporters, to uphold class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat, to strengthen proletarian internationalism and unswervingly defend Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought.

II. Proletarian Internationalism and the Struggle against Revisionism and Liquidationism

1. The Development of Chinese Social Imperialism Sharpens the General Crisis of Capitalism

The restoration of capitalism and China's development toward a new social imperialism is without doubt a great setback for the international Communist and labour movement. For the second time, after the betrayal of the Khrushchev clique, the Marxist-Leninist world movement has lost its revolutionary centre and the oppressed peoples their hinterland in liberation struggle. The bulwark of world peace has become a force taking part in a counterrevolutionary alliance with US imperialism in the struggle to redivide the world and increasing the danger of a third world war.

Does this mean that the general basic contradiction of our era between imperialism and socialism has become less sharp and that the restoration of capitalism in a socialist country is inevitable? To assume this would be a dangerous mistake. The basic contradictions which determine the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution have not disappeared.

“Historically all revolutions have had their reverses and their twists and turns. Lenin once asked:

‘... if we take the matter in its essence, has it ever happened in history that a new mode of production took root immediately, without a long succession of setbacks, blunders and relapses?’

The international proletarian revolution has a history of less than a century counting from 1871 when the proletariat of the Paris Commune made the first heroic attempt at the seizure of political power, or barely half a century counting from the October Revolution. The proletarian revolution, the greatest revolution in human history, replaces capitalism by socialism and private ownership by public ownership and uproots all the systems of exploitation and all the exploiting classes. It is all the more natural that so earth-shaking a revolution should have to go through serious and fierce class struggles, inevitably traverse a long and tortuous course beset with reverses.” (97)

The betrayal of the Second International was followed by the October Revolution, and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union was followed by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, where for the first time the impending seizure of power by a new bourgeoisie under socialism could be avoided. By the integration of Chinese social imperialism into the imperialist world system the global contradictions and the general crisis of capitalism are further sharpened. Not only the contradiction to Soviet social imperialism is sharpened, but also – by the development of Chinese commodity and capital export – the contradiction to the Western imperialists. As Lenin writes in “On the Question of Dialectics”,

“The unity (coincidence, identity, equal action) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute.” (98)

As a link in world imperialism, Chinese social imperialism is also in contradiction to the proletariat in China, to the international working class and the oppressed people as well as to the Communists all over the world who steadfastly adhere to Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought, creatively combining them with the revolutionary practice of class struggle in their own countries and developing them further. Sharpening international competition leads to sharpening exploitation and oppression of the developing countries and the working class in the state monopoly countries.

The liberation struggles of the Iranian peoples and the people of El Salvador, the resistance of the Afghani people are examples showing that the peoples oppressed by imperialism and social imperialism will rise up like a volcano. With the transition to a deep and worldwide economic crisis in the state monopoly countries, the objective conditions develop for the transition to the strategic offensive of the working class in the imperialist centres. The great day of mighty struggles in the countries at the heart of imperialism is coming closer. The struggles of the Polish working class are harbingers of coming class struggles in the countries ruled by revisionism and show that the

restoration of capitalism in socialist states is no way out for capitalism and cannot stop the wheel of history.

All these struggles will penetrate each other and lead to a new upswing of proletarian world revolution. In this respect the world situation is similar to Mao Tsetung's description of the situation in pre-revolutionary China in 1930:

“But when I say that there will soon be a high tide of revolution in China, I am emphatically not speaking of something which in the words of some people ‘is possibly coming’, something illusory, unattainable and devoid of significance for action. It is like a ship far out at sea whose mast-head can already be seen from the shore; it is like the morning sun in the east whose shimmering rays are visible from a high mountain top; it is like a child about to be born moving restlessly in its mother's womb.” (99)

Whether the imperialists will start a third world war or not depends on the struggle of the peoples – will the oppressed chase the imperialists off the stage of history on time? If in spite of everything the imperialists dare to unleash a new world war, then they can be sure that they will only deepen the wrath of the peoples, that the peoples will recognize imperialism more completely and draw the conclusions from history. It is just as Mao Tsetung said:

“With regard to the question of world war, there are but two possibilities: One is that the war will give rise to revolution and the other is that revolution will prevent the war.” (100)

“The danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today.” (101)

2. The Common Struggle of the International Working Class in Alliance with the National Liberation Movements Calls for Struggle against Revisionism and Liquidationism

The restoration of capitalism in China, the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought by the revisionists, and the liquidationist attacks of E. Hoxha have given temporary stimulus to liquidationism and revisionism all over the world. This is merely the expression of petty-bourgeois forces in the Marxist-Leninist world movement shrinking from intensifying class struggle, conforming to imperialism. The material basis of this is the sharpening of contradictions world-wide.

The history of the international Communist and labour movement shows that the international working class and the oppressed peoples have been victorious whenever they were led by Marxism-Leninism, the ideology of the only thoroughly revolutionary class, the proletariat. But whenever revisionism got the upper hand, the working class and the liberation struggles suffered defeats; defeats which often cost the proletariat and the oppressed peoples ten thousands of unnecessary victims. Just think of Chile and Indonesia. Imperialism and social imperialism were able to deprive numerous national liberation movements of the fruits of their struggle because they were not led by Marxist-Leninists, representatives of the working class, but by representatives of the national bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois forces with a revisionist line. The restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union as well as in China was not possible without revising Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin emphasized the meaning of continual struggle against revisionism:

“What we now frequently experience only in the domain of ideology, namely, disputes over theoretical amendments to Marx; what now crops up in practice only over individual side issues of the labour movement, as tactical differences with the revisionists and splits on this basis – is bound to be experienced by the working class on an incomparably larger scale when the proletarian revolution will sharpen all disputed issues, will focus all differences on points which are of the most immediate importance in determining the conduct of the masses, and will make

it necessary in the heat of the fight to distinguish enemies from friends, and to cast out bad allies in order to deal decisive blows at the enemy.” (102)

Today these words of Lenin take on a special meaning for the international proletariat and the struggle of the oppressed peoples because of the suddenly increased danger of a third world war, the coming new rise of proletarian world revolution, and the impetus which revisionism and liquidationism have gained. Worldwide class struggle demands strengthening proletarian internationalism and the alliance of the working class in the imperialist countries with the oppressed peoples struggling for their liberation. But in this situation revisionism and opportunism, because they conform to imperialism, necessarily develop towards social chauvinism and take the party of their respective imperialist “fatherland”.

“Such a perversion is ... the social-chauvinist trend, socialism in word and chauvinism in deed, the defense of the predatory interests of ‘one’s own’ national bourgeoisie under the guise of ‘defense of the fatherland’....” (103)

The proletariat can only realize its historic mission as grave-digger of imperialism in alliance with the oppressed peoples if it is led by Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought. This demands victory over revisionism and liquidationism.

Strategically, revisionism is weak. But in order to fight it successfully, one must see the inner cause of liquidationism clearly.

“Liquidationism cannot be separated from a petty-bourgeois mode of thinking. A proletarian mode of thinking is incompatible with liquidationism....” (104)

In order to be successful in the struggle against revisionism and liquidationism, above all revolutionary vigilance must be strengthened.

“The basis of revolutionary vigilance is nothing else but the critical-revolutionary attitude to reality, the correct combination of criticism with self-criticism as the method of scientific cognition. In order to be capable of recognizing and fighting even the seeds of the petty-bourgeois mode of thinking as the main cause of liquidationism, its different aspects and appearances, one must recognize and eliminate the emergence of the petty-bourgeois mode of thinking in others and, in oneself. Someone who adopts not a critical but a liberal attitude towards his own petty-bourgeois thinking will not recognize the liquidators’ attacks, will sooner or later adopt their standpoint and even become a liquidator himself.” (105)

The right will as expression of proletarian mentality must be combined with continuously deepening study, critical and self-critical learning of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought in closest connection with revolutionary practice and in struggle against opportunist and liquidationist views. The latter also must not just be a matter of theory detached from reality, but rather dialectically combine theory and practice. On this point we stated in *China Today 5*, with respect to the situation of class struggle in West Germany:

“Today in our daily work, especially in preparing and leading struggles of the working class, we must at the same time defend Marxist-Leninist theory, including Mao Tsetung Thought, against the petty-bourgeois liquidationists with their damaging views, their slander and distortions. In this way we realize the concrete unity of theory and practice.” (106)

In socialism the ideological struggle in fulfilling this task must be combined with a determined dictatorship over the class enemies; in party building in the struggle to prepare the revolution, with the necessary administrative measures against incorrigible opportunists and liquidationists.

3. For the Unity of the Revolutionary Forces on the Basis of the Teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao Tsetung

Today the international Communist and labour movement is split in an unprecedented way and lagging behind the objective tasks of international class struggle. The struggle for the unity of the revolutionary forces on a principled basis is an absolute necessity. Without a revolutionary party the working class cannot liberate itself from the yoke of imperialism. Also, proletarian internationalism cannot be realized completely without the unity of the revolutionary forces.

But this unity must have a principled basis: the international experiences of the labour movement, as they have been summarized by the classics, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung. Any other basis is liquidationist and must be rejected and fought. Does this mean that the classics did not make mistakes? Not at all. Mao Tsetung, for example, made several mistakes. After having fundamentally defended Mao Tsetung Thought in *China Today 5* against the liquidationist slander and attacks of E. Hoxha, we showed certain mistakes of Mao Tsetung in this pamphlet. But the main thing in judging Stalin and Mao Tsetung as classics is to see that in the dialectical unity of, on the one hand, further developing Marxism-Leninism and, on the other hand, individual mistakes, the further development of Marxism-Leninism is the main side. Building on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and summing up the positive and negative experiences of the international labour movement and the practice of revolution in China, Mao Tsetung made immortal contributions to the struggle of the world proletariat and the oppressed peoples. These were, aside from the contributions to strategy and tactics of revolution in colonial and semi-feudal countries and to Marxist philosophy, especially his theory on the continuation of class struggle under socialism with the Proletarian Cultural Revolution as its core. Independent of the Chinese particularities, their general aim and the main guidelines and methods are generally valid for the struggle of the world proletariat. The revisionists and liquidationists will never succeed in destroying these teachings of the proletariat. If you attack Mao Tsetung Thought, you attack Marxism-Leninism. The central question is: If you take the ideological path of revisionism, you will in the short or long run come into contradiction with recognizing the classics of Marxism-Leninism, first one of them, then the other, finally all of them. For this reason we also completely disagree with some organizations and groups who claim to defend Mao Tsetung but at the same time attack Stalin in a liquidationist way and reject him as a classic. Because their approach to the issues is metaphysical and idealistic, they do not understand the qualitative difference between individual mistakes Stalin made, mainly due to particular historical conditions, and the liquidationism of E. Hoxha. We are for a principled unity of the revolutionary forces on the basis of the correct combination of theory and practice. A conciliatory stand only helps the liquidationists. Also we are against unity with petty-bourgeois groups or organizations on an international level who pretend to defend Mao Tsetung Thought, but liquidate the mass line and the leading role of the working class.

The efforts must be increased to build and unite the true Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations in the struggle against the danger existing in many countries of petty-bourgeois forces dominating the Marxist-Leninist movement.

We are certain that in connection with developing the struggles of the working class in the state monopoly and the revisionist countries and the struggle of the oppressed peoples, the unity of the revolutionary forces will make progress and the Marxist-Leninist world movement will become strong again on the basis of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung.

**Long Live the Marxist-Leninist World Movement!
Defend Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought!**

Appendix

Declaration of the Central Leadership of the KABD on the Chinese Revisionists' Show Trial against the So-Called Gang of Four

On November 20 in Peking, the revisionist leadership of party and state opened before a special court the trial against Yao Wenyuan, Jiang Qing, Zhang Chunqiao and Wang Hongwen. The Communist Workers' League of Germany sharply denounces this trial. After their coup in October 1976, the bureaucrats in the leadership of party and state of the People's Republic of China under the leadership of the arch-revisionists Deng Xiaoping and Hua Guofeng have restored capitalism step by step. Like today's Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China today is only by name a socialist country. Thus today's capitalist roaders in China have reached the goal they just barely missed in 1966.

At that time, on August 8, 1966, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China passed, at the proposal of Mao Tsetung, the resolution on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This was a consequence out of the bitter experiences of the labour movement with the capitalist degeneration of the Soviet Union:

- The workers, peasants and revolutionary students took up class struggle against the bureaucrats, careerists and ambitious egotists in the leadership of party and state and adopted measures for the workers and peasants to control the leading cadres better. For example, the directors put in office from above were replaced by elected revolutionary committees, thus enforcing a higher form of political rule of the working class.
- Precondition for consolidating this political rule was that the common workers and peasants learned to master science and technology, planning and administration. "Self-reliance" was the slogan under which, for example, production was developed in great leaps.
- Those bureaucrats who incorrigibly resisted the revolutionary initiative of the masses and were already starting out on the capitalist road were deposed. These were traitors to the working class like President Liu Shaoqi and the General Secretary of the Communist Party, Deng Xiaoping. Today Liu is rehabilitated, and his companion Deng is again holding the reins. Is there any wonder when Deng and his kind today lament about the "chaos of the Cultural Revolution"?
- On the basis of these experiences in struggle, the socialist consciousness of the workers, peasants and students developed, their revolutionary vigilance against the danger of the restoration of capitalism was raised.

Ideological and political mistakes made by the four accused Marxist-Leninists during the Cultural Revolution and in consolidating its results must be uncovered in an objective and principled discussion, as was done during the lifetime of Mao Tsetung.

But this is not what the trial is all about. This is shown by the methods which the Chinese rulers apply, which are no better than the class justice of Western capitalists:

- After four years of solitary confinement, the defendants receive their indictment one week before the trial begins.
- The "public" is composed of 800 selected officials from the ranks of the new bourgeoisie.
- For years a smear campaign has run against the defendants, in order to prepare public opinion for the terror sentences already written up.
- The four Marxist-Leninists are deliberately put on trial together with members of the counterrevolutionary Lin Biao clique. The tribunal is aimed at the so-called gang of four, but actually,
- it is meant to hit the opposition to the revisionist course,
- it is meant to hit Mao Tsetung and Mao Tsetung Thought.

For this reason this show trial concerns every class-conscious worker. To the applause of the international bourgeois press, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is to be branded as a crime. This is the background of the trial! Its contents and methods show how much the new bourgeoisie must be afraid of the revolutionary Chinese masses. The revolutionaries in China and all over the world cannot be intimidated by such intrigues. Out of the obvious weakness of the revisionist rulers, they will draw new strength and hope and remember what Mao Tsetung said about the reactionaries:

“In the final analysis, their persecution of the revolutionary people only serves to accelerate the people’s revolutions on a broader and more intense scale.”

We demand:

- **Stop the show trial immediately!**
- **Release the four Marxist-Leninists immediately!**
- **Defend Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought!**
- **Forward to socialism!**

Resolution of Protest of the Central Leadership of KABD on January 21, 1981, to the Embassy of the Government of the People’s Republic of China

The Communist Workers’ League of Germany (KABD) sharply condemns the counterrevolutionary act of the Chinese state and party leadership in putting the four Marxist-Leninists Jiang Qing, Zhang Chunqiao, Wang Hongwen and Yao Wenyuan on trial and accusing them for their revolutionary role in the Cultural Revolution.

But the calculation does not work out, just as the plans of all exploiters and oppressors must fail.

We stand behind Comrade Jiang Qing and her brave presence at court, which again aroused the wrath of the new Chinese bourgeoisie. For she ripped the mask off the faces of the reactionary comedians in the Peking trial when she said:

“The aim of your show trial is to slander me and in doing this to discredit Chairman Mao. You want to mutilate the further development of Marxism-Leninism by Chairman Mao and all his great achievements. You throw dirt on me, but you mean Mao and the millions who took part in the Proletarian Cultural Revolution.”

No bourgeois court can annul the correct verdicts made by the masses in the Cultural Revolution!

All honest Marxist-Leninists demand:

- **Publicize the speech of Jiang Qing!**
- **Stop the show trial immediately!**
- **Release the four Marxist-Leninists immediately!**

Notes

- 1 W. Dickhut, *State-Monopoly Capitalism in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG)*, Vol. II, p. 128
- 2 J.V. Stalin, "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists", *Works*, vol. 6, Moscow 1953, p. 415
- 3 *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, Foreign Language Press, Peking 1965, pp. 32/33
- 4 *ibid* pp. 8/9
- 5 *Important Documents on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution*, Peking 1970, pp. 97/98 – in the following quoted as: *Important Documents...*
- 6 E. Hoxha, *Report on the Activity of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania*, Tirana 1971, p. 88
- 7 *Important Documents...*, p. 98
- 8 *Peking Review* 24/1973, p. 6
- 9 *Important Documents...*, p. 98
- 10 *Beijing Review* 29/1979, p. 17
- 11 *Peking Review* 17/1972, p. 15
- 12 *Peking Review* 26/1973, p. 8
- 13 "Comment on Soviet-West German Treaty", *Peking Review*, No. 38, 1970, p. 8
- 14 *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, p. 286
- 15 *Important Documents...*, p. 99
- 16 Mao Tsetung, "Statement of May 20, 1970", Peking 1972, pp. 7/8
- 17 *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, p. 272
- 18 *ibid*. p. 264
- 19 E. Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana 1979, pp. 298 f.
- 20 *The Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (Documents)*, Peking 1973, pp. 27/28
- 21 E. Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, vol. II, Tirana 1979, pp. 82 f.
- 22 *Peking Review* 9/1973, p. 4
- 23 *Peking Review* 11/1972, p. 9
- 24 W. Dickhut, *State-Monopoly Capitalism...*, Vol. II, p. 373
- 25 *ibid*.
- 26 *Albanien heute*, No. 2 (38), 1979, pp. 64/65, translated from German edition of *Albania Today*
- 27 *Peking Review* 39/1972, p. 13
- 28 *China Today* 2, Stuttgart 1980, p. 15
- 29 Supplement to *Peking Review* 15/1974, p. 11
- 30 *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, p. 202
- 31 According to: J.V. Stalin, *The Foundations of Leninism*
- 32 *Peking Review* 4/1975, p. 24
- 33 Supplement to *Peking Review* 15/1974, p. III
- 34 *Peking Review* 45/1977, p. 45
- 35 *Peking Review* 3/1972, p. 17
- 36 *Peking Review* 7/1973, p. 11
- 37 "Declaration of Principles of the KABD", p. 8, translated from the German edition
- 38 *Peking Review* 51/1975, p. 21
- 39 *Peking Review* 23/1975, p. 29
- 40 *Roter Morgen* 14/1975, translated from the German edition
- 41 *Rote Fahne* 15/1975, translated from the German edition
- 42 V.I. Lenin, "Socialism and War", in: *Collected Works*, vol. 21, Moscow 1964, p. 310
- 43 *Beijing Review* 3/1980, p. 10
- 44 J.V. Stalin, "Work of April Joint Plenum of C.C. and C.C.C.", *Works*, vol. 11, pp. 58/59
- 45 *Beijing Review* 1/1981, p. 3
- 46 *Beijing Review* 2/1981, p. 16
- 47 *Beijing Review* 34/1980, p. 24
- 48 *Beijing Rundschau* 28/1980, p. 8, translated from the German edition of *Beijing Review*
- 49 *Beijing Rundschau* 8/1981, p. 19, translated from the German edition of *Beijing Review*
- 50 *Beijing Review* 34/1980, p. 24
- 51 *Beijing Review* 29/1979, p. 25
- 52 *Beijing Rundschau* 25/1980, p. 16, translated from the German edition of *Beijing Review*
- 53 W. Dickhut, *The Restoration of Capitalism in the Soviet Union*, p. 207

- 54 *Beijing Review* 6/1981, p. 14
- 55 *Beijing Review* 2/1981, p. 16
- 56 *Beijing Review* 25/1980, p. 8
- 57 *Beijing Review* 4/1980, p. 13
- 58 *Beijing Review* 2/1981, p. 14
- 59 *Beijing Review* 3/1981, p. 11
- 60 *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, p. 231
- 61 *Beijing Review* 37/1980, pp. 10/11
- 62 *Beijing Review* 1/1981, p. 12
- 63 *Beijing Review* 2/1981, p. 14
- 64 *The Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (Documents)*, pp. 24 and 30
- 65 *Beijing Review* 3/1981, p. 3
- 66 *Beijing Review* 24/1980, p. 9
- 67 *Peking Review* 45/1977, p. 33
- 68 *Beijing Review* 25/1980, p. 8
- 69 *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, pp. 28/29
- 70 *Beijing Review* 4/1980, p. 14
- 71 *Beijing Review* 3/1980, p. 9
- 72 *The Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (Documents)*, pp. 28/29
- 73 *Peking Review* 45/1977, pp. 32/33
- 74 V.I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", in: *Collected Works*, vol. 28, pp. 286/287
- 75 V.I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", in: *Collected Works*, vol. 23, p. 34
- 76 *Peking Review* 45/1977, p. 32
- 77 "The Identity of Interests between the Soviet Union and All Mankind", in: *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, vol. II, p. 277
- 78 "On the International United Front against Fascism", in: *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, vol. III, p. 29
- 79 W. Dickhut, *State-Monopoly Capitalism...*, Vol. II, pp. 375 f.
- 80 *Beijing Review* 4/1980, p. 14
- 81 *Beijing Review* 16/1980, p. 11
- 82 *Beijing Review* 18/1980, p. 10
- 83 *Beijing Review* 19/1980, p. 24
- 84 *Beijing Review* 2/1981, p. 13
- 85 *Beijing Review* 10/1981, p. 10
- 86 *Rote Fahne* 23/1978, translated from the German edition
- 87 *Kommunismus und Klassenkampf*, No. 12, 1980, p. 10, translated from the German edition
- 88 *ibid* p. 9
- 89 *Kommunismus und Klassenkampf*, No. 9, 1980, p. 8, translated from the German edition
- 90 *Kommunismus und Klassenkampf*, No. 4, 1981, p. 48, translated from the German edition
- 91 *ibid* p. 58
- 92 *ibid* p. 60
- 93 *Kommunismus und Klassenkampf*, No. 3, 1975, p. 159, translated from the German edition
- 94 *Kommunismus und Klassenkampf*, No. 4, 1981, p. 62, translated from the German edition
- 95 V.I. Lenin, "The Junius Pamphlet", in: *Collected Works*, vol. 22, p. 313
- 96 *Kommunismus und Klassenkampf*, No. 4, 1981, p. 62, translated from the German edition
- 97 *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, pp. 467/468
- 98 V.I. Lenin, "On the Question of Dialectics", in: *Collected Works*, vol. 38, p. 358
- 99 "A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire", in: *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, vol. I, p. 127
- 100 *Important Documents...*, p. 81
- 101 *The Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (Documents)*, p. 28
- 102 V.I. Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism", in: *Collected Works*, vol. 15, p. 39
- 103 V.I. Lenin, "Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme", in: *Collected Works*, vol. 24, p. 470
- 104 *Revolutionärer Weg*, No. 15, *Fight Liquidationism*, original German edition 1976, English edition 2001, p. 13
- 105 *ibid.* pp. 95 f.
- 106 *China Today 5: Hoxha versus Mao Tsetung*, July 1980, p. 54