

**ALLIANCE Marxist-Leninist (North America); July 2000
"UPON THE CURRENT SITUATION, UNITY, AND IDEOLOGY - AN OPEN
LETTER TO LUDO MARTENS; "PARTI DU TRAVAIL" BELGIUM;**

Hari Kumar (Editor) and for Alliance-ML (North America); W.B. Bland for Communist League (Britain); G.Altinoglu for Marxist-Leninist Communist Party (Turkey); March 1996; Great Britain

Preface to 2021 republication

This pamphlet was put out as a moment of realignment of Marxist-Leninist forces was taking place world-wide. It had been hoped that a dialogue between those in the Hoxhaite wing and those in the Maoist wing, would lead to a principled debate and – thereafter – hopefully a principled unity. This following text was put out by a group of three groups listed above, all who had long upheld the line of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania under Enver Hoxha. For a short window of time, Ludo Martens, the leading representative of 'Parti Du Travail' appeared to be moving toward a willingness to query the views of Mao Zedong. We never received a reply.

In the intervening period, Bland, Altinoglu, and Ludo Martens have all died. Kumar was asked to re-present this work for a current audience. The only changes that have been made are punctuations, and removal of much emphases. But only minor wording changes for clarity were made, and the text unchanged otherwise. An updating to account of new materials will be issued at some later juncture, if the opportunity arises. The appendices have not been included here, but can be found at the pages of the Alliance Marxist-Leninist repository at: <http://ml-review.ca/aml/AllianceIssues/AppendicesFinal.html>

Hari Kumar, November 5, 2021.

Table of Contents and Bibliography

Note On Transliteration From Chinese Script

Introduction

The Role Of Ideology - What Is Behind Disunity?

1. The Communist Internationals

A) First International -The International Working Men's Association

(B) Lenin And The Formation Of The Third International

2. Upon Mao Zedong "Thought" & Marxism-Leninism

A) Mao And Stages Of The Revolution In Colonial Type Countries

B) Stalin And The Chinese Revolution

C) Mao Zedong On New Democracy

D) Relations With The Kuomintang And The USA

3. The PRC And Mao's New State

A) The Class Alliance Of The Chinese Communist Party.

What Factions Were There In The CCP?

i) No Marxist-Leninists Left In The CC Of CCP

ii) The Capitalists Who Leaned To The "Soviet" Russian Camp

iii) The Uncompromising National Capitalist Class

iv) The National Capitalists Who Leaned To The USA

B) The CCP Consolidates The Capitalist Classes

i) In The Countryside

ii) In The City

C) Differences Between The Factions

i) The Cult Of Personality Of Mao Zedong

ii) Mao's Attacks On The Party

iii) Mao Weakens Industrial Forces Of China

4. The 20th Congress Criticism Of Stalin

5. MAO'S FOREIGN POLICY

6. CONCLUSIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

We follow here, the pinyin system of romanization. This was introduced in the 1930's by Soviet East Asian users in the 1930's (*J.Spence :The Search For Modern China; New York; 1990; p.xxv*). This is now the official system employed in China itself (See: "*The Politics of China*"; Ed Roderick MacFarquhar; Cambridge; 1993; p.vii).

The older version of romanization was the Wade-Giles system. This has been in the main superseded in most current texts.

This may lead to some confusion for comrades familiar with the previous transliteration. It means, for instance, that Mao Tse-tung is referred to in the text as Mao Zedong, except when quoting from the published work from Peking, (In *Pinyin* this is Beijing) that is known as "The Collected Works of Mao Tse-tung".

Another exception is made, keeping with the Wade-Giles naming. This is where the names are much more familiarly rendered in Wades-Giles rather than the newer pin yin. Notably for instance, Canton, Peking (not Beijing), Kuomintang (KMT) (not Guomindang), and Chiang Kai-Shek. Admittedly this all may lead to some confusion for comrades more familiar with the previous transliteration form.

Therefore, to assist in this matter, this page contains the two forms of key names, if they have been used here in the *Pinyin* system - presented side-by-side, as a reference.

	PINYIN	WADE-GILES
NAMES OF PEOPLE	Mao Zedong Liu Shaoqi Deng Xiaoping Zhou Enlai Peng Zhen Zhu De Peng Dehuai	Mao Tse-tung Liu Shao-chi Teng Hsiao-ping Chou En-lai Peng Chen Chu Teh Peng Te-huai
NAMES OF PLACES	Yangzi Ya'nan Beijing	Yangtze Yenan Peking

INTRODUCTION

"The USA would find us more cooperative than the Kuomintang. We will not be afraid of democratic America influence, We will welcome it.. America does not need to fear that we will not be cooperative. We must cooperate and we must have American help."

(Mao Zedong to US Diplomat John Service, political adviser to American Forces Second World War; J.Service "Lost Chance in China"; New York; 1974; p.303-307).

We recently received "For The Unity of All Communists In Defence of Proletarian Internationalism"; a speech and Report to the Seminary March 1995, 9-12; India; given by Ludo Martens for the "Parti Du Travail" of Belgium (PTB).

Yeltsin's coup finally splintered the revisionist former USSR. Finally, "extreme" right revisionism was given its death blow. Intense, and long overdue discussion in the Marxist-Leninist movement worldwide ensued. On the many fronts of the "Marxist-Leninist" Left, the calls for unity of Comrade Ludo Martens and the "Parti Du Travail" (PTB) are well known.

The PTB called for a full discussion. Unfortunately, at a recent meeting, full discussion was not permitted. Comrade Bill Bland of the Communist League (CL) (UK); had been invited to the May 1995 meeting in Brussels. But he was denied full speaking rights, as he was not silent on the left revisionism of Mao Zedong. We re-print, the CL statement on this. No rebuttal by the PTB, is available that we can print alongside. What does this refusal to allow Bland to speak mean?

It suggests that discussion on Mao Zedong is "off limits" for some brands of Marxist-Leninists.

These Maoists are threatened by full and open discussion. This was eloquently expressed by the Marxist Leninist Communist Party (Foundation) [MLCP(F)]; of Turkey. This is also re-printed here. Again, we are not aware of any rebuttal from PTB that can be published here.

Comrade Ludo Martens deserves reply. Why?

- He shows commendable self-criticism.
- He exposes serious problems in Mao Zedong thought.

We applaud all this. But we are puzzled why Comrade Martens stops where he does; having exposed Mao Zedong on key issues, Comrade Martens still states Mao Zedong was a Marxist-Leninist.

- We ask Comrade Martens: why does he not take his analysis to its logical conclusion?
- We argue That Mao Was not a Marxist-Leninist.

Marxist-Leninists, including Comrade Martens, argue that Khrushchevism destroyed the ex-USSR. To do so, Khrushchev and all revisionists distorted our history. It is essential, to correct these distortions. Comrade Martens provides the start of a needed reassessment of Mao. We add to these comments. We wish to assist the desire of Comrade Martens for unity, towards a new international.

But for us, the unity of Marxist-Leninists is only possible on the basis of a frank, factual and principled discussion. Only then can this desire for unity, be cultivated into an edible fruit. Much "manure" and fertiliser abounds. But hard work is needed - the soil needs tilling and watering.

Many comrades say that the great Internationals became great because the working class parties were united. The refrain then comes: "UNITE! " Lenin fostered unity in the midst of a sea of squabbles. But this world unity was built only on the base of a Communist Programme in Russia.

This was implemented following a long and intense discussion to hone the Iskra line. This gave rise to the Third international. We do not have this base now. We must re-build it, using history. This does not begin by ignoring facts. For Marxist-Leninists, history explains facts.

The Role Of Ideology - What Is Behind Disunity?

One cause of disunity is personality; where someone's ego demands authority. This exists in quarters. But, it does not explain fully disunity. We reject this as a primary explanation.

A Second cause for disunity, is that in the previous pro-Russian revisionist "Communist Parties", workers were discouraged from discussion. A period of confusion now, is unsurprising. But workers thirst for knowledge about "What Happened to the USSR?" Therefore this is not a sufficient explanation for disunity.

The primary reason for division, amongst those who regard themselves as Marxist-Leninists is an inadequate political level which permits demagogues to mislead the movement and sow disunity. It must never be forgotten that the imperialists are rich and powerful, and that they are implacably opposed to Marxism-Leninism and socialism, and that it is far easier and cheaper for them to disrupt the building of a Marxist-Leninist party than to destroy such a party after it has been established.

Revisionism diluted ideological training, but this should not be so for Marxist-Leninists. Disunity exists, it must be rooted in political differences, and these must be openly discussed. Otherwise, petty personality opinions and authoritarian dictates will decide ideological differences.

Comrade Martens states that previous divisions between the various brands of »Marxist-Leninist« (pro-Chinese; pro-Albanian; pro- Castro etc) - are irrelevant now. We need now... "unity.

Comrade Martens bases this call upon these contentions :

1. The pioneers of Communist history, Marx and Engels - then Lenin - believed that Unity above all was the first criteria for the First and Third International, respectively.
2. Marxist-Leninists follow Mao Zedong. Mao did make errors, but was a Marxist-Leninist; justifying the term - "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought".

We Examine These Contentions Below.

First we show that Marx and Engels, then Lenin made clear distinctions between progressive and working class based views and retrogressive and petty bourgeois views, when forming their internationals. This has obvious implications for us now.

Secondly we examine the justification of the term "Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought". In brief we will argue that Mao was far from a Marxist-Leninist.

In this introduction, only one key comparison between Mao and Marxist-Leninists is needed. Let us compare the view of the **state** as seen by Lenin and that seen by Mao in his theory of the New Democratic State. Whereas Mao states :

"This new Democratic republic will be different from the old European-American form of capitalist republic under bourgeois dictatorship.. On the other hand it will also be different from the socialist republic of the Soviet type under the dictatorship of the proletariat... However, for a certain historical period, this form is not suitable for the revolutions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. During this period, therefore a third form of state must be adopted in the revolutions of all colonial and semi-colonial countries, namely, the new-democratic republic."

(Mao Tse Tung Works, "On New Democracy")

Here in contrast is Lenin:

"The forms of bourgeois state are extremely varied, but their essence is the same: all these states whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The transition from capitalism to communism certainly cannot but yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: the dictatorship of the proletariat."

(Lenin "State and Revolution").

Only states that establish the dictatorship of the proletariat will make a transition from capitalism to socialism. All other states are variants of bourgeois states. If the state arising after a victorious national democratic revolution, does not move from the first stage of the revolution, to the second socialist stage, that state will only fulfill the democratic stage at best. Marxist-Leninists have always argued to go to the second stage "uninterruptedly". Lenin said:

"From the democratic revolution we shall at once and just in accordance with the measure of our strength, the strength of the class conscious and organised proletariat, began to pass over to the Socialist revolution. We stand for uninterrupted revolution. We shall not stop half way."

(Lenin Two Tactics Cited in History of the CPSU(B) p. 74).

We will argue that:

- Mao erected a Chinese wall between these two stages;
- Mao did not even complete the first stage of the revolution;

Mao and the national capitalists did not expropriate all foreign capital in China – only pro-Japanese-comprador capital was expropriated.

1 . THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONALS

(A) The First International - The International Working Men's Association

How was the First International established in 1867, and how did it operate? Lenin recognised this as a crucial question. The history of the First International shows us that intense ideological struggle occurred, at the birth of the international movement.

The **Communist League**, formed by Marx and Engels, was the first working peoples party in the world anywhere. (*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels : 'Collected Works' ; Moscow, 1976: [Hereafter : M&E CW] Vol 6: p.96-103*). Engels formulated articles of membership for this pioneering party. He brooked no compromise on the principles required to form a new party. These principles had been worked out, by Marx and Engels, in the heat of theoretical and practical battles with many enemies of scientific socialism.

In his "Draft of a Communist Confession of Faith" in June 1847, Engels distinguishes upon an ideological basis, the communists from the utopians. This Draft became known as the 'Communist Credo'. (*M&E CW; Vol 6: Ibid, p.477-519*). Later the demands of the struggle forced Marx and Engels, to write a Programme, "The Communist Manifesto" of 1848.

The "Credo" and the "Communist Manifesto" underwent a very long gestation. This followed the many ideological attacks launched by Marx and Engels against incorrect theories, such as those of **Proudhon** (*a French petit-bourgeois intellectual, whose views then carried some weight in the French workers movement*). These ideological and theoretical battles formed the background for internationalism. (*M&E CW: Vol 6 "Poverty of Philosophy"; 1847; p.105-212*).

Marx and Engels then formed the "**International Working Men's Association**" in 1867, which rapidly became feared by the bourgeoisie. Even then the ideological battle was not over. Within the First International, fierce struggles were necessary against both right reformist trends in the International emanating in part from Trade Unionism; and against Left factional attacks from **Mikhail Bakunin** and his anarchist ideology. Bakunin's views were a:

"Variety of pre-Marxian petty bourgeois socialism, reflecting the sentiment of ruined petty proprietors, and were totally unsuited to chart any realistic way of ending capitalist oppression... In the autumn of 1868 in Geneva, Bakunin gathered a following of heterogeneous elements to form the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy... Marx revealed the confused purely declarative and demagogical nature of the Bakuninist Programme whose main points - ("equalisation of classes", "abolition of the right of inheritance", and abstentions

from political struggle) - were likely to seriously damage the workers movement."
(*Preface ; ME CW Vol 21; p. xxii*).

Bakunin having established a rival to the First International, then demanded the right of admission of his "**International Alliance of Socialist Democracy**" into the First International. How did Marx explain these anti-working class trends?

"As the stage of development reached by different sections of the workers in the same country and by the working class in different countries necessarily varies considerably, the actual movement also necessarily expresses itself in very diverse theoretical forms."
(*M&E CW : Vol 43; Letter to Engels March 1869; p.235*).

Obviously the movement has developed since then. Equally obviously there are a number of "very diverse forms" that reflects the whole development of the movement and of revisionism. Internationally, there were a host of parties, just as there are now. How did Marx and Engels proceed against the different anti-proletarian trends?

Inside Germany, an old enemy of Marx and Engels, **Ferdinand Lassalle** had been exposed as an opportunist phrase monger. But Lassalle continued to exert influence in the German workers movement. The leaders of the **Social Democratic Workers' Party Of Germany (Eisenachers)**, pandered to this influence, by trying to "Unite" with the Lassallean party, the **General Association Of German Workers**. They proposed a new programme that would unite these two parties - the **Gotha Programme**.

Marx and Engels, who had not been consulted on this step, were highly critical of this "dilution" of principle for paper unity. They rejected any compromise on principles in order to either form, or expand the party. They heavily criticised this bow to Lassallean views. They attacked the Gotha Programme:

"To begin with they adopt the high-sounding but historically false Lassallean dictum: in relation to the working class all other classes are only one reactionary mass. This proposition is true only... in the case of a revolution by the proletariat e.g. The Paris Commune; or in a country in which not only has the bourgeoisie constructed state and society after its own image but the petty bourgeoisie in it's wake has already carried out that reconstruction to its logical conclusion...
Secondly the principle that the workers' movement is an international one is to all intents and Purposes utterly denied in respect of the present...
Thirdly our people allow themselves to be saddled with the Lassallean "iron law of wages" which is based on a completely outmoded economic view...
Fourthly as its one and only social demand, the programme puts forward-Lassallean state aid in its starkest form...
Fifthly there is absolutely no mention of the organisation Of the working class through the medium of trade unions."
(*Engels : Letter to August Bebel March 18-28, 1875. M&E CW Vol 24: p.67-73*).

Internationally, there were a host of parties, just as there are now. How did Marx and Engels proceed against the different anti-proletarian trends? pandered to this influence, by trying to "unite" with the Lassallean party, the General Association Of German Workers.

These were not trivial matters! Engels concludes:

"Generally speaking less importance attaches to the official programme of a party than to what it does. But a new programme is after all a banner planted in public, and the outside world judges the party by it.. It should be further considered what the workers of other countries will think of this programme: What impression will be created by this genuflection on the part of the entire German socialist proletariat before Lassalleanism."
(Engels; *Ibid*; M&E CW Vol 24 p.72).

Nowadays, Ferdinand Lassalle means little to us. But Lassalle posed important practical and theoretical obstacles for Marx and Engels. In resolving them, they formed our ideological foundations; and strengthened the International and the Peoples' Party. Just as Lassalle, later Trotsky and Plekhanov posed different problems. In refuting these Lenin and Stalin forged the Bolsheviks, further laying a theory for us. Clearly from Marx onwards, ideological analysis and debate, have formed Marxist-Leninist theory.

But what happened to the First International?

The English trades unions initially provided much impetus to the First International. But then the Bakuninist machinations were supported by the reformist leading elements of the trade unionists. Bakunin's demands had to be exposed. At the Hague Congress of the International, Bakunin and his ally Guillaume were expelled for:

"Creating within our Association a secret society, the Alliance of Socialist Democracy which claimed to direct the International aims contrary to its principles."
(M&E CW: Marx to Editor of "Le Corsaire"; Vol 23; p.257).

Despite Bakunin's expulsion for factional activity, the anarchist-reformist bloc had enabled the reformist trade unionists to take this opportunity to attack Marx and Engels. Engels pointed out, despite the expulsion of Bakunin, there were major divisions in the International that forced decisive action:

"There were two elements in London both striving to gain the upper hand in the General Council. One was the French Blanquists... a small coterie who replaced discernment of the real course of the movement with revolutionary talk, and propaganda activity with petty spurious conspiracy leading only to useless arrests...

The second dangerous element in London comprised the English working class leaders in whose face Marx at the Hague Congress had flung the words: 'It is a disgrace to be among these English working class leaders for almost all of them have sold themselves to Sir Charles Dilke, Samuel Morley or even Gladstone (*Leaders Of the Government - Editor*)'...

The activity of the International in England would not only come under the control of bourgeois radicals but probably even under the control of the Government itself... A transfer was therefore necessary... New York was the only place.. With security for the Association's archives and an international composition of the General Council itself."

(M&E CW: Vol 23; Engels "On the Hague Congress of the International"; p.265-266).

The First International was therefore moved to New York. But this proved to be its dissolution. This dissolution was the end result of an un-holy alliance; a "Unity" of sectarian anarchist trends represented by Mikhail Bakunin, and social reformism of the Trade union aristocracy. Bakunin's factionalism, had forced the shift of First International away from Marx and Engels' direct control; and away from the radical influence of the masses of the workers in the English and German trades unions.

Lenin described the new stage:

"After the Hague Congress of the International 1872; Marx had the General Council of the International transferred to New York.. The First International had played its part and now made way for a period of a far greater development of the labour movement in all countries in the world, a period in which the movement grew in scope and mass socialist working class parties in individual national states were formed."

(V.I.Lenin, Collected Works, Moscow 1977; [Hereafter VL CW] ; "Karl Marx"; Ibid; Vol 21; p. 49).

Lenin summarised the work of the First International:

"In uniting the labour movement of various countries striving to channel into joint activity the various forms of non-proletarian pre-Marxist socialism (Mazzinni, Proudhon, Bakunin, liberal trades unionism in Britain, Lassalleian vacillations to the right in Germany etc) and in combatting the theories of all these sects and schools, Marx hammered out a uniform tactic for the proletarian struggle of the working class in the various countries."

(VL CW : Vol 21 : Ibid; p.49).

(B) Lenin And The Formation Of The Third International

The 2nd International was started in 1889 with the participation of Engels. However, it too was dissolved, in 1914. What was Lenin's assessment of The Second International?

"The Second International existed from 1889-1914, up to the war. This was the period of the most calm and peaceful development of capitalism, a period without great evolutions. During this period, the working class movement gained strength and matured... but the workers leaders had become accustomed to peaceful conditions and had lost the ability to wage a revolutionary struggle. When in 1914, there began the war... these leaders deserted to their respective governments. They betrayed the workers, they helped to prolong the slaughter, they became the enemies of socialism, they went over to the side of the capitalists."

(March 1919. VL CW: "The Third Communist International"; Vol 29; p.241)

The collapse of the Second International reflected the rise of opportunism :

"The collapse of the Second international... signifies the complete victory of opportunism, the transformation of the Social Democratic parties into national-liberal parties, is mainly the result of the entire historical epoch of the Second International - the close of the 19th Century and the beginning of the 20th Century. The objective conditions of this epoch - transitional from the consummation of West European bourgeois and national revolutions to the beginnings of socialist revolution - engendered and fostered opportunism... a

split in the working class and socialist movements... which in the main was cleavage along the lines of opportunism (Britain, Italy, Holland, Bulgaria and Russia); in other countries we see trends along the same line (Germany, France, Belgium, Sweden and Switzerland). The crisis created by the great war has torn away all coverings... exposed an abscess and revealed opportunism as the true ally of the bourgeoisie... In Russia the complete severance of the revolutionary... proletarian elements from the petty bourgeois opportunist elements has been prepared by the entire history of the working class movement. Those who disregard that history and declaim against "factionalism"... (are) incapable of understanding the real process of formation of a proletarian party.. are rendering that movement the worst possible service."

(V.Lenin; "The Collapse of the Second International"; Collected Works (CW) Vol 21; September 1915. p.256-258).

This created the need for a new International. This need was fulfilled after the Bolshevik Revolution:

"The Third International actually emerged in 1918, when the long years of struggle against opportunism and social chauvinism, especially during the war led to the formation of Communist parties in a number of countries. Officially the Third International was founded at the First Congress in March 1919, in Moscow... the new Third, "International Working Men's Association" has already begun to develop to a certain extent, into a union of Soviet Socialist republics... The epoch making significance of the Third, Communist International lies in its having begun to give effect to Marx's cardinal slogan, the slogan which sums up the centuries-old development of socialism and the working class movement, the slogan which is expressed in the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

(April 1919. VL CW: "The Third International and Its Place In History"; Vol 29; p.306-307)

Its formation was greeted by dismay by the Opportunists. Lenin prefaces his reply to one Second International fossil, in its entirety. The 3 page article, written by MacDonald tried to "prove" that the Third International was a mistake. "Ramsay Macdonald", was "the well known leader, of the British so-called Independent Labour Party" which is actually "an opportunist party... and typical of the "Center", wrote Lenin.

MacDonalds' vacuous arguments try to obscure the dividing line:

"The rise of separatist tendencies in the national and international policies of socialism has been a misfortune for the socialist movement. It is however not a bad thing that there are shades of opinion and variation of method within socialism, Our socialism is still in the experimental stage. Its basic principles are fixed, but the method of best applying them, the combinations which will bring about the triumph of the revolution, the manner in which the socialist state is to be built are still problems to be discussed, and the last word concerning them has no yet been spoken. Extremes may clash, and such a struggle may serve to fortify socialist views; but evil commences when everybody considers his opponent a traitor... At the present moment our movement is unfortunately encountering a new obstacle, a new International has been proclaimed in Moscow. I am very much grieved over this, for the Socialist International is at present sufficiently open to all forms of socialist thought, and in

spite of all theoretical and practical disagreements engendered with it by Bolshevism I see no reason why its Left wing should separate from the Center and form an independent group.. Instead of parting ways on account of what has taken place, let us create a really active International which will guard the socialist movement."

(July 1919. VL CW:"The tasks of the Third International"; Vol 29 CW; p.495-496).

As Lenin comments:

"This article is a fine specimen of the smooth hackneyed apparently socialistic phrases which have long served in all the advanced capitalist countries to conceal bourgeois policy within the working class movement."

(Ibid; p.497).

Lenin exposed Macdonald's lies. Firstly, that the Bolsheviks had only begun to fight Kerensky after the Constituent Assembly, and that the Bolsheviks had not seen "the role of the Soviets". Having refuted this first lie; Lenin turns to Macdonald's second lie:

"Until the 1914-1918 war the International only said that in a war of national defence socialists must unite with other parties". That is a monstrous and glaring deviation from truth. Everybody knows that the **Basle Manifesto** of 1912 was unanimously adopted by all socialists and that of all the documents of the International it alone refers precisely to the war between the British and German groups of imperialist predators, which in 1912 everybody clearly saw was in preparation... The Basle Manifesto said three things which Macdonald now passes over in silence, thereby proving that with people like him a split is necessary... These three things are the following:

The war that threatens cannot be justified now as being in the interest of national freedom;

in this war it would be a crime on the part of the workers to shoot at each other; the war leads to proletarian revolution...

The Communist International will not agree to unity with parties which refuse to admit this truth and are incapable of demonstrating by their deeds their determination readiness and ability to bring these truths home to the masses...

Macdonald knows... that we have built the Third International and broken unreservedly with the Second International because we became convinced that it was a hopeless, incorrigible, played the part of a servant to imperialism, of a vehicle of bourgeois influence, bourgeois lies and bourgeois corruption in the labour movement."

(VL CW:"Tasks of the Third International"; Ibid; p.499;501).

The need for a new International was clear. But to establish it, the Third International depended on the success of the Bolshevik Revolution. This in turn needed clarity on issues of "Unity". The Russian workers movement was full of different opinions and views. How was the question of "Unity" handled by Lenin? Lenin believed that a full and open debate was needed before "Unity" was possible:

"We declare that "Before we can UNITE, AND IN ORDER THAT WE MAY UNITE, WE MUST FIRST of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation, as Iskra demands".

(V.L. CW Vol 5: "What is to be Done? Burning Questions Of Our Movements"; 1902; p.367).

Yet Lenin saw the need for unity on **Practical Issues**. These were issues needing a **Broad Front** for practical work; and formed the backdrop for ideological strengthening of a Party. Lenin cited Marx's approach here during the episode of "The Gotha Programme":

"If you must unite, Marx wrote to the party leaders, then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement, but do not allow any bargaining over principles, do not make any theoretical 'concession'. This was Marx's idea.. Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement".
(VL CW: "What is To be Done?" Vol 5: p.369-370).

Lenin stresses the importance of theory to the party:

"Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This idea cannot be insisted upon too strongly at time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand in hand with an infatuation for the narrowest form of practical activity...

Let us quote what Engels said in 1874 concerning the significance of theory in the social-democratic movement.

Engels recognises not two forms of the great struggle of Social democracy (political and economic) as is the fashion among us, but three, placing the theoretical struggle on a par with the first two:

'The German workers have two important advantages...

First they belong to the most theoretical people of Europe; and they have retained that sense of theory...

Without a sense of theory among the workers, this scientific socialism would never have entered their flesh and blood... What an immeasurable advantage it is may be seen... from the indifference towards all theory which is one of the main reasons why the English working-class movement crawls along so slowly."

(VL CW: *Ibid*, "What Is To Be Done?" Vol 5: p.369-372).

Lenin's "What is to be done?" laid the foundations for a professional revolutionary Party. In it he stressed the urgent need for a newspaper:

"What we require foremost and imperatively is to broaden the field, establish **real** contacts, between the towns on the basis of **regular, common work**.. I continue to insist that we can **start** establishing real contacts only with the aid of a common newspaper, as the only regular, All-Russian enterprise, one which will summarise the results of the most diverse forms of activity.. If we do not want unity in name only we must arrange for all local study circles **immediately to assign** say a fourth of their forces to active work for the **common** cause, and the new paper will immediately convey to them the general design scope and character of the cause.. the mere function of distributing a newspaper would help to establish **actual** contacts."

(VL CW: "What Is To Be Done?" *Ibid*; p.506-507).

TO CONCLUDE :

Ideological discussion and thorough understanding of our history was and remains important. Unity can only be forged on a principled ideological understanding otherwise it lapses into opportunism.

2. UPON MARXISM-LENINISM AND MAO ZE DONG "THOUGHT"

Once he was a self-confessed "extreme Maoist" (As is "In our Party it was generally acknowledged that in all realms" the ideas of Mao Zedong were "superior" to those of Stalin or even Lenin... Our party accepted the idea often stated in the Chinese texts that Stalin, as opposed to Mao did not understand that class struggle continued under socialism." See *Martens*, p. 14).

But Comrade Martens no longer feels that Mao is immune from critique. This is welcome. Honest and full self-criticism is a mark of genuine Marxist-Leninism. Despite this, Comrade Martens exhorts us that:

"Facing the abyss of unemployment, poverty exploitation and violence which confronts the workers of the world, only Marxism-Leninism - Mao Zedong Thought can open the way to national and social liberation."
(*Martens; Ibid; p.4*).

How Has Mao Zedong Thought Contributed to Marxism-Leninism?

Martens says: "Mao Made Two Major Contributions to Marxism-Leninism":

"For the first time in history Mao developed the theory and strategy of the national-democratic revolution in a large oppressed Third World country, as a preparatory step leading to socialist revolution, and he led the Chinese revolution, through great difficulties until the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. After Khrushchev took over in the USSR, Mao Zedong led the struggle against modern revisionism and through the development of the cultural revolution enriched the theory of the continuation of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat."
(*Martens Ibid; p.10*).

To the contrary, we reply that Mao added nothing positive to Marxism-Leninism. We hope that Comrade Martens will engage in further discussion, on these matters, after re-examining the record.

A) LENIN AND STAGES OF THE REVOLUTION IN COLONIAL TYPE COUNTRIES

According to Comrade Martens :

"For the first time in history Mao developed the theory and strategy of the national-democratic revolution in a large oppressed Third World country, as a preparatory step leading to socialist revolution."
(*"For The Unity of All Communists, In Defense of Proletarian Internationalism"; Report Presented to the Seminary, March 9-12 1995; India p.4*).

But, we protest, that it was Lenin and Stalin who developed this theory and strategy! What attitude should Communists take to the bourgeoisie in a colonial-type country?

On this, Lenin was divided from Trotsky; then Stalin and Trotsky were divided; then Stalin and Mao Zedong were divided!

- **Trotsky dismissed all bourgeoisie as comprador and reactionary.**
- **This is a Leftist error.**
- **Here Mao agreed with Lenin and Stalin.**
- **But Mao refused to move from the first stage of the revolutionary struggle into the second stage**

Stalin, to the "University of the Toilers of the East", noted that there were two wings in the native bourgeoisie:

"The situation is somewhat different in countries like India. The fundamental and new feature of the conditions of life in countries like India is not only that the national bourgeoisie has split up into a revolutionary part and a compromising part, but primarily that the compromising section of the bourgeoisie has already managed, in the main, to strike a deal with imperialism. Fearing revolution more than it fears imperialism, and concerned more about its money bags than about the interests of its own country, this section of the bourgeoisie is going over entirely to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution, it is forming a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country."
(J.V.Stalin, "Works" Moscow, 1954; [Hereafter JVS W] Vol 7; "Political Tasks of The University of The People's of The East. Speech Delivered to Students of The Communist University of The Toilers of The East", May 18, 1925; pp.135-46; 318).

This is the Line developed by Lenin. Lenin modified his "Theses on Revolution in Semi-Colonial Countries" in debate with **Mabendra Nath Roy**; (M.N.Roy). Roy stressed the vacillating role of the national bourgeoisie. Lenin accepted this as an important correction.

The "**Theses On The National And Colonial Question**", were adopted at The 2nd Congress of The Communist International (CI), [Petrograd and Moscow: July 19th to August 7th, 1920]. The Theses were adopted after intense study by The National and Colonial Commission of the Congress; of both Roy's "*Supplementary Theses*"; and Lenin's original "*Theses*".

Lenin and Roy disagreed over whether, and how much to ally with the national bourgeoisie.

Roy had an unrealistic view of the strength of the workers movements in colonial countries. Roy concluded that the working class of colonial-type countries were in full conflict with the entire bourgeoisie; thus support of a "liberation movement" with any section of native bourgeoisie, must be rejected:

"It would be a mistake to assume that the bourgeois nationalists movement expressed the sentiments and aspirations of the general population... The CI must not find in them (*i.e. the bourgeois nationalists elements - Ed*) the media through which the revolutionary movements in the colonies should be helped... The bourgeois national democrats in the colonies strive for the establishment of a free national state, whereas the masses of workers and peasants are revolting, even though in many cases unconsciously against the system which permits

such brutal exploitation. Consequently, in the colonies we have two contradictory forces that cannot develop together. To support the colonial bourgeois movements would amount to helping the growth of the national spirit which will surely obstruct the awakening of the class consciousness in the masses."

(M.N.Roy: Draft Supplementary Theses On the National and Colonial Question, 2nd Congress CI, Cited in G.Adhikari(Ed); "Documents of the History of the Communist Party of India", Volume 1; New Delhi; 1971 p.184, 186-8).

Roy's Formulation Contradicted Lenin.

Lenin thought that in the first stage of the revolution, the bourgeois democrats had some useful role to play and communists should support them there:

"All the Communist parties must assist the bourgeois democratic liberation movement in these (*i.e. colonial type countries - Ed*)... The Communist International (CI) must enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in colonial and backward countries."

(V.I.Lenin : Preliminary Draft of Theses on National and Colonial Questions, 2nd Congress CI in "Selected Works", Volume10, London, 1946; p. 236-7).

Lenin deleted Roy's premise from the Supplementary Theses before they were put to the Congress. Roy deviated in other ways from Marxism-Leninism in his **Draft Supplementary Theses**.

Firstly Roy declared the revolution in colonial-type countries was "an economic struggle", rejecting the political national-liberation content. Lenin amended this.

Secondly Roy declared that colonial-type countries exploitation was "the main" strength of developed capitalist countries. Lenin amended this to read that colonial type exploitation was "one" of the principal sources of strength.

Thirdly Roy declared, that super-profits from a colonial type country could be used to give concessions to the entire working class of the dominant developed capitalist country. Lenin amended this to read the super-profit from a colonial-type country was used to give concessions only to a stratum of workers in the developed dominant capitalist country.

Fourthly, Roy's Draft Supplementary Theses declared that socialist revolution was not possible in the developed capitalist countries, without prior successful national-democratic revolution in the colonial type countries. Lenin amended this :

"The breaking up of the colonial empire, together with the proletarian revolution in the home country will overthrow the capitalist system in Europe,"

and Lenin added:

"These two forces must be coordinated if the final success of the world revolution is to be guaranteed."

(Supplementary Theses. Ibid, p. 181).

In response to Roy, only one change to Lenin's original Draft Theses was adopted by the congress. This clarified that the working class in a colonial type country should support a

bourgeois-led movement only if it was genuinely revolutionary. The term "*bourgeois democratic*" was replaced by "***nationalist-revolutionary***":

"I would like to particularly emphasise the question of the bourgeois democratic movements in backward countries. It was this question that gave rise to some disagreement. We argued about whether it would be correct, in principle and in theory, to declare that the CI and the CP's should support the bourgeois-democratic movement in backward countries. As a result of this discussion we unanimously decided to speak of the nationalist-revolutionary movements instead of the 'bourgeois-democratic' movement. There is not the slightest doubt that every nationalist movement can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement... But it was agreed that if we speak about the bourgeois-democratic movement all distinction between reformist and revolutionary movements will be obliterated; whereas in recent times this distinction has been fully and clearly revealed in the backward and colonial countries, for the imperialist bourgeois is trying with all its might to implant the reformist movement also among the oppressed nations...

In the Commission this was proved irrefutably, and we came to the conclusion that the only correct thing to do was to take this distinction into consideration and nearly everywhere to substitute the term "nationalist-revolutionary" for the term "bourgeois-democratic". The meaning of this change is that we communists should, and will, support bourgeois liberation movements only when these movement do not hinder us in training and organising the peasants and the broad masses of the exploited in a revolutionary spirit...

The above mentioned distinction has now been drawn in all the theses, and I think that, thanks to this, our point of view has been formulated much more precisely."

(Lenin. Report Of Commission on the National and Colonial Questions, Ibid, p 241).

Despite his errors, Roy did contribute to Marxist-Leninist theory :

Firstly he drew attention to the existence of the tendency within the bourgeoisie of these countries, to compromise with imperialism:

"Afraid of revolution, the nationalist bourgeoisie would compromise with imperialism in return for some economic and political concessions to their class. The working class should be prepared to take over at that crisis the leadership of the struggle of national liberation and transform it into a revolutionary mass movement."

(M.N.Roy, "Memoirs", Bombay, 1964; p.382).

Despite Roy's dismissal of **ALL** the bourgeoisie - a Trotskyite error - Lenin saw the positive factor in Roy's view.

This was that a distinction had to be drawn within the bourgeoisie of a colonial-type country between a section which favoured national-revolutionary struggle against foreign imperialism (later called the "national bourgeoisie") and a section which favoured compromise with imperialism and while it might profess support of the national liberation movement, in practice objectively served imperialism by damping down national-revolutionary struggle (later called "comprador bourgeoisie").

Secondly Roy in his "Draft Supplementary Theses", saw that if the revolutionary process in a colonial type country were under the leadership of the working class, such a country could avoid a period of capitalist development.

"The supposition that owing to the economic and industrial backwardness the peoples in the colonies are bound to go through the stage of bourgeois democracy is wrong... If from the beginning the lead of the revolution is in the hands of the Communist vanguard, the revolutionary masses... would go straight ahead through the successive periods of revolutionary experience."
(Roy, Draft Suppl Theses; Ibid. p.186).

Lenin agreed with this, a concept that had not been in his own Draft Theses:

"A rather lively debate on this question took place in the Commission, not only in connection with the theses which I signed but still more in connection with Cmde Roy's Theses which Cmde Roy will defend here and which with certain amendments were adopted unanimously. The question was presented in the following way:
Can we recognise as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of development of national economy is inevitable of those backward countries which are now liberating themselves?...
We reply to this question in the negative. If the revolutionary victorious proletariat carries on a systematic propaganda amongst them, and if the Soviet governments render them all the assistance they possibly can, it will be wrong to assume that the capitalist stage is inevitable for the backward nationalities. The CI must lay down and give the theoretical grounds of the proposition that, with the aid of the proletariat of the most advanced countries the backward countries may pass to the Soviet system and, after passing through a definite stage of development, to Communism, without passing through the capitalist stage of development."
(Lenin, Report of the Commission, Ibid, p.243)

Hence Marxist-Leninists, see that if the working class gains leadership of the national-democratic revolution; this revolution can be transformed relatively uninterruptedly, into a socialist revolution. Mao disagrees with this key point.

Thirdly, Roy recognised that in some colonial-type countries - such as India and China - a significant native working class existed, objectively capable of gaining the leadership of the national-democratic revolution there:

"A new movement among the exploited masses has started in India, which has spread rapidly and found expression in gigantic strike movements. This mass movement is not controlled by the revolutionary nationalists, but is developing independently in spite of the fact that the nationalists are endeavouring to make use of it for their own purposes. This movement of the masses is of a revolutionary character."
(M.N.Roy. Speech 2nd Congress CI, Cited Adhikari, Ibid. p.191-2).

THIS WAS WHY LENIN APPROVED ROY'S MODIFIED SUPPLEMENTARY THESES.

Stalin pointed out why Roy's additions were needed:

"Both in his speeches and his theses (at the 2nd Congress of CI-ed) Lenin has in mind the countries where:

"There can be no question of a purely proletarian movement,' where, 'There is practically no industrial proletariat."

Why were the Supplementary Theses needed? In order to single out from the backward colonial countries which have no industrial proletariat such countries as China and India, of which it cannot be said that they have 'practically no industrial proletariat'. Read the "Supplementary Theses", and you will realise that they refer chiefly to China and India...

How could it happen that Roy's special Theses were needed to "Supplement" Lenin's theses? The fact is that Lenin's Theses were written and published long before the Second Congress opened... prior to the discussion in the Special Commission of the Second Congress. And since the Second Congress revealed the necessity of singling out from the backward countries such countries as China and India, the necessity of 'Supplementary Theses' arose."

(JVS W : "Questions of the Chinese Revolution", Vol 9; p.236-238).

In the absence of a significant working class in the colonial country, a different leadership was necessary. As Lenin in his Report and Theses at the 2nd congress of the CI saw here, the leadership of the national democratic revolution being exercised by the working class of the developed capitalist countries, in particular by the working class of Soviet Russia:

"If the revolutionary victorious proletariat carries on systematic propaganda among them, and if the Soviet governments render them all the assistance they possibly can... the backward countries may pass to the Soviet system, and after passing through a definite stage of development to Communism without passing through the capitalist stage of development."

(Lenin. Report on the Commission. Ibid, p.243)

Finally, Roy thought that the whole bourgeoisie in colonial-type countries is counter-revolutionary. This was incorrect. But it contains an element of truth. i.e. When the working class is seen to win the leadership of the national-democratic movements, even the national bourgeoisie will desert the national democratic revolution and go over to the imperialist counter-revolution. They prefer even a subordinate exploiting position under imperialism, to the possibility that the working class will use its leading position, to transform the national-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. This Marxist-Leninist position was put in the "**Theses on the Eastern Question**", adopted by the 4th Congress of the CI in November 1922.

"At first the indigenous (national - Ed) bourgeois and intelligentsia are the champions of the colonial revolutionary movements, but as the proletarian and semi-proletarian peasant masses are drawn in, the bourgeois and bourgeois-agrarian elements begin to turn away from the movement in proportion as the social interests of the lower classes of people come to the forefront."

(Theses on the Eastern Question, 4th Congress CI, J.Degras (ed)" The Communist International: 1919-1943: Documents", Volume 1; London; 1971; p.388).

Roy's contribution on the vacillations of the native bourgeoisie, was later to be ignored by Mao.

We conclude the correct line on the two-stage revolution in colonial countries was formed by Lenin at the Comintern

B) STALIN AND THE 1927 CHINESE REVOLUTION

Stalin, in 1925, distinguished at least three categories of colonial and dependent countries:

“Firstly countries like Morocco who have little or no proletariat, and are industrially quite undeveloped. Secondly countries like China and Egypt which are under-developed industries and have a relatively small proletariat. Thirdly countries like India.. capitalistically more or less developed and have a more or less numerous national proletariat. Clearly all these countries cannot possibly be put on a par with one another.”

(JVS W: Vol 7: Political Tasks of the University of the People's of the East. Speech Delivered at a meeting of Students of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East, May 18th, 1925; p. 148).

In each country the conditions were different and had to be concretely studied before deciding the exact tactic:

“In countries like Egypt and China, where the national bourgeoisie has already split up into a revolutionary party and a compromising party, but where the compromising section of the bourgeoisie is not yet able to join up with imperialism, the Communists can no longer set themselves the aim of forming a united national front against imperialism. In such countries the Communists must pass from the policy of a united national front to the policy of a revolutionary bloc of the workers and the petty bourgeoisie. In such countries that bloc can assume the form of a single party, a workers and peasants' party, provided, however, that this distinctive party actually represents a bloc of two forces - the Communist Party and the party of the revolutionary petty bourgeois. The tasks of this bloc are to expose the half-heartedness and inconsistency of the national bourgeoisie and to wage a determined struggle against imperialism. Such a dual party is necessary and expedient provided it does not bind the Communist Party hand and foot, provided it does not restrict the freedom of the Communist Party to conduct agitation and propaganda work, provided it does not hinder the rallying of the proletarians around and provided it facilitates the actual leadership of the revolutionary movement by the Communist party. Such a dual party is unnecessary and inexpedient if it does not conform to all these conditions for it can only lead to the Communist elements becoming dissolved in the ranks of the bourgeoisie to the Communist Party losing the proletarian army.

The situation is somewhat different in countries like India. The fundamental and new feature of the conditions of life in countries like India is not only that the national bourgeoisie has split up into a revolutionary part and a compromising part, but primarily that the compromising section of the bourgeoisie has already managed, in the main, to strike a deal with imperialism, Fearing revolution more than it fears imperialism, and concerned with more about its money bags than about the interests of its own country, this section of the bourgeoisie is going over entirely to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution, it is

forming a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country.”

(JVS W; Tasks of University of People's of East, Ibid; May 18th, 1925. pp. 135-146).

How did this concretely relate to China? Who were the revolutionary bourgeoisie; and what was the single party that represented the workers and peasants that Stalin refers to? The party Stalin was discussing was the **Kuomintang (KMT)**.

The **Manchu Dynasty** of China obstructed democratic reforms along with the foreign imperialists who controlled China's economy. The so called enlightened bourgeoisie of China tried to change this. They were exemplified by **Sun Yat Sen**, who was himself influenced by Lenin and the USSR. A ferment had followed the Versailles Treaty of 1919. This granted Germany's former colony in Shandong to Japan instead of granting autonomy to Shandong. This further fuelled Japan's ambitions in China and especially in Manchuria. The 4 thMay demonstration in Beijing was the signal for organised resistance.

Sun Yat Sen founded the KMT (National People's party) the party of the revolutionary **bourgeoisie** in 1912. This was the party that Stalin referred to. The **Chinese Communist Party (CCP)** was formed in July 1921, with assistance from the **Comintern** and its representative **Maring**. *(Jonathan Spence, 'The Search For Modern China'; 1990; New York; p. 325).* Early on the CCP had a close relationship with the KMT. Sun Yat Sen asked **Adolf Joffe** (Soviet diplomat) for assistance in reorganising the KMT. The USSR supported the training of Chinese communists and revolutionary democrats, in the USSR itself:

“After founding the KMT Dr. Sun Yat Sen put forward the **Three Great Policies**, alliance with Russia, cooperation with the Communist Party, and assistance to the peasants and workers. He was the father of China's bourgeois democratic revolution. . . In 1922 he began reorganising the Kuomintang (KMT).. As the First revolutionary War in China developed rapidly, both the CCP and the KMT felt the need for more revolutionary cadres and asked the Soviet Union to train more people. In response the Soviet Union founded Sun Yat-Sen University For the Toilers of the East solely for the Chinese students.. At the end of 1925, with the help of VASIL CONSTANTIN BORODIN, the Soviet political adviser to the National Government in Guangzhou, the KMT and the CCP jointly selected 310 students to be set to Sun Yat-Sen University.”

(Deng Mao Mao; Deng Xiaoping - My Father; New York; 1995; p.33; 82; 105).

After the death of Sun-Yat Sen, the KMT fell to the leadership of CHIANG KAI-SHEK, who reneged on the policy of Sun Yat-Sen. By 1927 China was a colonial state dominated by British and USA imperialism. The stages of the revolution flowed from the CI Theses. Stalin analysed the situation as follows:

“What are the stages in the Chinese Revolution? In my opinion there should be three:

The first stage is the revolution of an all-national united front, the Canton period, when the revolution was striking chiefly at foreign imperialism, and the national bourgeoisie supported the revolutionary movement;

The second stage is the bourgeois democratic revolution, after the national troops reached the Yangtze River, when the national bourgeoisie deserted the revolution and the agrarian movement grew into a mighty revolution of tens of millions of the peasantry. The Chinese revolution is now at the second stage of its development;

The third stage is the Soviet revolution which has not yet come, but will come. “
(*J.V.Stalin; On the International Situation and the Defence of the USSR; Joint Plenum of CC and the CPSU Control Commission; August 1 1927. Vol 10; p.16-17*)

Stalin's first stage and the second stage together constitute what is termed the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution. Stalin emphasised that the main axis was the agrarian movement:

“The characteristic feature... of the Turkish revolution (The Kemalists)... is that it got stuck at the first step, at the first stage of its development, at the stage of the bourgeois liberation movement, without even attempting to pass to the second stage of its development, the stage of the agrarian revolution.” (*Stalin; Ibid; p.346*)

Unfortunately, the CCP rejected Stalin's advice on moving from the first stage to the second stage using the agrarian revolution. Because of this the CCP was defeated; allowing Trotsky and Zinoviev a pretext to attack Stalin.

Replying to their attack, Stalin again outlined the history of the Chinese revolution. The desertion of the Chinese Kuomintang right faction had been fully anticipated by Stalin in February 1926:

“It is necessary to adopt the course of arming the workers and peasants and converting the peasant committees in the localities into actual organs of governmental authority equipped with armed self-defence, etc.. The CP must not come forward as a brake on the mass movement; the CP should not cover up the treacherous and reactionary policy of the Kuomintang Rights, and should mobilise the masses around the Kuomintang and the CCP on the basis of exposing the Rights... The Chinese revolution is passing through a critical period, and.. it can achieve further victories only by resolutely adopting the course of developing the mass movement. Otherwise a tremendous danger threatens the revolution. The fulfilment of directives is therefore more necessary than ever before.”

(*ECCI Directive to the CCP; February 1926; Cited JVS W : Vol 10; p.21*).

Stalin repeatedly urged the CCP, through 1926 and early 1927 to break the bloc with the right KMT and move to a militant revolutionary struggle. The CCP did not heed such advice:

“The victory of the revolution cannot be achieved unless this bloc is smashed, but in order to smash this bloc, fire must be concentrated on the compromising national bourgeoisie, its treachery exposed, the toiling masses freed from its influence, and the conditions necessary of the hegemony of the proletariat systematically prepared. In other words, in colonies like India it is a matter of preparing the proletariat for the role of leader of the liberation movement, step by step dislodging the bourgeoisie and its mouthpieces from this honourable post. The task is to create an anti-imperialist bloc and to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat in this bloc. This bloc can assume although it need not always necessarily do so, the form of a single Workers and Peasants Party, formally bound by a single platform. In such countries the independence of the Communist Party must be, the chief slogan of the advanced communist elements, of the hegemony of the proletariat can be prepared and brought about by the Communist party. But the communist party can and must enter into an open bloc with the revolutionary part of the bourgeoisie in order, after isolating the compromising national bourgeoisie, to lead the vast masses of the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie in the struggle against imperialism.”

(J.V.Stalin Stalin's Letters to Molotov; Edited Lars T. Lih; Oleg V. Naumov; and Oleg V. Khlevniuk; Yale 1995; p.318-9.)

The **Executive Council** of the **Comintern** (ECCI) adopted Stalin's view; in a directive sent to the CC of the CCP in February 1926. At the 7th Plenum of ECCI, (Moscow November 22nd to December 16th, 1926), the **Resolution On The Chinese Situation** followed Stalin. This declared the revolution in China was in transition to a new stage as the national bourgeois were about to desert the national-democratic revolution; so the revolutionary forces would be the working class, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie; and that the working class must become the **leading** force:

“Now the movement is on the threshold of the 3rd stage, on the eve of a new realignment of classes. In this stage the driving force of the movement will be a bloc of an even more revolutionary nature - of the proletariat, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie to the exclusion of the majority of the capitalists bourgeois... When the national bourgeoisie desert the revolution and conspire against it.. the proletariat is the dominating force of this bloc.”

(Resolution of the Chinese Situation; 7th Plenum ECCI; In R.C.North and X.J.Eudin:M.N.Roy's Mission to China: The Communist-KMT Split 1927; Berkeley; 1963; p.135)

The ECCI emphasised the agrarian revolution:

“In the present transitional stage of the development of the revolution, the agrarian stage of the development of the revolution, the agrarian question becomes the central question. The class which... succeeds in giving a radical answer to it will be the leader of the revolution.”

(Ibid; p.137).

The ECCI made clear that the working class had a choice: Either attempt to maintain the alliance with the national bourgeoisie, who were on the point of desertion of the national democratic revolution; Or; cement an alliance with the peasantry through the agrarian revolution. Failing to choose the latter would be disastrous :

“The fear that the aggravation of the class struggle in the countryside will weaken the united anti-imperialist front is baseless.. Not to approach the agrarian question boldly by supporting all the economic demands of the peasant masses is positively dangerous for the revolution. To refuse to assign to the agrarian revolution a prominent place in the national-liberation movement for the fear of offending the dubious and disloyal cooperation of a section of the capitalist class is wrong. this is not the revolutionary policy of the proletariat.

The present situation is characterised by its transitional nature when the proletariat must choose between allying itself with a considerable section of the bourgeoisie or further consolidating its own alliance with the peasantry. If the proletariat does not put forward a radical programme it will fail to attract the peasantry into the revolutionary struggle and will lose its hegemony in the national-liberation movement. Under direct or indirect imperialist influence, the bourgeoisie will regain the leadership of the movement once more.”

(Ibid; p.138).

As well as mass work, the CCP should work through the KMT government and the revolutionary army:

“The revolutionary armies will strike root in the peasant masses as the standard bearer of agrarian revolution.. The CCP and their revolutionary allies must penetrate the new government, so as to give practical expression to their agrarian programme by using the government machinery to confiscate land,

reduce taxes, and invest real power in the peasant committees, thus carrying out progressive reforms on the basis of a revolutionary programme.

The Communists must enter the Canton government in order to support the revolutionary Left wing in its struggle against the weak and vacillating policy of the Right...

The Communists must stay in the Kuomintang and intensify their work in it... The CCP must strive to develop the KMT into a real peoples' party... a solid revolutionary bloc of the proletariat, peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the other oppressed and exploited strata of the population. For this the CCP must work along the following lines:

- a) Systematic and determined struggle against the... right wing attempting to convert the KMT into a bourgeois party.
- b) Definite formation of a Left wing in the KMT and establishment of close cooperation with it." (*Ibid*; p.140-41).

The ECCI representative in China **Grigori Voitinsky** and the leader of the CPSU Mission in China **Mikhail Borodin**, both opposed these directives. They were supported by the CC of CCP; then headed by General Secretary **Chen Tu-Hsiu**. To help implement the ECCI 7th Plenum Theses by the CCP, in January 1927, M.N.Roy was sent as a special ECCI representative.

The Chinese national bourgeoisie led by Chiang Kai-Shek launched its coup on April 12th 1927.

The CCP did not heed the warning signs and advice, to escape the struggle from the CI and Stalin. The CCP did not forestall the attack by the KMT under Chiang Kai-Shek; who viciously butchered the Shanghai workers, and the militants of the CCP. Stalin commented:

"In the First period of the Chinese revolution.. the national bourgeoisie (not the compradors) sided with the revolution...Chiang Kai-Shek's coup marks the desertion of the national bourgeoisie from revolution. April, 1927."
(*JVS W: 'Question of Chinese Revolution' Vol 9; p. 226, 229*)

Even now, Roy's arguments were rejected. But Roy managed to pressure the CCP to hold the 5th CCP Congress in Wuhan (April 27th to May 9th 1927). Chen argued to delay the agrarian revolution. But Roy's pressure forced the CCP, to verbally accept the ECCI line; however this was short lived. **The CCP leadership refused to follow even their own 5th Congress directives.**

On May 21st, 1927 **Colonel Hsu Ke-hsiang** seized control of Changsha, and launched a White terror. 20,000 workers and peasants were killed. The CCP sabotaged the peasant army in its attempt to fight back, and forced a retreat. They were then of course easy fodder, and were slaughtered. Still, the CCP and Borodin refused to go to the masses. Chen Tu-hsiu's line was traitorous:

"The basic point in all Chen Tu-hsiu's speeches has been the demand that the general leadership in the movement be handed over to the KMT."
(*Tsia Ho-sen: Istoriiia opportunizma v Kommunisticheskoi Partii Kitaia (An account of Opportunism In the Chinese Communist Party) In :Problemy Kitaia (50. Chinese Problems); No. 1, 1929; p.35*).

Desperate, Roy wired the ECCI for support.

A reply telegram from the ECCI, on May 30th, 1927; buttressed Roy. Meanwhile the Wuhan Left KMT met Chiang Kai-Shek, and Feng Yu-hsiang and combined against the

CCP. **Roy warned the CCP a coup was imminent.** Again this was ignored. The CCP refused to launch agrarian struggle. Instead Chen Tu-hsiu wrote a telegram to the ECCI:

“90% of the National Army are.. opposed to excesses in the peasants' movement. In such a situation, not only the KMT but also the CCP is obliged to adopt a policy of concessions, It is necessary to correct excesses and to moderate the activities of the confiscation of land.”

(Chen Tu-hsiu: Telegram to ECCI; June 15th 1927; In M.N.Roy :Revolution and Counter revolution in China; Calcutta; 1946; p.482).

Now the CC dismantled the workers struggle and peasants struggles, fearing a rupture with the KMT. The two Communist ministers resigned, to make the government appear more respectable!! All to no avail. On July 15th, the KMT expelled members of the CCP from the KMT and the army.

The ECCI Resolution of July 14th had noted that:

“The revolutionary role of the Wuhan Government is played out; it is becoming a counter-revolutionary force.”

(ECCI: Resolution On the Present Situation on the Chinese Revolution, in: International press Correspondence, Volume 7, No. 44; July 28th; 1927; p.984).

A White terror ensued:

“Between January and August 1928 alone, more than 100,000 people lost their lives. The Party organisations suffered serious damage. By the end of 1927 Party membership had been reduced from more than 50,000 to some 10,000”.

(Deng Mao; Deng Xiaoping - My Father; New York; 1995; p.119).

Stalin characterised the new development as the desertion of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia from the revolution:

“The present period is marked by the desertion of the Wuhan leadership of the KMT to the camp of counter-revolutionary intelligentsia from the revolution.. This desertion is due firstly to the fear .. In face of the agrarian revolution and to the pressure of the feudal landlords on the Wuhan leadership, and secondly to the pressure of the imperialists in the Tientsin are who are demanding that the KMT break with the Communists as the price for permitting its passage Northwards.”

(J.V.S. W Notes on Contemporary Themes; Vol 9; p.366-67).

But Stalin pointed out that **now** it was correct to propagandise in favour of the formation of soviets:

“If in the near future - not necessarily in a couple of months, but in 6 months or a year from now, a new upsurge of the revolution should become a fact, the question of forming Soviets of Workers and peasant' deputies may become a live issue as a slogan of the day, and as a counterpoise to the bourgeoisie. Why? Because if there has been an upsurge of the revolution in its present phase of development, the formation of Soviets will be an issue that has come fully mature. Recently a few months ago it would have been wrong for the CCP to issue the slogan of forming soviets, for that would been adventurism, which is characteristic of our opposition, for the KMT leadership had not yet discredited itself as an enemy of the revolution. Now on the contrary, the slogan of forming Soviets may become a really revolutionary slogan if (If!) A new and powerful revolutionary upsurge takes place in the near future. Consequently alongside the fight to replace the present KMT leadership by a revolutionary leadership it is necessary at once even before the upsurge begins to conduct the widest

propaganda for the idea of Soviets among the broad masses of the working people, without running too far ahead and forming Soviets immediately, remembering that Soviets can only flourish at a time of powerful revolutionary upsurge.”

(J.V.S. W: Notes on Contemporary Themes; Vol 9; p.366-7).

Here Stalin rebuked Trotsky who had been calling for “Soviets Now!” for some time, quite incorrectly. The ECCI instructed the CCP to resign from the Wuhan Government apparatus whilst simultaneously staying within the KMT; and to turn it into a bloc **led** by the working class; that the arming of peasants and workers was crucial; and that an illegal party apparatus be built up. Finally, the resolution attacked the CCP for its grave right opportunist errors:

“The leaders of the CCP have pursued a policy of damming back the masses. The revolutionary instruction of the ECCI were rejected by the leaders of the CCP. Matters even went so far that the CCP ‘agreed’ to the disarming of workers.”

(Resolution of the ECCI: ‘On the Present Situation of the Chinese Revolution’; Ibid; Inprecorr July 28th; 1927)

Unfortunately, the CCP now swung from right opportunism into left wing adventurism.

They tried to organise an uprising in Nanchang, in July 1927. Zhou En Lai, Mao Zedong, Chu De, Li Li-San and others were involved. Stalin disavowed this military adventurism:

“The whole business of the Southern revolutionary movement, the departure of the troops of Yeh Ting and Ho Lung from Wuhan, their march into Kwantung and so forth - I want to say that all this was undertaken on the initiative of the CCP.”

(J.V.S. W: The Political Complexion of the Russian Opposition; Vol 10; p.161-2).

The CCP eventually did launch agrarian struggle. But they were now consistently ultra-left in their theory and practice. Mao Zedong was one who preached at this stage “Socialism now”. Stalin stated:

“The Comintern was and still is of the opinion that the basis of the revolution in China at the present period is the agrarian-peasant revolution.”

(J.V.S. W: The Political Complexion of the Russian Opposition; Vol 10; p. 161).

Yet Mao took a Trotskyite line. He argued that the line of the ECCI and Stalin had been wrong for some time. On August 20th Mao wrote to the CCP CC misrepresenting the ECCI position:

“The international proposes the immediate establishment of Soviets of workers and peasants and soldiers in China. Objectively China has long since reached 1917, but formerly everyone held the opinion that we were in 1905. This has been an extremely great error. Soviets of workers, peasants, and soldiers are wholly adapted to the objective situation. In the period of soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers, we should no longer use the flag of the KMT. We must raise high the flag of the CCP to oppose the flag of the KMT.”

(Mao: In Chung -Yang tung-hsin (Central Newsletter) No.3; August 30th 1927, p.38-41)

It was in this Ultra-Left spirit that a hastily and ill prepared insurrection was carried out. The Canton Insurrection of December 11th, 1928 was an instance of a completely failed putsch, not a proletarian uprising. Here a major portion of blame lies with **Heinz Neumann** an Ultra-Left ECCI representative. The **Canton Commune**, drowned in blood

as the KMT smashed it. The ECCI again criticised the CCP, in February 1928 at the 9th Plenum of the ECCI:

“The Canton Insurrection... A heroic attempt of the proletariat.. Revealed a whole series of blunders by the leaders: Insufficient work among the workers and peasants, and among the enemy forces, a wrong appraisal of the yellow trade unions; inadequate preparation of the party organisation and the Young Communist League... complete ignorance of the national party center of the Canton events, weaknesses in the political mobilisation of the masses.”
(Resolution On Chinese Question of the 9th Plenum of the ECCI In International Press Correspondence, Vol 8, No.16; March 15th, 1928; p. 322).

Mao helped plan this adventure. He also organised another putsch the military attack upon Changsha. This was a part of a mission he was given to enter Hunan to carry out the **Autumn Harvest Uprising**.

In September 1927 Mao Zedong was entrusted by the Central Committee to go to Hunan as its special representative to organise the Autumn Harvest Uprising and to found the 5,000 strong 1st Division of the 1st Corps of the Chinese Workers and Peasants Revolutionary Army. *(Deng Mao Mao; Ibid; p.121).*

Unfortunately, Mao again would not apply advices of Marxist-Leninists. Mao explained his Programme to Edgar Snow:

“My programme there called for the realisation of 5 points:

1. Complete severance of the provincial party from the KMT;
2. Organisation of a peasant worker revolutionary army;
3. Confiscation of the property of small and middle and as well great landlords;
4. Setting up the power of the CP in Hunan independent of the KMT; and
5. The organisation of the Soviets. The fifth point at that time was opposed by the Comintern.”

(Mao Zedong: Cited E.Snow; Red Star Over China; London; 1937; p.163).

In fact only on points 1, 2 and 4, was Mao fully consistent with the ECCI. The other points were Leftist deviations. Stalin had pointed out that **IF** conditions were mature, Soviets were appropriate:

“If in the near future - not necessarily in a couple of months, but in 6 months or a year from now, a new upsurge of the revolution should become a fact, the question of forming Soviets of Workers and peasant' deputies may become a live issue as a slogan of the day, and as a counterpoise to the bourgeoisie. Why? Because if there has been an upsurge of the revolution in its present phase of development, the formation of Soviets will be an issue that has come fully mature.... if (IF!) A new and powerful revolutionary upsurge takes place in the near future.”

(JVS W : Notes on Contemporary Themes Ibid; vol 9; p.366).

Given the 'putschism', and the decimation of forces, conditions were **not** ripe, as Mao alleged. As Stalin had pointed out to Trotsky:

“The opposition does not understand that the point is not at all to be the 'first' in saying a thing; running too far ahead and disorganising the revolution, but to say it at the right time and to say it in such a way that it will be taken up by the masses and put into practice.”

(JVS W: Notes On Contemporary Themes; Vol 9; p.369).

The Autumn Harvest Uprising failed. The peasant bias of Mao had ensured that with the poor organisation, the urban proletariat was not prepared by the insurrectionists. As the official party history of the period says:

“The peasants did not obtain any aid from the urban proletariat... At the time of the Hunan harvest uprising, Changsha simply had no workers' movement whatsoever.”

(Hua Kang: Chung-kuo Ta Ko-Ming-shi A History of the Great Chinese Revolution; 1932; p.366).

Consequently Mao was dismissed from the CCP CC in November 1927 (*J.Spence; Ibid; p.370*). Mao now took his surviving troops into the Jinggang mountain range bordering Jiangxi and Hunan. Having previously proclaimed ‘Socialism Now!’, Mao encountered resistance from the rich peasantry. Hence he significantly changed his philosophy. (*J.Spence; Ibid; p.371*). This Right phase of Mao, was when he developed the so called “New Democracy”. Under KMT attack, Mao shifted camp to Ruijin with the remnants of his army; located between Jiangxi and Fujian. Mao now cultivated the rich peasantry (*J.Spence Ibid; p. 372*). With **Zhu De** the **Jiangxi Soviet** was established. This was only one of about 12 set up across the country by other members of the CCP.

Despite these Soviets, overall the workers and peasants had been temporarily defeated. A period of battles between the various warlords followed. Chiang Kai-Shek leading the KMT emerged as victorious. By 1928 Chiang Kai-Shek ruled a **National Government** that ruled from Canton to Mukden (*J.Spence Search For Modern China; Ibid; p.365*). The official ideology was a virulent anti-communist, anti-imperialist nationalism.

The failed 1927 revolution gave Trotsky a chance to attack Stalin.

i) Trotsky and Zinoviev argued it was incorrect to enter a bloc with the KMT Revolutionary Bourgeoisie. Stalin replied:

“What were the Kuomintang (KMT) and its government at the first stage of the revolution in the Canton period? They were a bloc of the workers, the peasants, the bourgeois intellectuals and the national bourgeoisie. Was Canton at that time the centre of the revolutionary movement, the place d'armes of the revolution? Was it correct policy to support the Canton Kuomintang as the government of the struggle for liberation from imperialism?... Yes it is true.”

(JVS W; The International Situation and the Defence of the USSR; Speech to Joint Plenum CC and Central Control Commission CPSU(B); Aug 1, 1927. Vol 10; p.16-17).

ii) Trotsky, Kamenev & Zinoviev alleged united front retarded the revolution. Stalin replied:

“But what does a united front with the national bourgeoisie at the first stage of the colonial revolution mean? Does it mean that the Communists must not intensify the struggle of the workers and peasants against the landlords and the national bourgeoisie, that the proletariat ought to sacrifice its independence? No... A united front can only be of significance only where and only on condition that, it does not prevent the CP from conducting its independent political and organisational work, from organising the proletariat. From rousing the peasantry against the landlords, from openly organising a workers' and peasants' revolution and from preparing in this way the conditions for the hegemony of the proletariat.”

(JVS; Ibid; Vol 10; p. 17).

Stalin was well aware that the CCP was hesitant:

“I know that there are some Kuomintangists and even Chinese Communists who do not consider it possible to unleash revolution in the countryside, since they fear that if the peasantry were drawn into the revolution it would disrupt the united anti-imperialist front. That is a profound error comrades. The more quickly and thoroughly the Chinese peasantry is drawn into the revolution, the stronger and more powerful the anti-imperialist front in China.”

(Stalin; Ibid; Vol 10; p.20).

“I know that among the Chinese communists there are comrades who do not approve of workers going on strike for an improvement of their material conditions and legal status and who try to dissuade the workers from striking. (A voice: That happened in Canton and Shanghai.) That is a great mistake, comrades. It is a very serious under-estimation of the role and importance of the Chinese proletariat. This fact should be noted in the theses as something decidedly objectionable. It would be a great mistake if the Chinese Communists failed to take advantage of the present favourable situation to assist the workers to improve their material conditions and legal status, even through strikes. Otherwise, what purpose does the revolution in China serve?”

(Stalin; Ibid; Vol 10; p.20).

iii) Trotsky accused Stalin of not warning CCP against Wuhan. Stalin referred back to documents sent to Wuhan.

“As for the oppositions' assertions that the Comintern failed to warn the CCP of the possible collapse of the Wuhan KMT, that is one of the usual slanders... Permit me to quote some documents to refute the slanders of the opposition.

First Document of May 1927:

‘The most important thing now in the internal policy of the KMT is to develop the agrarian revolution systematically in all provinces particularly in Kwangtung, under the slogan of ‘All power to the peasant associations and committees in the countryside’. This is the basis for the success of the revolution and of the KMT. This is the basis for creating in China a big and powerful political and military army against imperialism and its agents. Practically the slogan of confiscating the land is quite timely for the provinces in which there is strong agrarian movement, such as the Hunan, Kwangtung, etc. Without this the extension of the agrarian revolution is impossible.’

‘It is necessary to start at once to organise 8 or 10 divisions of revolutionary peasants and workers with absolutely reliable officers. This will be a Wuhan guard force both at the front and in the rear for disarming unreliable units.. Disintegrating activities must be intensified in the rear and in Chiang Kai-Shek's units...”

“The Second Document of May 1927: *(Ed: This formed the 1926 ECCI Directive referred to earlier).*

Without an agrarian revolution victory is impossible, Without it the Central Committee of the KMT will be converted into a wretched plaything of unreliable generals. Excesses must not be combatted by means of troops, but through the peasant associations... You must not sever yourselves from the working-class and peasant associations... Some of the old leaders of the CC of the KMT are frightened by events. An increased number of new peasant and working class leaders must be drawn in from the masses into the CC of the KMT. Their bold voices will either stiffen the backs of the old leaders or result in their removal.

The present structure of the KMT must be changed... reinforced with new leaders who have come to the fore in the agrarian revolution... Dependence upon unreliable generals must be eliminated. Mobilise about 20,000 Communists, add about 50,000 revolutionary workers and peasants... Form several new army corps... If this is not done there is no guarantee against failure... Punish officers who maintain contact with Chiang Kai-Shek or who incite the soldiers against the people... Persuasion is not enough. It is time to act. If the Kuomintangists do not learn to be revolutionary Jacobins, they will perish as far as the people and the revolution are concerned."

As you see, the Comintern foresaw events it gave timely warning of the dangers and told the CCP that the Wuhan KMT would perish if the Kuomintangists failed to become revolutionary Jacobins."

(Stalin; Ibid; Vol 10; p.33-5).

Despite this defeat the Marxist-Leninist tactics and strategy outlined was correct.

Stalin pointed out, that the Opposition, with their ultra-left tactics, would not have even reached the current situation:

"The fact that the CCP has in a short period grown from a small group of 5 or 6 thousand into a mass party of 60,000 members; the fact that the CCP has succeeded in organising nearly 3,000,000 proletarians in trade unions; the fact that the CCP has succeeded in rousing the many millions of the peasantry from their torpor and in drawing tens of millions of peasants into the revolutionary peasant associations; the fact that the CCP has succeeded during this period in converting the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat from an aspiration into a reality- the fact that the CCP had succeeded in a short period of time in achieving all these gains is due among other things, to its having followed the path (of) Lenin, the path indicated by the Comintern."

(Stalin; Speech; Joint Plenum; Ibid; Vol 10; p.38).

TO CONCLUDE: IN THE CHINESE REVOLUTION STALIN PROPOSED :

A two stage National Democratic Revolution followed by the Socialist Revolution.

The allies for the First Stage would include the reforming National Bourgeoisie, in China Called the Kuomintang (KMT).

But as the National Democratic Revolution wins; and; the masses move to the Second Stage; inevitably this Revolutionary National Bourgeoisie will desert.

Leninist policy is to pre-empt the desertion; enter the Socialist phase, with agrarian revolt, before the bourgeoisie attacks.

But Stalin's advice was ignored by the CC of the CCP

In private Stalin was severely critical of the CCP

Stalin knew the lack of resolve and understanding of the leaders of the CCP including of course, **Mao Zedong**:

"The main thing now is whether or not the current Chinese CP can manage to retreat with honour from this new period (the underground beatings, executions, betrayals and provocations among their own ranks etc.) to come out hardened tempered, without splitting up, breaking into pieces, disintegrating and degenerating into a sect or a number of sects. We cannot exclude this danger at

all, nor can we exclude the possibility of an interval between this bourgeois revolution and a future bourgeois revolution- analogous to the interval that we had between 1905 and 1917. Moreover I believe that such a danger is more real.. . Why? **Because unfortunately we don't have a real or, if you like, actual Communist Party in China.** (*Our emphasis*). If you take away the middle-ranking who make good fighters but who are completely inexperienced in politics, then what is the current Central Committee of the Chinese CP (CCP)? Nothing but an amalgamation of general phrases gathered here and there not linked to one another with any line or guiding idea. I don't want to be very demanding to the CC of the CCP. I know that one can't be too demanding to it. But here is a simple demand: Fulfil the directives of the Comintern. Has it fulfilled these directives? No. No because it did not understand them, because it did not want to fulfil them and has hoodwinked the Comintern, or because it wasn't able to fulfil them. That is a fact... the current CC was forged in the period of the nationwide (democratic) revolution and received its baptism by fire during this period and it turned out to be completely unadaptable to the new agrarian phase of the revolution. The CC of the CCP does not understand the point of the new phase of the revolution. There is not a single Marxist mind in the CC of the CCP capable of understanding... The CCP CC was unable to use the rich period of the bloc with the Kuomintang in order to conduct energetic work in openly organising the revolution, the proletariat, the peasantry, the revolutionary military units, the revolutionizing of the army, the work of setting the soldiers against the generals. The CCP CC has lived off the KMT for a whole year and has... done nothing to turn the conglomerates of elements (true, quite militant) into a party, into real party...The CCP sometime babbles about the hegemony of the proletariat. But the intolerable thing is... the CCP does not have a clue (literally not a clue) about hegemony - it kills the initiative of the working masses, undermines the unauthorized actions of the peasant masses, and reduces class warfare in China to lot of big talk about the 'feudal bourgeoisie'... That is why I now believe the question of the party is the main question of the Chinese revolution.”
(76. No. 36; July 1927; *Stalin's Letters; Ibid; p.140-41*).

Stalin thought that the CC CCP was incompetent; that the CCP CC needed intense re-education and nannying. The CCP CC included Mao Zedong. Later, Stalin changed his opinion of the CC CCP. Instead of being incompetent; he thought they were anti-Marxist-Leninist.

Despite his set back in Hunan, and his demotion from the CC of the CCP in 1927, Mao rapidly continued to capture leading positions in the CCP:

“In November 1931, the First National Congress of the Chinese Workers and Peasants Soviet was held in Ruijin. That Congress elected Mao Zedong chairman of the Provisional Central Government of the Chinese Soviet Republic.”

(*Deng MaoMao; Deng Xiaoping-My father; New York; 1995; p.203*).

After the defeat of the 1927 revolution, and the criticism of the ECCI, the CCP underwent a dramatic ultra-Left shift. This was an equal, and opposite and equally disastrous turn in its own right. Hereafter the leaders of the CCP were **Wang Ming**, and **Li Li San** in an **Ultra-Left Faction**; and **Mao Zedong, Deng Xiaoping, Liu Shaoqi, Lin Biao, P'eng Chen** in the other major faction. The Mao faction won over the Ultra-Leftists. In so doing, at times it took some left-opportunist lines. But ultimately the Mao faction established a **Right Opportunist** line. This line was pro-petit bourgeois and pro-capital.

Mao accused Stalin of interference :

“Without the demise of the Third International the Chinese Revolution could not have succeeded. When Lenin was alive, the Third International was well led. After Lenin's death, the leaders of the Third International were dogmatic leaders (for instance leaders [like] Stalin, Bukharin were not that good). Only the period under Dimitrov was well led. Dimitrov's reports were well reasoned. Of course the Third International had [its] merits as well, for instance, helping various countries to establish a [communist] party. Later on [however] the dogmatists paid no attention to the special factors of various countries [and] simply transplanted everything from Russia. China [for one] suffered great losses. We used the rectification pattern for more than 10 years, criticised dogmatism [and] did things independently, and on [our own] initiative according to the spirit and essence of Marxism. [Only then] did [we] achieve the victory of the Chinese revolution. Lenin likewise did not recognise the Second International. As a result, the October revolution succeeded. I don't think we should have any more [communist] internationals. Ever since its foundation, the Cominform has done only one thing: that is to criticize Yugoslavia...”

Kang Shen interjected: It also criticised France and Japan.

Chairman Mao: But it does not mean [we] do not want to have it forever; but [if we are to have it] we'd want to have the type in the initial stage of the 3rd International [when] various countries [had their own independence], exercised their own initiative and did things according to their own circumstances and not interfering with others' business. I've talked this way with many Soviet comrades, with Yudin and Mikoyan.”

(Mao Zedong Summary of a Talk With the Representatives of Press and Publishing Circles.; 10 March 1957; In The Secret Speeches of Chairman Mao-From the Hundred Flowers to the Great Leap Forward; Ed. Roderick MacFarquhar, Timothy Cheek and Eugene Wu. Harvard, 1989, p. 255-256).

Mao and Trotsky agree that Stalin sabotaged the 1927 Revolution!

C) MAO ZE DONG ON NEW DEMOCRACY

Comrade Martens states that Mao first correctly applied revolutionary strategy in colonial-type countries. For Mao, this strategy involved a ‘**New Democracy**’. Mao coined this term during the Sino-Japanese War before the Second World War. The CCP formed a **United Front** with all forces claiming to be anti-Japanese.

To assist this Mao was made the single leader. During the anti-Japanese United Front, latent tensions between factions of the **Chinese Communist Party (CCP)** were submerged. All factions agreed that one leader was necessary. **Lui Shao-Qi** (or Lui Shao Chi), then an ally of Mao's, expressed the CP line in an interview with **Anna Louise Strong**. This was intended to popularise the CCP in the West. Here Lui Shao Qi repeats Mao's view that **Mao Sinified Marxism**:

"Mao Tse Tung's great accomplishment has been to change Marxism from a European to an Asiatic form. Marx and Lenin were Europeans, they wrote in European languages about European histories and problems, seldom discussing Asia or China. The basic principles of Marxism are undoubtedly adaptable to all countries. But to apply their general truth to concrete revolutionary practices in China is a difficult task. Mao Ze-Dong is Chinese; he analyses Chinese problems

and guides the Chinese people in their struggles to victory. He uses Marxist-Leninist principles to explain Chinese history and the practical problems of China. He is the first that has succeeded in doing so. Not only has he applied Marxist methods to solve the problems of 50 million people, but he has popularised Marxism among the Chinese people as a weapon for them to use. On every kind of problem - the nation, the peasants, strategy, the construction Of the party, literature and culture, military affairs, finance and economy, method of work, philosophy - Mao has not only applied Marxism to new conditions, but has given it a new development. He has created a Chinese or Asiatic form of Marxism, China is a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country in which vast numbers live at the edge of starvation, tilling small bits of soil. Its economy is agricultural, backward and dispersed. In attempting the transition to a more industrialised economy, China faces the competition and the pressures-economic political and military - of advanced industrial lands. This is the basic situation that affects both the relations of social classes and the methods of struggle towards any such goal as national independence and a better freer life for the Chinese. There are similar conditions in the other lands of Southeast Asia. The course chosen by China will influence them all."

(Liu Shao-chi: Interview Anna Louise Strong; "The Thought of Mao Tse Tung , " Amerasia, 6, June 1947, p.161. : Cited Donald S Zagoria: The Sino-Soviet Conflict 1956-61"; New York; 1966; p.14-15).

But we know that Lenin and Stalin had extensively analysed and studied the revolution in the East!

The composition of the Anti-Japanese United Front, was a class alliance that joined all classes willing to fight Japanese imperialism. i.e. all classes **except** the pro-Japanese comprador class of big bourgeoisie (Capitulationists); and the landlord class, who supported them; and the wavering die-hards:

The landlord class forms the main base for imperialism rule in China; it is a class which uses the feudal system to exploit and oppress the peasants obstructs China's political economic and cultural development and plays no progressive role whatsoever. Therefore the landlords as a class are a target and not a motive force of the revolution. In the present War of Resistance a section of the big landlords along with one section of the bourgeoisies (the captulationists) has surrendered to the Japanese aggressors and turned traitor, while another section of the big landlords, along with another section of the big bourgeoisie (the die-hards), is increasingly wavering even though it is still in the anti-Japanese camp. December, 1939.

(Mao Tse Tung "Selected Works"; 1960 [hereafter Mao SW] Vol 2; Peking: Chinese Revolution and Chinese Communist Party"; p.319).

The Front correctly aimed not to establish socialism; but to rid China of Japanese imperialist occupation. The attitude towards the KMT, still led by Chiang Kai-Shek, was complicated by the previous 1927 betrayal of the KMT. After the defeat in 1927, Stalin had pointed out that the revolutionary role of the KMT was finished:

The Kuomintangists have disgraced and discredited themselves by their connection with the counter-revolution... The Communists will no longer take part in the KMT if a revolution appears upon the scene again.

(JVS: "The Political Complexion of the Russian Opposition"; Vol 10; p.162).

In fact very shortly thereafter, Chiang Kai-Shek made a private visit to Japan. This was partly to ask the wealthy Madame Soong, for permission to marry her American educated daughter, Soong Mai-Ling. However also, he had talks with the Japanese Prime Minister General Tanaka, with a view to forge an alliance with Japan:

"General Tanaka intended to assist the KMT and Chiang-Kai-Shek to accomplish their aims, in return for which aid he hoped to obtain the latter's acquiescence in the proposed relations between Japan and Manchuria. For the purpose.. General Tanaka.. Gave his approval of the Northward advance. "
(M. Shigemitsu: "Japan and her Destiny"; translated by O.White; London; 1958; p.47).

Nonetheless, the CCP now made overtures to the KMT. Mao himself recognised that the policy he was proposing had to be justified to the Chinese people:

"The (national-ed) bourgeoisie... withdrew from the revolution... and turned into enemies of the people... In the present circumstances there is the possibility that the bourgeoisie will once again cooperate with us and join in the resistance to Japan, and the party of the proletariat should therefore not repel them but welcome them and revive the alliance with them."
(Mao SW: 'The tasks of the CCP In the period of the resistance to Japan'; May 1937; Vol 1; p. 271, 272)

However, to ensure the possibility of the bourgeoisie once again cooperating, Mao gave profound reassurances to the bourgeoisie. This was **incorrect** and relinquished a large degree of the independence of the CCP. Mao strove to convince the national bourgeoisie into the front:

"Capitalists should be encouraged to come into our anti-Japanese base areas and start enterprises there if they so desire. Private enterprises should be encouraged and state enterprise regarded as only one sector of the economy."
(Mao SW; Volume 2: 'On Policy'; December 1940; p. 447.)

"Some people suspect that the Chinese Communists are opposed to... the growth of private capital and the protection of private property, but they are mistaken... We have too little of capitalism... It will be necessary in the interests of the socialist progress to facilitate the development of the private capitalist sector of the economy."
(Mao SW: Vol 3; 'On Coalition Government'; April 1945; p. 282, 283).

Mao aimed to establish a new-democratic state where **ALL** the above classes would have political power. The classes forming this '**new democratic state**' comprised all classes in China opposing Japan, including the national bourgeoisie:

"The New Democratic Republic... will consist of the proletariat, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie and all those in the country who agree with the national and democratic revolution; it will be the alliance of these classes in the national and democratic revolution. the salient feature here is the inclusion of the bourgeoisie."
(Mao SW: 'The Task of the CPC In The Period of Resistance to Japan'; May 1937; Vol 1; p. 271-72)

This was therefore according to Mao to be a new type of democracy:

“In present day China, the bourgeois-democratic revolution is no longer of the old general type, which is obsolete, but one of a new special type. We call this the new-democratic revolution and it is developing in all other colonial and semi-colonial countries as well as in China. The new-democratic revolution is part of the world-proletarian revolution for it resolutely opposes imperialism. i.e. international capital. Politically it strives for the joint dictatorship of the revolutionary classes over the imperialists, traitors, and reactionaries, and opposes the transformation of Chinese society into a society under bourgeois dictatorship. Economically it aims at the nationalisation of all the big enterprises and capital of the imperialists, traitors and reactionaries and the distribution among the peasants of the land held by the landlords and the distribution among the peasants of the land while preserving private capital enterprise in general... In the present War of Resistance the anti-Japanese democratic political power of the Anti-Japanese National United Front; this is neither a bourgeois nor a proletarian one-class dictatorship of the revolutionary classes under the leadership of the proletariat. All who stand for resistance to Japan and for democracy are entitled to share in this political power, regardless of their party affiliation.

The new democratic revolution also differs from a socialist revolution in that it overthrows the rule of the imperialists, traitors and reactionaries in China, but does not destroy any section of capitalism which is capable of contributing to the anti-imperialist anti-feudal struggle.

(Mao Tse Tung: "Chinese Revolution and Chinese Communist Party"; Ibid; Volume 2; p. 326-7)

According to Mao, New Democracy was **transitional**:

“The Chinese democratic republic which we desire to establish now must be a democratic republic under the joint dictatorship of anti-imperialist and anti-feudal people held by the proletariat, that is a new-democratic republic... This new-democratic republic will be different from the old European-American form of democratic dictatorship, which is the old democratic form and already out of date. On the other hand it will also be different from the socialist republics of the Soviet type under the dictatorship of the proletariat which is already flourishing in the USSR and which moreover... Will undoubtedly become the dominant form in all the industrially advanced countries... However for a certain historical period, this form is not suitable for the revolutions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, namely the new-democratic republic. This form suits a certain historical period and is therefore transitional... It is a form which is necessary and cannot be dispensed with. January 1940.”

(Mao SW; "On New Democracy"; Volume 2; p.350)

Therefore the new democratic state was **not socialist**. But it had:

“An ultimate perspective of not capitalism but socialism or communism, since China's bourgeois-democratic revolution at the present stage is not of the old general type but is a democratic revolution of a special type - a new-democratic revolution... However it is not at all surprising.. That a capitalist economy will develop to a certain extent within Chinese society with the sweeping away of the obstacles to the development of capitalism after the victory of the revolution.. A

certain degree of capitalist development will be an inevitable result of the victory of the democratic revolution in economically backward China.
(Mao SW: "Chinese Revolution and Chinese Communist Party"; Vol 2; p.329)

But to ensure a **red facade**, Mao proclaimed his '**New Democracy**' would have socialist factors:

"What will these socialist factors be? The increasing relative importance of the proletariat and the Communist Party among the political forces in the country; leadership by the proletariat and the Communist Party which the peasantry, intelligentsia and the urban petty bourgeoisie already accept or are likely to accept; and the state sector of the economy owned by the working people.
(Mao SW: "Chinese Revolution and Chinese Communist Party"; Vol 2; p.330)

Mao did recognise a **second stage**, that of the socialist revolution. However - although Mao says its arrival is **inevitable**, he deferred the Socialist revolution to some nebulous future when the 'necessary conditions are ripe':

"The Chinese revolutionary movement led by the CCP embraces the two stages, i.e., the democratic and the socialist revolutions which are essentially different revolutionary processes, and that the second process can be carried through only after the first had been completed. The democratic revolution is the necessary preparation of the socialist revolution, and the socialist revolution is the inevitable sequel to the democratic revolution."
(Mao SW: "Chinese Revolution and Chinese Communist Party"; Vol 2; p.330-31).

But Marxism-Leninism holds that a state of the **dictatorship of the proletariat** is necessary to establish socialism:

"The revolution will be unable to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie to maintain its victory and to push forward to the final victory of socialism unless... it creates a special organ in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat as its principle mainstay."
(JVS W: 'The Foundations of Leninism'; April-May 1924; Vol 6; p. 112).

For Marxist-Leninists transition from 'new democracy' [the joint dictatorship of several classes, including the national bourgeoisie] - to the dictatorship of the proletariat must, involve **class struggle against the resistance of the national bourgeoisie**.

Maoism rejects this Marxist-Leninist view, holding that the contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class can be resolved peacefully:

"The contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class is one between exploiter and exploited and is by nature antagonistic. But in the concrete conditions of China this antagonistic contradiction between the two classes, if properly handled, can be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and be resolved by peaceful means."
(Mao SW: Vol 5; 'On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People'; February 1957; p.386)

The "correct handling" which can resolve these contradictions by peaceful means is:

"The policy of uniting with, criticising and educating the national bourgeoisie."
(*Mao SW Ibid; p. 286*)

Mao defines this as a policy of the "**Ideological remoulding**" (*Mao SW Ibid; p. 403*) of the national bourgeoisie. This is the same theory of the Soviet revisionist **NIKOLAI BUKHARIN** of the capitalists growing peacefully into socialism:

"According to Bukharin's theory of the capitalists' peaceful growth into socialism... the irreconcilable antagonism of the class interests between the exploiters and the exploited disappears, the exploiters grow into socialism. (**but**)... there have been no cases in history where dying classes have voluntarily departed from the scene. there have been no cases in history where the dying bourgeoisie has not exerted all its remaining strength to preserve its existence."
(*Mao SW Ibid; p. 403*).

The New Democratic State was apparently to differ from all states before. It was the harbinger, Mao said, of **all states to be** formed from revolutions in colonial and semi-colonial countries (*Mao; Ibid; p.351*). The state reflected all classes that participated in the revolution.

What **economic tasks** will the new democratic state carry out?

Mao accepted the programme of the Manifesto of the Kuomintang's [KMT] First National Congress held during the period of KMT-Communist cooperation. This incorporated Sun Yat Sen's reinterpreted **Three People's Principles**. (*Mao SW: Vol 2: "On New Democracy"; Vol 2; p.363*). Accordingly, the economic tasks are akin to a state capitalist nationalisation:

"It will own the big banks and the big industrial and commercial enterprises... Enterprises such as the banks, railways and airlines whether Chinese owned or foreign-owned, which are either monopolistic in character or too big for private management, shall be operated and administered by the state so that private capital cannot dominate the livelihood of the people: this is the main principle of the regulation of capital..."

In the new-democratic republic under the leadership of the proletariat the state enterprises will be of a socialist character and will constitute the leading force in the whole national economy but the republic will neither confiscate capitalist private property in general nor forbid the development of such capitalist production as does not dominate the livelihood of the people for China's economy is still very backward. The republic will... confiscate the land of the landlords and distribute it to those peasants having little or no land, carry out Sun Yat Sen's slogan of '*Land to the Tiller*', abolish feudal relations in the rural areas, and turn the land over to the private ownership of the peasants... In general socialist agriculture will be established at this stage, though various types of cooperative enterprises developed on the basis of land to the tiller will contain elements of socialism. China's economy must develop along the path of the regulation of capital and the equalization of landownership, and must never be privately owned by a few... We must never establish a capitalist society of the European-American type."

(*Mao SW: Vol 2: "On New Democracy"; Vol 2; p.353*).

Mao reassured the bourgeoisie that the CCP will:

“Never push aside anyone who is revolutionary; we shall persevere in the united front and practice long term cooperation with all those classes, strata, political parties and groups, and individuals willing to fight Japan to the end... The Three People’s Principles of Nationalism, Democracy and the People’s Livelihood as reinterpreted by Sun Yat Sen in 1924 are basically similar to the communist political programme for the stage of the democratic revolution in China.”
(Mao SW, "On New Democracy"; Vol 2; p.357-8; 362).

He brands the “Left phrase mongerers”, saying they call for “One stage revolution”. There is no talk - as there is with Lenin - of moving into the second stage as the bourgeoisie start to desert the first phase of the revolution! (See below).

Mao understood Marxism-Leninism. But Mao rejected it!

Mao obscures how long it takes to reach socialism, and then communism. Since this time scale is not defined scientifically by Mao, they varied according to the short term political convenience, of the moment. This is shown by his varying use of time required to achieve socialism and communism - as below.

When speaking in 1955, according to Mao socialism is assured in 1955:

"By the end of 1955 "The victory of socialism will be practically assured."
(‘Socialist Upsurge in China’s countryside’ (p.159-60); Cited by Roderick MacFarquhar: "Origins of the Cultural Revolution"; Volume 1: "Contradictions Among The People 1956-57"; Oxford; 1974; p.268 Vol 1; p.15

But by 1957 Mao asks whether socialism will EVER be achieved!

“The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie the class struggle between various political forces, and the class struggle in the ideological field between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will still be long and devious and at times may become very acute.. In this respect the question whether socialism or capitalism will win is still not really settled.”
(Mao From Communist China, 1955-9: Policy Documents with analysis: Harvard; 1962; p.288 Cited MacFarquhar; Vol 1; Ibid; p. 160).

Suddenly by 1958, Communism is 10 years away! This astonishing Utopian assertion comes with the so called ‘**GREAT LEAP FORWARD**’. With the sharpening of struggle between factions within the CCP, Mao declares that:

"Our comrades must be made to understand the theories of Marx, Engels Lenin and Stalin on the relations of production consist of the interrelationships among three elements: the system of ownership, the interrelationship [among the people]... and distribution. I don’t think that economic theory has clarified this properly. The Soviet Union, too has failed to resolve this matter since the October Revolution. The interrelationship among the people when labouring is the important element in the relations of property. To stress relations of production and not stress [human] interrelationships is impossible. Equality among people will not automatically emerge following the transformation of ownership. If China fails to solve the relationship between people, the Great Leap Forward will be impossible... We should consider the question of eliminating the

wage system and restoring the supply system. The army of the past had no salaries, no Sundays off, no eight hour work system; superiors and subordinates were as one; the army had become one with the people, and thus we were able to mobilize tens of thousand of people. This Communist spirit is very good. If human beings live only to eat, isn't that like dogs eating shit? What meaning is there to life if you don't help others a bit, or don't practice a bit of communism? If the wage system is eliminated, there will be, one, food to eat- nobody will die - two, physical health... We should put into practice some of the ideals of utopian socialism. The life of Protestant Puritans was very hard. Sakyamuni who created Buddhism was also a product of an oppressed people... The people's communes contain the sprout of communism, When products are plentiful we will implement communist [distribution] of grain, cotton and edible oils... the workers beat drums and gong and don't ask for piece rate wages. All of these are the sprouts of communism and they destroy the system of bourgeois right.. Probably in about 10 years our productions will be very bountiful and the people's morality will be very noble; then we can practice communism in eating, clothing and housing. Eating without paying in public mess halls is communism."

(In "The Secret Speeches of Chairman Mao - From the Hundred Flowers to the Great Leap Forward"; Ed. Roderick MacFarquhar, Timothy Cheek and Eugene Wu. Harvard, 1989." p.413; 414;418;419)

The Great Helmsman Mao, disparaged Marxist-Leninists on Communism:

"I would like to ask that the book, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on Communism (Stalin didn't do very well) be printed in every province and widely distributed.. It's very enlightening, although there are still some inadequacies because of the limitations imposed by conditions in the [*authors' times*]. They had little experience, so naturally their views are vague and inexplicit. Don't think the ancestors all fart fragrantly and fart no foul farts... The Soviet Union has had 41 years of experience; we've had 31 years. We should break free of superstition."
("Secret Speeches of Chairman Mao"; Ibid; p.441)

Criticising USSR Mao counterposed a Utopian' approach in China:

"The Soviet Union practices the use of high rewards and heavy punishments, emphasising only material incentives. We now practice socialism and have the sprouts of communism. Schools factories and neighbourhoods can establish people's communes. In a few years big communes will be organised to include everyone... Too great a reliance on material rewards with high rewards and heavy punishments won't do. We won't hand out medals from now on. Officers should go down to the ranks to be ordinary soldiers.."
("Secret Speeches of Chairman Mao"; Ibid; p.410. p.408).

Is this consistent with Marx, Engels, Lenin And Stalin?

Is this Marxism-Leninism?

NO! MAO WAS NOT A MARXIST-LENINIST.

D) CPC, THE KUOMINTANG AND THE AMERICANS - SECOND WORLD WAR AND CIVIL WAR

The Japanese had long coveted China and had engineered various provocations in Manchuria. Finally Japan invaded China in 1931. The KMT did initially resist. Chiang Kai-Shek sabotaged the anti-Japanese struggle, despite the masses who wished to counter-attack the Japanese invaders:

"In September 1931 Chiang Kai-Shek was going all out to conduct the campaign of encirclement and suppression against the Red Army, the Japanese militarists stepped up their war of aggression against China. On September 18th the Japanese invaders launched an attack against Northeastern China. But the Chiang Kai-Shek government in Nanjing went so far as to issue a "no-clash" order, prohibiting the North-Eastern Army, led by Gen. Zhang Xueliang from putting up resistance. As a result, the hundreds of thousands of troops of the North-eastern army retreated to areas south of the Shanhaiguan Pass without firing a single shot... After occupying Northeastern China without fighting a battle in January 1932, the Japanese troops... attacked Shanghai. On March 3rd they captured the city. On May 5th, Chiang Kai-Shek signed the Truce Treaty of Wusong and Shanghai, permitting Japan to station troops in Shanghai, promising to ban the nationwide anti-Japanese movements and ordering the anti-Japanese 19th Route Army.. to leave for Fujian to 'suppress the Communist Party."
(Deng Mao Mao; "Deng Xiaoping - My Father"; New York; 1995; p.195).

Chiang Kai-Shek's mission to General Tanaka has been discussed already. Even the CCP itself was quite late in resisting the Japanese. The Ultra-Leftist strategy of **Wang Ming** and **Li Li San** - who were at this time the leading members of the **CC of the CCP** - was in part responsible for this delay:

"In September 1932 the Provisional Central Committee of the CPC called on the people of China to arm themselves and to resist the aggression of the Japanese imperialists... However under the control of Wang Ming the CC headed by Bo Gu wrongly... put forward the slogan of "Defend the Soviet Union With Arms!" At home it advocated "Down With All!" It held that the conditions had been ripe for seizing key cities and waging general strike. Because of these erroneous propositions and slogans the Party lost the opportunity to maintain close contact with the anti-Japanese masses. On the other hand Chiang Kai-Shek took the opportunity to suppress large numbers of party members. They were arrested and killed."
(Deng Mao Mao; "Deng Xiaoping - My Father"; New York; 1995; p.196).

Meanwhile the Japanese made rapid territorial gains and established a puppet government supported by Chiang Kai-Shek. Meanwhile Chiang Kai-Shek attacked, instead of the Japanese, the CCP. When the Japanese created the "Mukden Incident" of September 1931, they created a pretext to invade, from Korea into South Manchuria. The Japanese used the ex-Emperor Puyi as a puppet:

"In 1932 the Japanese established the "Manchukouo" puppet state under Japanese control.. Chiang Kai-Shek in spite of the strong opposition of Chinese [to the Japanese aggression] launched the fourth campaign... against the Red

Army... The Red Army... led by Zhou Enlai and Zhu De won".
(*Deng Mao Mao; "Deng Xiaoping - My Father"; New York; 1995; p.210-211*)

But the masses refused to let the KMT policy stand. On December 9, 1935 a huge demonstration in Peking occurred. These "**December Ninthers**" lit a nation wide demand for anti-Japanese actions (*Spence Ibid; p. 420*). But the Japanese continued to over-run the KMT. Despite the masses, the KMT cravenly signed the Taggu Truce in May 1933. This ceded Northeastern Hebei to Japan and created a large "Demilitarized Zone" patrolled by "non-hostile Chinese troops".

Meanwhile Chiang Kai-Shek continued his attacks against the CCP. He forced the "Bandit Suppression Headquarters" to drive into the heart of the **Jianxi Soviet**. By 1934, the blockade was serious. The CCP withdrew from the situation in a military retreat. This was led by Zhou Enlai, Lin Biao, and Peng Dehuai. This was the famous "**Long March**" of October 16th, 1934. The 80,000 strong army broke out of the blockade and went some 6,000 miles in 370 days. (*Spence Ibid; p. 404-405*)

The Command of the CCP military had been in the hands of Li Teh (Real name Otto Braun) who had been sent from the Comintern, in 1933. (*Deng Mao Mao Ibid; p.228-239*) The portrayal of the Maoists is that Li Teh bore the responsibility for the need for the Forced Retreat. This is unlikely. At the same time the Maoists blame Li Teh for:

"Suddenly changing the policy of relying on the base areas and ordering the Red Army to leave the Central Revolutionary Base Area without conducting thorough ideological mobilization among the cadres and the masses in advance."
(*Deng Mao Mao, Ibid; p.229*).

But the encirclement was complete and the break through had to be made. Also the maneuver had to be completed in as much secrecy as possible. This makes these criticisms invalid. The real problem that the faction around Wang Ming posed for the Maoists, was that they were in favour of a more open recognition of the USSR. Most of them had been trained in the USSR, and they went by the title the "**Returned Bolsheviks**", or the "28 Bolsheviks". Furthermore and more problematic for Mao, they had criticised the Mao faction for his army tactics and for his favouring of the rich peasantry:

"There was considerable tension between Mao and his followers on the one hand and the "28 Bolsheviks" on the other... They opposed his views on guerilla warfare, argued that the local armed forces should be disbanded and that a single powerful united Red Army should be created, and were dogmatic that land reform should dispossess former rich and middle peasants as well as landlords."
(*D.S.G.Goodman: "Deng Xiaoping and the Chinese Revolution, a political Biography"; London; 1994; p.34*)

These criticisms of Mao were doubtless in part correct. The factions of the CCP around Wang Ming, Li Teh and Bo Gu were now in open enmity with that of Mao. At this point left the CC of the CCP held the **Zunyi** meeting between January 15th-17th 1935. It was at this meeting that Mao finally established his hold on the very centre of the CCP.

The forced retreat of the Long March had defeated - for now - the KMT attack on the CCP. The KMT came under further considerable pressure to collaborate to defeat The Japanese invaders. The Manchurian war lord, Zhang Xueliang kidnapped Chiang Kai-Shek to force the KMT to cooperate with the CCP. In December 1936, Zou EnLai negotiated with Zhang and stated that the leadership should be under Chiang, for a national United Front Government (*Spence; Ibid; p.423*). As the Japanese entered into Eastern China as well, pressure mounted for opposition. By July 1937, there was an agreement between the CCP and the KMT to cooperate to resist the Japanese. Given Kai-Shek's attacks, and his hidden relations with the Japanese, this was a doomed enterprise. However, this marked the start of the **Sino-Japanese War**. The Red Army was designated the Eighth Route Army (*Spence; Ibid; p.460*). But it was a fragile alliance.

Even though the KMT was poorly led, and had links with some pro-Japanese landlords; it was supported by the USA. Initially the KMT refused to join a United Front with the CCP. But in September 1937, after the Japanese assault on Shanghai, an agreement was reached between the KMT and the CCP Red Army at **Yan'an** Northern base area. That base area was held by the Eighth Route army. The CPC and KMT pledged cooperation in a united front against Japanese imperialism.

The basis of the United Front was the "Three Principles of the People" of **Sun Yat Sen**. Even though it was correct to unite with all forces fighting Japanese imperialism, the CCP incorrectly threw away any semblance of a correct strategy by making major concessions of principle, thereby hampering its independence, as seen in its promises:

"The CCP pledged to restrain class struggle; to abolish the autonomous regions of another Soviet [the Shaanxi Soviet]; to renounce the use of armed struggle for soviet formation; and renounce the seizing of landlord holdings."
(*Jonathan Spence: "The Search For Modern China"; 1990; New York; p.460*)

As the **Sino-Japanese war** became part of the **Second World War**, the situation again changed. Soon the KMT attacked the CCP New Fourth Army, in the **Yangzi River** area in January 1941. Despite massive losses, the CCP remained in the Front. The decision to stay in The Front even now, reflected the desire of the CCP to achieve an alliance with the USA.

Both the USSR and USA had aided the KMT Government at Chongqing, and the USSR aided the CCP at Yan'an. Following the fall of Burma, and the loss of KMT troops, Chongqing was waning. After the Japanese attack of 1944, **Operation Ichigo ("Number One")**, Chongqing weakened.

At this time the USA began to look to the YAN'AN CCP.

From the USA perspective the imperialists had a choice. On the one hand the CCP had fought well against the Japanese, but carried the stigma of the name "Communist". On the other hand, the KMT were definitely capitalist, but were corrupt and had not engaged in the fight well.

General Joseph Stillwell urged support to the CCP, but Chiang Kai-Shek obstructed this. Stillwell was removed in favour of **General Albert Wedemeyer**, and **Ambassador Hurley** pulled away from Yan'an. The European war was almost won by the Allies. The **Yalta Meeting** in February 1945 signalled the entry of the USSR into the Asian war.

But the destruction of **Hiroshima and Nagasaki** signalled the USA intent, to deny the USSR a foothold in Asia. The USA and the KMT instructed the Japanese not to surrender to either USSR troops in Manchuria or the CCP. After the Japanese surrender, the KMT installed puppets who had been supporting Japanese fascism. Disillusionment mounted. Mao met Chiang Kai-Shek at Chongqing, escorted by the USA ambassador Hurley in August 1945. But this did not yield any stable compromise. Chiang Kai-Shek openly attacked the CCP in November 1945.

Ambassador Hurley resigned in November accusing secret USA advisers of CCP sympathy. Indeed some of the USA leaders had understood by now that the CCP was not Communist. But the KMT continued to attack the CCP. General **Marshall** of the USA tried to mediate a ceasefire between the CCP and the KMT. Although an initial agreement was reached, it broke down in January 1947.

Links between Ya'nán and the USA had grown during the war. Chiang's greed and corruption as well as the inefficiency and incompetence of the KMT troops had alienated the USA:

"Chiang Kai Shek's action in virtually putting a monetary price on his continuing in the war aided the increasing disenchantment with China in Washington. Henry Morgenthau (*Secretary of the Treasury*) opposed the loan for the same reason as Gauss (*US Ambassador to China*), because as he told the President, China had no way of using it and it would be ineffective to control inflation...

"My God" wrote Stillwell, "50 million gold to build their air fields and a 50 million gold squeeze!"

(*Barbara Tuchman : "Sand against the Wind. Stillwell and the American Experience in China 1911-1945"; London; 1985; 528-9*)

The situation demanded re-thinking. USA Ambassador Gauss put it as follows:

"It appears that we are to be faced inevitably with the problem of determining whether the Chinese Communists are to be supplied with American arms and equipment in the struggle against Japan. Since this would have to be done against the will of Chiang Kai-Shek", Gauss pointed out, "the decision could bring about his downfall".

Stillwell stated his position on the Communists flatly and frankly in a memorandum for Hurley, "The 8th Group Army (Reds) will be used. There must be no misunderstanding on this point. They can be brought to bear where there will be no conflict with the Central Government (KMT) troops about. They must be accepted as a part of the team during the crisis."

(*Tuchman; Ibid; p. 619*)

As the British Communist Alan Winnington noted, Mao courted the USA. Mao was opposed by some of the CCP including **Peng Dehuai**, who were much more pro-USSR. Mao however interviewed the American diplomat **John S. Service** who reported Mao as saying:

"America needs an export market for their heavy industry and these specialised manufactures. She also needs an outlet for capital investment. China needs to build up her own market and raise the living standards of her own people.. America is not only the most suitable country to assist this economic

development of China: she is also the only country fully able to participate."
(Cited by Alan Winnington: "Breakfast With Mao – Memoirs of a foreign correspondent"; London; 1986; p.72).

This type of reassurance by Mao convinced the USA imperialists that Mao was, as Stalin called him, "A radish communist - red on the outside and white on the inside".

It reassured the USA that Mao was not going to turn against the interests of the USA. Mao never did turn against the USA imperialists.

As Tuchman notes:

"Few believed the Chinese Communists were "real" communists... **President Roosevelt**... in a letter to Captain Carlson (Military Observers Mission) said :
"I am hoping and praying for a real working out of the situation with the so-called Communists."
(Tuchman; *Ibid*; p.621).

Stalin certainly agreed that the CCP was not "communist":

"Stalin often said that the Russian and Chinese revolutions were two different matters."

(M.S.Kapitsa *China Specialist Soviet Ministry Foreign Affairs 1940 onwards. Cited In: Sergei N. Goncharov, John W. Lewis, Xue Litai : "Stalin, Mao and the Korean War - Uncertain partners"; Stanford; 1993. p.25).*

"Stalin did not consider Mao a true Marxist and always suspected that the Chinese revolution would mutate "into something else", meaning something anti-Marxist and anti-Soviet."

(M.S. Kapitska; *Cited "Uncertain Partners"; p.8).*

Stalin had understood the real desires of Mao regarding the USA. Stalin sent a personal envoy to Mao and China, **Ivan V.Kovalev**; former People's Commissar for Transportation. Kovalev reported only to Stalin. He had the highest entry into CCP circles. His reports to Stalin naturally included the information about the USA, and also CCP responses to the **Cominform** exposure of **Tito**:

"In the 1940's reliable information was given to Mao and Zhou En Lai about the affiliation with US intelligence of several Americans who were staying in Yan'an and were receiving important information there. Yet in spite of warning Mao and Zhou did nothing to isolate them."

Cited "Uncertain partners"; p.303.

"Stalin directly inquired about the Chinese position on the "Yugoslav Issue"... Kovalev (replied) to Stalin...

In 1947 Mao had sent two top lieutenants **Lu Dingyi** and **Liu Ningyi** to Yugoslavia and [Kovalev] inferred from this that Mao wanted to understand "How Yugoslavia which had declared itself to be a socialist country, might find a way, under the conditions of severe struggle between the camps of socialism and

imperialism, to establish friendly relations with the imperialists countries, the USA and England."
(Kovalev; cited "Uncertain Partners"; *Ibid*; p.33).

The CCP was "running with the fox and hunting with the hare", as an English phrase goes. Which one would give the most? The USSR or the USA?
Principles be damned! Mao's tactics were indeed reminiscent of the Titioites.

In an obvious attempt to force the pace of USA recognition, as early as 1946, Zhou En Lai warned the special US envoy, General George C Marshall (Chief of Staff of army) that:

"We will certainly "lean to one side". However the extent of [our leaning to the Soviet side] depends on your policy to us."
(Cited "Uncertain partners"; *Ibid*; p 45).

This "shopping around" of the CCP, was in marked contrast to the correct war time behaviour of such as **Enver Hoxha** of Albania.

The CCP actively tried to attach themselves to the USA. But, now, as the war was ended, the USA had become 'cooler'. The pro-Mao lobby in the USA had been blocked by pressure from the pro-KMT lobby. In the interim therefore, the CCP needed to gain some ground. The CCP now moved Left.

The CCP launched a **Land Reform** which gained for them the peasantry in Northern Jangsu, Hebei, Shandong. (Spence; *Ibid*; p.491-493).

The seizure of the lands of the Japanese and their collaborators, was huge in just Manchuria alone (Spence; *Ibid*; p.497). This assisted the CCP to gain the masses.

Manchuria had been ceded by the Yalta Agreement, to a USSR occupation. The USSR now assisted the CCP by allowing the CCP and not the KMT to occupy key areas (Sergei N. Goncharov, John W. Lewis, Xue Litai: "Stalin, Mao & the Korean War"; Stanford; 1993; p.11-14).

Although the KMT did occupy Yan'an, the USSR then assisted the CCP further, with arms and funds. **Lin Biao** used this to build the Peoples' Liberation Army (PLA).

The KMT, in desperation, staved off a crisis by printing money. This provoked a severe inflation and major labour unrest. By 1948, the CCP and PLA launched a conventional frontal war on the KMT. Chiang Kai-Shek retreated to the island of Taiwan, recalling the retreat of the Southern Ming court from the Manchu invasions 500 years earlier.

On October 1 1949, **THE PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA (PRC)** was instituted In Peking, by Mao Zedong.

By 1954 a constitution was enacted by a newly elected **National Peoples' Congress (NPC)**. The NPC put the First 5-Year Plan.

3. THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA (PRC) AND MAO'S NEW STATE

A) THE CLASS ALLIANCE OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

The CCP was a **class coalition** made up of many factions. Even at the proclamation of the PRC, Mao's previous opponents from 1927, were still within the CCP. As MacFarquhar puts it:

"In 1956, the Chinese top leadership included men like Zhou En Lai and Chang Wen-t'ien, who had been bitter opponents of Mao in the early 1930's. Men like Li Li-San and Wang Ming who had been leaders of the CCP were still members of the CC."
(MacFarquhar; *Ibid*; Vol 1: *Ibid*; p.46).

What Factions Were There In The CCP?

i) There were no Marxist-Leninists left in the CC of CCP

MacFarquhar notes that the one person that Mao purged, early after the PRC was established was **Gao Gang**. (MacFarquhar; *Ibid*; Vol 1: *Ibid*; p.46)

Gao Gang's removal in 1953, eliminated one of the few potential remaining Marxist-Leninists. Stalin had tried previously to protect Gang from Mao (See "*Uncertain Partners*" p.68-69). Mao purged him after Gang's attack upon **Bo Yibo** minister of Finance.

Bo Yibo was supported by Mao in being "soft" on capitalists, in the tax reforms proposed at the National Conference On Financial and Economic Work in 1953:

"Since the beginning of 1953 Bo Yibo's tax reform proposals had created a furore in the leadership... They were soft on former capitalists and the private sector but also they would alter the balance of fiscal advantage away from the state sector back to the private sector, and force the former to compete more directly with the latter.. Gao's comments on Bo were trenchant... Bo's defence... came from Mao."
(D.S.G.Goodman: "*Deng Xiaoping and the Chinese revolution. A political biography*"; London; 1994; p.52)

ii) The faction of the pro-"Soviet" Russian forces.

Peng Dehuai, and **Chen Yun**, represented the small section of the CC of the CCP who still had allegiance to the USSR. But because by this stage the USSR had fallen into revisionism under Khrushchev, objectively this Chinese faction could not be considered any longer a Marxist-Leninist force. This - because the Khrushchev forces had dismantled socialist property relations in the countryside. They were busily dismantling socialist property relations and socialist planning in the state as a whole. The state of the USSR had fallen from the control of the workers and peasants of the USSR. (*The economic basis of this destruction of socialism has been extensively documented by W.B.Bland in "The Restoration of Capitalism In The Soviet Union"; originally printed 1980; reprinted Alliance Number 14; February 1995; North America*).

This force, objectively represented pro-USSR compradors. The removal of Peng Dehuai eliminated a major pro-Soviet force in the CCP leadership.

iii) The National Capitalist class.

The question is often asked as to which faction **Liu Shaoqi** belonged?

Liu Shaoqi was **not** a Marxist-Leninist. For instance, although during the civil war, the land reform helped to establish CCP power :

"(After the) destruction of the old Kuomintang (KMT) power structure, (land reform) enabled the CCP to extend its power to villages throughout the land. The thought reform and five "anti-campaigns" established CCP dominance over the urban intelligentsia and bourgeoisie by the end of 1952."
(MacFarquhar R. "Origins of The Cultural Revolution"; Vol 1; Ibid; p.16).

Liu Shaoqi was critical even of this. At the 16-24 November CC Conference in 1953; Liu Shaoqi could only say:

"Our present desire to change two forms of ownership and abolish two forms of private ownership - the transformation of the system of private ownership by small producers, that is, individual ownership by peasants, into the system of collective ownership; and the capitalist system of ownership into the state system of ownership by the whole people - (had brought) disquietitude and unrest to all the people excepting the working class in the whole country".
(MacFarquhar R. "Origins of The Cultural Revolution"; Vol 1; Ibid; p.21).

This is hardly the stance of a Marxist-Leninist. **Liu represented the national capitalist class** who promoted indigenous industry.

As seen, Mao also represented an approach initially favourable to national capitalists. However Mao "leaned" to the USA. He did **not** choose to "lean to the USSR".

Mao obstructed the moves to expropriate USA based foreign capital. Both the Liu Shaoqi section; and the Peng Dehuai section of the CC of the CCP were fiercely attacked by **Mao** and **Lin Biao**. As seen, Mao had previously been in favour of the USA over the USSR, in the Second World War as allies. Objectively then, Mao was a pro-USA force within the international communist movement.

Deng Xiaoping was a close ally of Mao in the struggles of Mao and Deng in 1933 against the "**28 Bolsheviks**":

"In 1933... Deng found himself in opposition to the CCP leadership on almost all counts. In particular he argued that it was necessary to pursue a lenient policy towards the relatively prosperous peasant both to ensure that the CCP had sufficient support to ensure that it could implement land reform and because as a guerilla force the CCP required a sound economic base for its own sustenance.. The CCP leadership attacked Mao... and Deng".
(Goodman Ibid; p.34-5).

But increasingly after the Great Leap Forward, Deng came to represent that section of the national capitalist class, who rejected compromising to a large extent with the USA.

Zhou En Lai similarly played a shifting role, at times supporting the Liu faction (eg being against Mao's attacks on planning); but at critical moments he sided with the Mao faction.

The CCP was a complex class alliance. As events unfolded, it became clear that it was dominated by uncompromising political representatives of national capitalist and some national bourgeoisie who were prepared to compromise with USA capital.

The capitalist class had its own representatives within the CCP; but in addition they had separate "democratic" political parties.

B) THE CCP CONSOLIDATES THE CAPITALIST CLASSES

If Mao was a Marxist-Leninist the PRC would have gone now into the second stage, towards socialism. But Mao built "New Democracy" as he had promised - with the capitalist class.

i) In The Countryside

Mao and Liu Shaoqi and Zhou En-Lai, all wished to "**collectivize**". This was acceptable to the CCP CC for some very pragmatic reasons. **Firstly**, because of the imperative of:

"The need to obtain control of crop surpluses which were vital to the industrialisation programme-as payment for machinery imports as raw materials for light industry, and as food for the growing numbers of urban workers."
(MacFarquhar R. "Origins of The Cultural Revolution"; Vol 1; Ibid; p.17).

Secondly, both sectors of the party had no need to placate landlordism. In fact, the CCP had already dealt with landlords in the anti-Japanese United Front. The veneer of "collectivisation" helped to deflect the resentment of the impoverished peasantry. Mao:

"Everyone has noticed that in recent years there has been a spontaneous and constant growth of capitalist elements in the countryside and that new peasants have sprung up everywhere. Many well to do middle peasants are striving to become rich ones. Many poor peasants lacking sufficient means of production are still not free from the toils of poverty; some are in debt others selling or renting their land. If this tendency goes unchecked.. peasants who have lost their land and who are still having difficulties will complain."
(MacFarquhar R. "Origins of The Cultural Revolution"; Vol 1; Ibid; p.16-17).

Thirdly, "collectivisation" did **not** threaten "class harmony". What form did this "collectivisation" take? The form was **Agricultural Producers Cooperative (APC)**. In these **APC**, private property relations continued. They were disguised under the term of "dividends":

"Peasants received a dividend according to his relative contribution of land, tools, animals.. The policy [adopted] was of restricting rather than liquidating rich peasants. In contrast to the forced deportation and killing of Russian kulaks, Chinese rich peasants.. were treated.. Mildly."
(F.C.Teiwes Chapter 1: The Establishment and Consolidation of the new Regime 1949-1957. In Ed R.MacFarquhar : "The Politics of China 1949-1989"; Cambridge; 1993; p.59)

A limited form of agricultural improvement, should not divert us from the fact that in essence the second stage of the revolution had not been embarked upon.

Actually the move to the second socialist stage was sabotaged.

The so called "**Socialist Development**" put agriculture before industry. Mao expressed it as putting "*Green Leaves Before Red Flowers*":

"We've solved the theoretical problem in Marxism. First take care of agriculture while at the same time taking care of heavy industry. The arguments Khrushchev had with Molotov were precisely over too much heavy industry. We take a road opposite to that of the Soviet Union: we first take care of agriculture in order to facilitate industrial development; we first take care of the green leaves and then the red flowers."

(Ed R MacFarquhar, T Cheek, E Wu. Harvard 1989; "*Secret Speeches Of Chairman Mao*"; p.423).

ii) In The City

Pro-Japanese capital related ventures were all expropriated immediately. All other imperialist owned properties including USA linked comprador capital was not touched. And national capitalist class capital was not touched. The formerly pro-Japanese property and assets had formed the basis of the state owned sector:

"The Central People's Government led the people of the whole country in carrying out a series of reforms.. The confiscation of enterprises formerly belonging to the bureaucrat-capitalist who worked hand in glove with the Kuomintang and their conversion into socialist state enterprises."

(Liao Kai-lung, "*From Yen-an to Peking*"; Peking; 1954; p.156-157)

But as already said, those enterprises owned by imperialist other than the Japanese , and by compradors dependent upon imperialism other than the Japanese, were NOT nationalised:

"Enterprises financed by foreign capital were allowed to operate provided they abided by the laws and decrees of the Central People's Government."

(Liao Kai-lung, "*From Yen-an to Peking*"; Peking; 1954; p.156-156).

Even during the Korea war of 1950-53, when US and Chinese armed forces were in actual conflict US owned enterprises were only placed under state control and NOT nationalised:

"When the US used the Korean war as a pretext to freeze our overseas assets and impose an economic blockade and embargo upon us, our government retaliated with the announcement on December 28th 1950, that control would exerted over property belonging to the US imperialists."

(Liao Kai-lung, "*From Yen-an to Peking*"; Peking; 1954; p.157).

By September 1953, Mao equated "socialism" with "**State Capitalism**":

"The transformation of capitalism into socialism is to be accomplished through state capitalism."

(Mao SW, Vol 5; "*The Only Road For Transformation of Capitalist Industry and Commerce*"; September 1953; p.112.

"State capitalism... is to be put into practice gradually so as to attain socialist ownership by the whole people."

(Mao SW, Volume 5; 1977: "On the Draft Constitution of the People's Republic of China"; Peking 1954; p.143).

Liu Shaoqi was in no disagreement, as was enshrined in Article 6 of the Draft Constitution of the People's Republic of China. (See *Report On Constitution by Liu Shaoqi; Peking; 1962; p.66*).

All capital that was not fully expropriated, was converted into **JOINT STOCK VENTURES WITH THE STATE** however. This did allow a veneer of not being "private". Profit termed "bonuses", was now paid to "managers" not "owners". The enterprises were operated jointly by the state and private capital:

"The advanced form of state capitalism in China is called a state-private enterprise. This is the principle way through which the transition of capitalist industry and commerce into socialist enterprises is being effected... A joint state-private enterprise is one in which the state invests and to which it assigns personnel to share in management with the capitalists... A fixed rate of interest was paid by the state for the total investment of the capitalists in the joint state-private enterprises... The interest is fixed at a rate of 5% per annum".
(Kuan Ta-Tung; "The Socialist Transformation of capitalist industry and Commerce in China"; Peking; 1960; pp. 75, 84, 86-87).

The Chinese national capitalist class not only had no objection to Mao's 'socialism', in which the state invested in their enterprises and guaranteed their profits, they welcomed it:

"Why were there increasing numbers of capitalists who petitioned of their own free will to have their enterprises changed over to joint state-private operation?.. The statistics of 64 factories in various parts of China which had gone over to joint operation earlier than others revealed that their profits were increasing.. Taking their profit in 1950 as 100, it was... 306 in 1953... The capitalists paraded with cymbal and drum, while sending in their petitions for the change over of their enterprise."
(Kuan Ta-Tung; *Ibid*; pp.78-79, 84).

By 1954 Mao was claiming that:

"Socialism already exists in our country today".

(Mao SW; "On the Draft Constitution of the PRC"; *Ibid*; p.394).

"Socialist relations of production have been established".

(Mao SW; "The Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People"; February 1957, Vol 5; p.394).

Yet even by 1957, Mao was still drumming up business!

"In December 1957, Mao visited Shanghai where Major Ch'en Yi arranged for him to meet 80 city's leading business men:

"Mao began by praising the great contribution the 'national capitalist friends' had made in the past. "Now I have come from Peking to seek our advice," he went on. Many businessmen he said, had been requesting that the socialist transformation of private enterprise should be hastened, 'lest the national bourgeoisie lag behind

in the progress towards socialism.' "I don't think that I can agree with that', he informed us. 'But I am not well informed on the subject. I want to listen to your opinions. I have brought only my two ears to this meeting, and if you expect more from me, you will be disappointed."

(MacFarquhar; "Origins of Cultural Revolution" Ibid; Vol 1; p.22).

The remaining cautious capitalists who had delayed, were convinced enough, to be taken over into Joint Stock ventures with the state, by 1957. Initially "The People's Daily" on 3 January in an editorial said:

"It is stipulated that within 2 years of 1956 and 1957 there will basically be realized the socialist transformation of capital industry and commerce.'

(MacFarquhar; "Origins of Cultural Revolution"; Ibid; Vol 1; p.23).

However under pressure by the capitalists, this time frame for so called "socialist transformation", was rapidly shortened.

By the 15th January under the direction of the mayor of Peking **P'eng Zhen**, "socialist transformation" was completed. This was possible using the simple expedient of :

"Little more than a change of description-private firms were simply re-labelled joint state-private. The feat was quickly celebrated by a rally in T'ien An Men Square on the 15th attended by Mao, Liu Shaoqi, Zhou En-Lai."

(MacFarquhar "Origins of Cultural Revolution" Ibid; Vol 1; p.23).

C) DIFFERENCES DEVELOP BETWEEN DOMINANT FACTIONS WITHIN THE CPC

That both Mao and Liu were not Marxist-Leninists is by now clear.

Liu Shaoqi's faction disagreed with Mao over several issues. These were whether to strengthen China's industrial base and how; whether the Cult of Mao should be continued; and the role of the CCP. The major disagreement however was how much to woo and support the USA. It is these disagreements that overlie and explain the public responses of the CCP to the CPSU.

i) THE CULT OF PERSONALITY OF "MAO ZE DONG".

During the class alliance forged during the anti-Japanese war, the Cult of Mao was useful to all factions of the CCP. But even then, the extent of the cult was a problem for some factions. Even in 1942, Liu Shaoqi had apparently disapproved of Mao's assumption of the title 'Chairman' and remarked to some colleagues:

"What is a chairman? I have never heard people in the Soviet Union calling Lenin Chairman Lenin!"

Liu also asserted that:

'The Stalin of China has not yet appeared!'

(Liu Selected Editions (Liu SE) (SCMM 651, p.20). Cited MacFarquhar R:"Origins of Cultural Revolution"; Ibid; p.7);

Liu accepted Mao as a leader, as it made sense during a war to have one leader. But he resisted the Cult erected by Mao:

"Even after Liu Shao Ch'i began eulogising Mao as leader and theoretician possibly in return for being made No.2 in the party, he did not put Mao on a pedestal.. In 1947 Liu told a conference:

"There is no perfect leader in the world. This was true of the past as it is of the present, in China and in other countries. If there is now, he only pretends to be such, just like inserting an onion in a pig's nose to make it look like an elephant."
(*Liu Selected Editions; Cited MacFarquhar R: "Origins of Cultural Revolution" Vol 1. p.7).*)

After the PRC was established the struggle between the factions naturally focused on the Cult of Mao. In 1953, The Constitution of the Young Communist League removed its references to Mao Zedong Thought. (*Goodman; Ibid; p.55*)

As the struggle between the Mao and the Liu faction intensified, during the Great leap Forward, Liu Shaoqi:

"Warned against the attribution of everything to Mao's works and also ordered that the phrase the 'Thought of Mao Tse-Tung' should not be used in propaganda abroad. P'eng Chen adopted a similarly deflationary attitude when enthusiasts in his local party hailed Mao as the greatest Marxist-Leninist theorist of the age and the teacher of world revolution, and he suggested that after Marx and Lenin there was no need for further discussion of political economy and the theory of imperialism. Lu Ting-yi explained why Mao's thought could not be said to surpass Marxism-Leninism."

(*Roderick MacFarquhar: "The Origins of the Cultural Revolution: Volume 2: The Great Leap Forward 1958-1960"; Oxford 1983; p. 319).*)

Liu's faction intended this to lead to the disintegration of the Cult of Mao.

Deng Xiaoping, Liu Shaoqi and Peng Dehuai pushed to remove reference of Mao Zedong Thought from the Constitution. They took this step at the **8TH CCP CONGRESS** of 15 September 1956:

"The 1945 CCP Constitution had explicitly recognised that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought was the party's ideology. However Mao Zedong Thought was written out of the 1956 version, leaving only Marxism-Leninism as the description of the CCP's guiding ideology.. Sources originating from the Cultural Revolution.. were highly critical of Deng's action in proposing the removal of the reference."

(*Goodman; ibid; p.55).*)

"Liu Shao-ch'i's political report also contained no mention of Mao's Thought.. Peng Teh-huai confessed [in the Cultural Revolution-ed].. that he had originally proposed to drop Mao's Thought.. the crucial section of Liu's report ..was written by P'eng Chen."

(*MacFarquhar; Ibid; vol 1; p.100).*)

Mao then professed that he was "retiring" to the "second front". But doubtless his resignation from the Head of State, was **forced** from him by the National capitalist class. **Liu Shaoqi** became the acknowledged Head of State.

But as a compromise the hand-over was due to start in 1959. As a further compromise, Mao was to be made an Honorary Chairman of the Central Committee. It was at this 8th Congress also that Deng Xiao Ping was to switch sides from supporting Mao, to supporting Liu. He was now placed on the newly-created six man Politburo Standing Committee; and given the title of General Secretary.

ii) MAO'S ATTACKS ON THE PARTY

To defend his position, Mao would attack the authority of the party itself, the CCP. Liu's opposition to Mao, would now take the form of a defence of the CCP. The first indication of this was to be the campaign launched by Mao in April 1956 called:

"Let Hundred Flowers Bloom, Let Hundred Schools Contend."

On Mao's insistence, a total **liberalism** in the arts and ideology and press was promoted. This was meant to reassure the bourgeoisie, that the New Democratic State belonged to them also. The campaign targeted CCP official behaviour.

Initially the Liu Shaoqi faction was in favour of the campaign. In support of this line they asserted that the 'class struggle was dying down':

"Comparing this year with last year the class struggle is not getting fiercer and sharper but is ameliorating. The landlords and rich peasants hold the common good and obey the laws (feng-kung shou-fa), the bourgeoisie has accepted the transformation, even the counter-revolutionaries are sincere... In general the situation has changed, the rich peasants had been deprived of their weapons and over half of the bourgeoisie have entered state - private enterprises... Let me repeat that it is no longer true to say that the class struggle is getting sharper."
(MacFarquhar; Ibid; vol 1; p.80).

Liu hoped the 100 Flowers campaign would limit the Mao Cult:

"According to Liu, the main objective of the 100 schools policy was 'to oppose doctrinairism and to avoid confining ourselves to one school of thought'.
(Cited MacFarquhar; Ibid; vol 1; p.53).

But Liu tried to safeguard the future rights of the CCP to:

"Interfere with culture on political grounds... all future political attacks should be backed by formal documents... at no point did Liu exhibit any willingness to countenance democrats criticising full time party officials".
(MacFarquhar; Ibid; vol 1; p.115).

Therefore initially Liu supported the "100 Flowers Campaign". But the Liu Shaoqi faction, soon recognised that the "100 Flowers Campaign" was an invitation to the petit bourgeois and the bourgeoisie to openly attack the CCP. The Liu Faction saw a further need of the "cover", of the "Red Facade" of the CCP. They therefore opposed this decision, even though they were pro-capitalist.

Therefore the Liu Shaoqi faction now opposed Mao, and opposed the "Hundred Flowers" campaign.

But Mao continued against their opposition. The vice-president of Tsingua University said:

"The reason why contending and blooming is not going well is because the Liu Shao-ch'i-P'eng Chen axis does not support contending and blooming."
(MacFarquhar *Ibid*; Volume 1: *Contradictions Among The People 1956-57*"; Oxford; 1974; p.285).

During the 5 weeks of the "blooming" a total challenge was offered to the CCP authority. As the party cadre rejected the virulent attacks, Mao was forced to humiliatingly withdraw.

At the same time Mao continued to foster other attacks, that took the forms of "rectification" campaigns aimed at party cadre (MacFarquhar *Ibid*; p.191; 196;). These attacks were justified by the article "Internal Contradictions Among the People", a speech of 27 February 1957, where Mao pretended:

"Never has our country been as united as it is today."
(MacFarquhar; Vol 1 *Ibid*; p.185).

Mao gave an open and "frank admission of serious CCP errors."
(MacFarquhar; Vol 1 *Ibid*; p.187).

For all these reasons Mao counter-attacked, and asked for an:

"Opening wide... Let all people express their views freely so that they dare to speak, dare to criticise... not suppressing wrong views but convincing people by reasoning with them."
(MacFarquhar; Vol 1 *Ibid*; p.188).

Both P'eng Chen and Liu Shaoqi strongly objected to these attacks. Liu Shaoqi boycotted the Contradictions speech to the Supreme State Conference (*ibid*; p.191). Liu did reply though:

"Contradictions within the ranks of the people.. some cadre held that.. the methods of rectification would prove more effective than more persuasive education. Some went further and suggested the 'dual measure of persuasion and force', that is to say, in addition to the formula 'unity-criticism-unity' there should be added some 'pressure'".
(MacFarquhar; Vol 1 *Ibid*; p.198).

Later, during the "**Great Leap Forward**" (see below), a surreptitious attack on the party was launched by the "elevation of the masses". Party cadre who resisted were labelled as 'Right Obstructionist'. That also assisted the destruction of the influence of the party. But as the Liu faction gained control, it used the failure of the Great Leap Forward to oust Mao. However, Mao then turned to the Army to attack the Party.

First he removed Peng Dehuai from control of the PLA. In his place he put Lin Biao, a loyal acolyte. Biao now pushed further the cult of Mao. It was at this time that the printing of the "Little Red Book" was established.

But Peng Dehuai counter-attacked. At the July 1957 **Lushan CCP** Party Conference, Peng Dehuai openly attacked Mao. The grounds for attack were the severe disruption of the economic and political life created by the "Great Leap Forward". Peng charged that the myths of economic success were fabrications by party cadre who were forced to manufacture "successes" or be purged as "right obstructionist."

Nevertheless, Mao's vigorous defence and humiliation of Peng Dehuai succeeded as none of the national capitalists would support Peng Dehuai. There is evidence that Deng Xiaoping and Liu Shaoqi, as well as even Zhou En Lai, supported the correctness of the charges laid by Peng. (See Goodman : "*Deng Xiaoping and the Chinese Revolution*"; *Ibid*; p.61) The reason they did not support Peng's counter-attack against Mao, was that Peng Dehuai promoted further links with the USSR. In particular Peng hoped to use USSR aid to further develop the PLA, and potentially to get atomic weaponry. The Liu Shaoqi faction saw that Peng objectively supported the now-revisionist USSR. They therefore turned a blind eye to his fate.

From now on the PLA would be the instrument of the attacks of Mao on the CCP. It would be the weapon turned against the CCP during the so-called "**Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution**".

iii) MAO WEAKENS INDUSTRIAL FORCES OF CHINA.

The underlying economic differences between the factions became clear with the 'Great Leap Forward', launched from the 3rd Plenum of the 8th Central Committee in September 1957.

By this time Mao had been forced to accept that he would be removed from the position of Head of state, in favour of Liu Shaoqi from 1959. The counter-strike he chose was one of economic and huge political sabotage by the method of an adventurist and ultra-leftist step.

Mao proposed a 'substitution of capital in investment by labour". This substituted for expertise and skilled labour - enthusiasm ("*Better Red Than Expert*"). Mao's slogan was: "*More Better faster and more economical*". It replaced planning with emphasis on decentralised and uncontrolled mass activity. This was exemplified in the backyard furnaces development. Here in a crazy notion, furnaces to produce "steel" were set up in backyards and any scrap or tea pot was used to produce "steel". The resulting unusable steel was one side effect, but a more serious one was the misguided energy spent by the peasantry and workers in this fruitless enterprise. Crops lay waste and true productive work was neglected.

Furthermore Mao attacked the very notion of Planning. Thus he attacked various components of the Five Year Plan. Especially those that touched on the promotion of **heavy over light industry**. This put him in a major conflict with Liu Shaoqi whose allies were in control of the Five Year Plans. (MacFarquhar; *Ibid*; Vol 1; p.57-74)

Naturally the national capitalist class would be in favour of a policy that promoted heavy industry. Naturally also, the comprador capitalist class would be uninterested in this.

It was the Minister of Finance **Li Hsien-nien**, an ally of the faction representing the National Capitalist class who attacked Mao's economic objectives first, even before Mao had launched the "Great Leap Forward", during the so called "Little Leap". The Peoples' Daily quoted Li Hsien-nien's speech:

"While opposing conservatism, one must at the same time oppose the tendency towards impetuosity and adventurism (chi-tsao mao-chin), and this kind of tendency has already appeared in many departments and many places during the past few months."
(MacFarquhar; *Ibid*; Vol 1; p.8)

The end results of the so-called "Great Leap Forward" were economic misery, starvation and great disillusion among the masses with the potential for progressive change of the CCP :

"The year 1960 was a truly appalling one for China. The leadership became entangled in the Great Leap and obsessed by the widening rift with the USSR. Agricultural output fell to about three-quarters of its 1958 level. There was widespread drought and famine, and during 1959 to 1961 China's population actually fell by 13.5 million. Looking back .. Deng was to regard the period immediately after the Lushan plenum as 'the most difficult times'.. The disastrous economic aftermath of the Great Leap.. Agricultural output continued to decline and food was in short supply. Industry which relied on agriculture for either its raw materials or capital also went into decline. Light industry fell by 10% in 1960 over the reported previous years' figures., 22% in 1961, and 8% in 1962. Heavy industry was even harder hit, dropping by 47% in 1961 over 1960 and 22% in 1962 over 1961".
(D.S.Goodman; *ADeng Xiaoping & the Chinese Revolution" Ibid*; p.65).

Only with great difficulty was Mao forced to recant his line. In recanting he lost much prestige. His response would be to launch the so called "**Cultural Revolution**"; a war against the faction of Lui Shaoqi. But before that the CCP was to break with the USSR. By now, the leading faction in the PRC was the national capitalist class.

4. THE CCP AND THE 20TH CONGRESS CRITICISM OF STALIN

Comrade Martens agrees that the initial response of the CCP, to the 20th party CPSU Congress was poor. But the change between the initial and the later response of the CCP, is not explained by him. The internal situation of the CCP is not considered by Martens. Yet it is there that the key lies.

In February 1956, the infamous 20th Party Congress of the CPSU (B), was held, and took **two main political positions** :

1. The denunciation of Stalin. This meant an attack on Marxism-Leninism.
2. The insistence on the peaceful road to socialism; and the insistence that war was not "inevitable"; "War is not predestined and unavoidable." This meant the preaching of international class harmony.

Neither of these positions were challenged by the CCP.

To summarise the three major factions of the CCP, these were as stated above:

- i) A bourgeoisie "leaning" to the USA; represented by Mao
- ii) An "uncompromising" national bourgeoisie represented by Liu Shaoqi.
- iii) A pro-USSR faction represented by Peng Dehuai

As Comrade Martens points out, the CCP bowed to the traitorous statements by Khrushchev. Deng Xiaoping, Liu Shaoqi, and Hu Ch'iao-mu drafted the 5th April reply, that was published in the "Peoples' Daily", called "*On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*." Mao agreed to this text. (MacFarquhar; *Ibid*; Vol 1 : *Ibid*; p.43).

Martens notes:

"At first the position of the Mao Zedong and the CCP was hesitant. They did not consistently defend the Marxist-Leninist work of Stalin, but followed Khrushchev... the criticisms formulated by Mao Zedong simply repeat Khrushchev's calumnies... with no serious facts to back them up. The conclusion is in the same tone: Khrushchev has taken steps to correct Stalin's errors."
(Martens; *Ibid*; p.11).

Martens recites the CCP accusations against Stalin in "On the Historic Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat":

"Stalin's "subjectivism"; "blind faith in Stalin's own wisdom and authority"; arrogance; inability to "rectify" mistakes; "insufficient vigilance against Hitler"; "Leftist error in "deepening the class struggle after liquidation of the classes; oppression of peasantry during collectivisation; emphasised Heavy versus light industry."
(Martens; *Ibid*; p.11-12).

But why did the 1956 CCP support the attack of Khrushchev against Stalin?

Firstly there was an initial agreement on attacking the "Cult Of Stalin".

All factions of the CPC agreed with the attacks on Stalin. Mao agreed also, but was aware this might also allow attacks on the Mao Cult of Personality. The compromise CCP solution then was to simply object to the "complete negation of Stalin".

But later as the Mao faction engaged in more concerted struggle with the Liu Shaoqi faction, the issue of "The Cult of Mao's Personality" became embroiled in a larger issue. Peng Zhen and Liu Shaoqi had resisted both the Mao cult, and had also been openly anti-Stalin. The two were explicitly linked in a threat to Mao:

"Stalin considered himself perpetually and absolutely correct. The result was that he was seized by the 20th Congress and smashed to smithereens, and in many places in the world his pictures were taken down and even torn up. As one can see, all men make mistakes; what differs is the size and nature of their mistakes."
(Roderick MacFarquhar: "*Origins of the Cultural Revolution*" Vol 1; *Ibid* p.270).

Secondly, there was agreement on the need for "Class harmony".

Amongst all factions of the CCP, there was an agreement with the Khrushchevites on the issue of "World Peace". After all the CCP had been cultivating the worlds' "progressive bourgeoisie" at the **Afro-Asian Bandung Conference** in Indonesia, in April 1955.

But events changed to upset this CPC three-faction class harmony.

Support of Khrushchev changed into an attack of the CPC upon the open right Revisionism of Khrushchev in 1963.

The "*Proposal for the General Line of the International Communist Movement*"; was dated June 14th, 1963. It was the work of Deng Xiaoping's secretariat, but **Chen Boda** [Mao's political secretary] later found it expedient to claim that the final version was Mao's. (*Uli Franz "Deng Xiaoping"; New York; 1988; p.168*).

As Martens appreciates, even this document does not attack the Trotskyite and Bukharinist assumptions of Khrushchev (*Martens, Ibid; p.13*). In fact "The Proposal" also accepts that:

"Stalin did not distinguish... the two categories of contradictions... contradictions between the enemy and us and contradictions among the people... The process of elimination of the counter revolution allowed many counter revolutionary elements to be justly punished; but honest people were also unjustly condemned... he made the mistake of enlarging the repression in 1937 and 1938."
(*Cited, Martens, Ibid; p.13*).

Clearly even now, the CCP did not definitely want a rupture with the revisionist CPSU even in 1963. The Chinese proposed to **Mikhail Suslov** a compromise, where they would supposedly:

"Return to the unity of Lenin's Communist international. But [Suslov] saw just one catch in Deng's proposal:.. the demand that the formula for apportioning delegations be determined by party strength and population."
(*U.Franz; Ibid; p.171*).

In fact, the CCP was vying with the CPSU to gain control of the international revisionist communist movement.

Yet "Proposal of General Line" did signify a rupture with Soviet revisionism. Why did this now take place?

A number of factors had changed:

Firstly, by 1963, the pro-USSR forces within the CPC multi-class alliance, had been purged. Mao Zedong attacked Peng Dehuai after the Lushan Congress of 1959.

Secondly the historic role of the **Party of Labour of Albania** in attacking Khrushchev openly, forced the hand of the CCP to the step of "A Proposal For the General Line Concerning the International Communist Movement."

Thirdly, Mao recognised that the attack on Stalin's "Cult" justified an attack on him. This has been discussed above. But a side effect of this was to diminish the authority of the CCP. Thus paradoxically, the pro- Liu national capitalist class was forced to concede that they had to "resurrect" the "Cult of Mao" to some extent. They needed this in order to build up the country after the recent economic disasters of the Great Leap.

Fourthly and related to this, the ex-USSR had withdrawn all its aid in 1960. This was a blow to the CCP. Khrushchev had retaliated in this way for the purging of Peng Dehuai; and to counter the challenge that the CCP posed at a world level, to the authority of the ex-USSR as the "senior party".

Fifthly, Mao had seen a possibility to dissolve the Red Façade by a frank liberalism. But countering this, Liu's faction attacked the general policy of "class harmony".

For example, members of the **China Peasants And Workers Democratic Party** (CPWDP), were attacked at the May 1957 National People's Congress. At this meeting (held after the "Let a 100 Flowers and a 100 Schools Contend" campaign) Mao was attacked for weakening the CCP, under pretexts that China was "unified" and that the bourgeoisie was "transformed". **Wu Han** who was a deputy major for Peng Zhen, led the attack:

"Suddenly something over a year ago, after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, after the Hungarian incident and after the appearance of a high tide of anti-communism in various countries of the world, and after the issuing of the call for long term co-existence and mutual supervision - they (Chang Po-Chun and Lo Lung-Chi) took stock of the international and internal situation and estimated that a change of climate must take place, and that the Communist Party could not long survive and there were great possibilities for the democratic parties."
(Roderick MacFarquhar: "Origins of the Cultural Revolution" Vol 1; *Ibid.* p.276).

This led to an attack by the Liu Shaoqi faction on the policy of "Long term co-existence and mutual supervision between the Communists and the democratic parties, at the 1957 session of the National Peoples Congress". (R. MacFarquhar; *Ibid.*; Vol 1; p. 276).

Sixthly: The USA supported the revisionists of the USSR in their attacks launched at the 20th party congress. As long as Mao still dominated the ruling circles of the CCP, a guarded CCP support for the Khrushchev forces was appropriate. Both Mao and Khrushchev, after all were objectively linked to the USA. But now that the resolutely national bourgeoisie under Liu Shaoqi had asserted *their* own dominance, kow-towing to the USA was not desired by Liu's faction. As the CCP said after it had dealt with Mao temporarily:

"In complete disregard of the common conclusion of the 1957 declaration that US imperialism is the enemy of all the people of the world, the leadership of the CPSU passionately sought collaboration with US imperialism... Particularly

around the time of the Camp David Talks in September 1959, Khrushchev lauded Eisenhower to the skies."
(*"The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves."*; Peking; 1963; p.24).

It would take Mao's supposed "Cultural Proletarian Revolution" to again change the Chinese line toward support of the USA.

Thus the alliance of forces favoured the open launch by the CCP, of a full attack on the Khrushchev forces. The national capitalist class was forced to build up its industrial base without any aid from the ex-USSR. The pro-USA section of the Chinese capitalist class was forced to accept the temporary victory of the anti-USA national bourgeois. They were to resort to the anti-CCP (i.e. an anti-Party) strategy of the so-called "Cultural Revolution", to win back power. Only then would Mao openly ally the CPC with the USA. This was signalled by Nixon's pompous visit to China.

5. MAO'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mao's foreign policy aimed to support the same USA forces who had once seen that Mao was a "radish communist". The support took the form of three main thrusts :

The First under the guise of a spurious theory of "Three Worlds" would force the proletariat to ally with their enemies;

The Second under the supposed theory of an 'encirclement', would put the world's peasantry at the leadership of the world's progressives; thereby denying the proletariat's leading role;

The Third was simply to endorse wherever needed the puppets placed into power by the USA around the world.

Maoist revisionist foreign policy vastly compounded the enormous disruption to the world proletariat, after Stalin's death.

i) THE "THEORY OF THE THREE WORLDS".

This pseudo-theory was pronounced by the "rehabilitated" Deng Xiaoping, representing Mao, following the "cultural counter-revolution". Deng presented this 'theory' to the United Nation in April 1974. (See *'Politics of China'* Ed R.MacFarquhar; *Ibid*; p. 291).

The Albanian Marxist-Leninist, Enver Hoxha pointed out that after the October Revolution Lenin and Stalin had said:

"There are now two worlds: the old world of capitalism, that is now in a state of confusion but which will never surrender voluntarily, and the rising new world, which is still very weak, but which will grow for it is invincible."
(*Hoxha, Enver: "Imperialism and the revolution" in Selected Works [Hereafter EH SW] Tirana Volume V; p. 553; 1985 : Citing V.Lenin : CW vol 33 p 153-54 Alb ed*).

Clearly Lenin and Stalin's views are in dire contradiction with the Maoist dictum of Three Worlds. In Mao's "theory":

The "**First World**" was the "super imperialists"; the USA and the former USSR; the "**Second World**" was formed by those lower rank capitalists countries like the European capitalists states; and "**The Third World**" was the so called spear head of revolution; in the impoverished colonial and semi-colonial world.

The problems of this analysis; one that is not even based on any factual data, are manifest. The Marxist-Leninist Enver Hoxha has exposed these problems well:

"The Chinese leadership takes no account of the fact that in the "Third World" there are oppressed and oppressors, the proletariat and the enslaved, poverty stricken and destitute peasantry, on the one hand, and the capitalists and the landowners, who exploit and fleece the people on the other. To fail to point out this class situation in the so-called Third World, to fail to point out the antagonisms which exist, means to revise Marxism-Leninism and defend capitalism. In the countries of the so-called third world, in general, the capitalist bourgeoisie is in power. This bourgeoisie exploits the poor people in its own class interests to make the largest possible profit for itself and to keep the people in perpetual slavery and misery."
(E.Hoxha SW; Vol 5; Ibid; p.556).

The practical consequences of this "theory" has been the formation of unprincipled alliances with the most unsavoury fascist elements world wide, justified because they are in the so called "Third World". This is described below:

"Social-imperialist China too is making great efforts to penetrate in both former colonial and semi-colonial countries. A example.. is provided by Zaire, a country ruled by the clique around Mobutu, the wealthiest and most bloodthirsty clique on the African continent. In the fighting.. recently in Morocco... the Sherifian Kingdom of Morocco, the French Air Force and China all rushed to the aid of Mobutu the murderer of Patrice Lumumba.. What do the Chinese revisionists want in... Zaire?... The Chinese social-imperialists are interfering in the affairs not only of that country, but also of other peoples and countries of Africa and other continents... Even the USA dare not assist Pinochet the fascist hangman of Chile so openly as China is doing... Under the guise of Marxism-Leninism, China is trying to show it is allegedly exporting the idea of revolution... But China is exporting the idea of the counter-revolution."
(Enver Hoxha Ibid; p. 516).

Indeed many of the states supported by China have not any shred of a claim to being even progressive:

"Many of the states which the Chinese leadership includes in the '3rd World', are not opposed to American imperialism and Soviet social imperialism. To call such states "the main force of the revolution and the struggle against imperialism" as Mao Zedong advocates is a glaring mistake."
(Enver Hoxha Ibid; p. 557).

The problems of this so-called theory as applied to the "Second World", are obvious. The Maoists "marginalise" the metropolitan countries' proletariat struggle, by pointing to the "Third World" as the important struggle. The theory even justifies the nonsensical theory of the super-profits being used to benefit the proletariat of the metropolitan countries. This lie makes the proletariat of the metropolitan countries, supposedly the accomplices of the ruling class in the rape and exploitation of the semi-colonial world. This is untrue.

As Hoxha points out, the result in the so called "Second World" of this "theory" of Mao is a rejection of proletarian consciousness:

"Where the big capitalist bourgeoisie and the big imperialist of yesterday, who are still imperialist are ruling. In the countries of the so called "second world", there is a large and powerful proletariat which is exploited to the bone, which is kept down by crushing laws, the army, the police, the trade unions, by all those weapons of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie... the Chinese revisionists ignore the proletariat."

(Enver Hoxha Ibid; p. 557)

In contrast to Mao, Hoxha took the position of the leaders - Lenin and Stalin. In his address to the 7th Congress of the Party of Labour Of Albania held in Tirana in November 1976, First Secretary Hoxha referred to:

"What is called the 'second world' the 'third world' the 'non-aligned world', or the 'developing countries'. All these terms, which refer to the various political forces acting in the world today, cover up and do not bring out the class character of these political forces. The fundamental contradictions of our epoch, the key problem which is predominant today on a national and international scale, the ruthless struggle between the bourgeois-imperialist world, the one hand, and socialism, the world proletariat and its natural allies on the other... Marxism-Leninism teaches us that in our epoch, countries are grouped according to the social system prevailing in them, into bourgeois capitalist and socialist countries".

(Hoxha: Report Submitted to 7th Congress of Party of Labour of Albania; Tirana; 1977; p. 172-3)

II) THE "THEORY" OF THE ENCIRCLEMENT OF THE CITIES BY THE COUNTRYSIDE

"In 1965 Lin Biao had declared that just as the rural revolutionaries had surrounded and strangled China's cities in 1948 and 1949, so now would the impoverished "Third World" countries surround and strangle the super-powers and the rest of the advanced capitalist nations. This statement became a basic formula for Chinese foreign policy during the Cultural Revolution.."

(Spence J: Ibid; p. 627.)

This took up the "theory" first expounded in Mao's works such as the "Establishment of Base Areas" in Volume ii of the selected Works, (Peking 1965; p.93-102) under the heading "Problems of strategy in guerrilla war against Japan". This was extended to become a world-wide application. As Lin Biao put it:

"It must be emphasised that Comrade Mao Tse-Tung's theory of the establishment of rural revolutionary base areas and the encirclement of cities from the countryside is of outstanding and universal practical importance for the present revolutionary struggles of all oppressed nation and peoples, and particularly for the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples in Asia, Africa, and Latin America against imperialism and its lackeys... The basic political and economic conditions of many of these countries have many similarities to those that prevailed in China, the peasant question is extremely important in these regions. The peasant constitute the main force of the national-democratic revolution against imperialisms and their lackeys... The countryside and the countryside alone can provide the revolutionary bases from which the revolutionaries can go forward to final victory. Precisely for this reason Comrade Mao Tse-Tung's theory of establishing revolutionary base areas in the rural areas and encircling the cities from the countryside is attracting more and more attention among the people in these regions."

(Lin Biao "Long Live The People's Victory"; Peking; 1965)

Of course, Lin Biao was the head gardener of the weed of "Mao Zedong Thought". Also we discussed the period when the "theory" of base encirclement arose. But we did not emphasise at the time that in fact, the "Long March" was a **forced retreat**. It was not a master-stroke of military all-knowing genius that underlay it, it was simply put a retreat.

This elevation of a retreat to a theory begins to explain the disastrous results of this "theory". In India it decimated a whole generation of valiant fighters who forsook the proletarian masses in the cities to go into the countryside to launch "revolution in the rural areas". They were wiped out by the Indian army. The Maoist CPI(ML) still grapples with the legacy of the Naxalbari adventurist Risings.

This "theory" is linked to the "Theory of the Three Worlds". Both emphasise the peasantry and place the proletariat far behind. Whatever else this is, this is not Marxism-Leninism. Mao had long been a proponent of the peasant over the proletariat; reflecting his refusal to accept Marxism-Leninism.

Indeed his famous report of February 1927 - "*Report on an Investigation of the Peasant movement in Hunan*" - was explicitly written to draw attention to the peasant. But as he did this he placed the peasant above the workers. In the report as it was originally written, Mao allotted 70% of the achievements of the national democratic revolution to the peasantry:

"To give credits where they are due; if we allot ten points of the accomplishments of the democratic revolution, then the achievements of the urban dwellers and the military units rate only three points while the remaining seven points go to the peasants in the rural revolution."

(Mao: *Report In Mao Tse Tung hsuan-chi (Sel Work) Vol 1;Edition Of 1948; p.22*).

This passage was significantly amended to make it more 'acceptable' in the 1951 edition. Appropriately, for this type of mentality, in this same article, Mao originally allots the "leading force" to the peasants :

"This great mass of the poor peasants are.. The vanguard in the overthrow of the feudal forces." *Mao Ibid; p.32*.

Again, by the time of the 1951 edition, this version was altered. Now it reads that the leading role belongs to the Communist Party! Mao knew the "formulae" of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, but clearly did not either believe them or enact them.

iii) FURTHER PRACTICAL SUPPORT TO USA IMPERIALISM

After the victory of Mao in the "cultural revolution" the rapprochement with the USA did not take very long. From 1969 a visible change took place. On February 25th, 1971, US President Richard Nixon told Congress of the USA:

"We are prepared to establish a dialogue with Peking... The US is prepared to see the People's Republic of China play a constructive role in the family of nations."

In his First speech in Peking during his visit of February 21st to 28th, President Nixon made matters clear:

"What brings us together is that we have a common interest. So let us in these next five days start a long march together."

From now on, the PRC established close links with the US dominated bloc such as Pakistan and Romania; with fascist Spain in 1973; and with other unsavoury regimes : General Ne Win of Burma (visited PRC in August 1971); Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia (visited in October 1971); General Sese Mobutu of Zaire (visited in January 1973); and Tun Abdul Razak of Malaysia (visited in 1974). The PRC supported the regime of Yahya Khan who attempted to destroy the legitimate national liberation struggle taking place in Bangla Desh.

IN CONCLUSION:

The final break with the former USSR on the part of the CCP was far from a principled Marxist-Leninist step. It was a step of convenience. Furthermore Mao was not in the vanguard of the split. If anyone in China was, it was the semi-reluctant National capitalist class.

The whole history of our movement after the death of Stalin requires much thought and analysis.

We repeat Lenin's Words to the Russian movement :

"We declare that "Before we can **UNITE, AND IN ORDER THAT WE MAY UNITE, WE MUST FIRST** of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation, as Iskra demands".

(VL CW Vol 5: "What is to be Done? Burning Questions Of Our Movements"; 1902; p.367).

Finally, we repeat with Lenin that a united front for practical activity now, does not need a full agreement now on every point:

"If you must unite, Marx wrote to the party leaders, then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement, but do not allow any bargaining over principles, do not make any theoretical 'concession'. This was Marx's idea..."

Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement".
(VL CW Vol 5: "What is to be Done? Burning Questions Of Our Movements"; 1902; p.369-370).

**WE ARE SURE THAT ALL PRINCIPLED MARXIST-LENINISTS WILL AGREE
TO THIS.
LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM !
WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE !**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Communist International: 1919-1943: Documents", Theses on the Eastern Question, 4th Congress CI, (ed) J.Degras Volume 1; London; 1971

- Resolution On the Present Situation on the Chinese Revolution, in : "International press Correspondence".
- Resolution On Chinese Question of the 9th Plenum of the ECCI In "International Press Correspondence", Vol 8, No.16; Mar 15, 1928.

Franz, Uli; "Deng Xiaoping"; New York; 1988

Goodman, D.S.G.; "Deng Xiaoping and the Chinese Revolution, a political Biography"; London; 1994.

Goncharov, Sergei N. and Lewis, John W; and Xue Litai; "Stalin, Mao and the Korean War -Uncertain partners"; Stanford; 1993.

Ho-sen, Tsia; "Istoriia opportunizma v Kommunisticheskoi Partii Kitaia" (An account of Opportunism In the Chinese Communist Party) In : "Problemy Kitaia" (Chinese Problems); No. 1, 1929.

Kang, Hua ; "Chung-kuo Ta Ko-Ming-shi" ("History of the Great Chinese Revolution"); 1932

Lenin, V.I.; Preliminary Draft of Theses on National and Colonial Questions, 2nd Cong. CI in "Selected Works", Volume 10, London, 1946

Lenin, V.I.: Collected Works, Moscow 1977;

- Vol 21 : 49
- "The Third Communist International"; Vol 29
- "The Collapse of the Second International"; Vol 21;
- "The Third International and Its Place In History"; Vol 29
- "The tasks of the Third International"; Vol 29.
- "What is to be Done? Burning Questions Of Our Movements", Vol 5

MacFarquhar, Roderick; "Origins of the Cultural Revolution"; Volume 1: Contradictions Among People 1956-57"; Oxford; 1974.

MacFarquhar, Roderick; "Origins of the Cultural Revolution: Vol 2, "The Great Leap Forward"; Oxford 1983.

Mao Mao, Deng; "Deng Xiaoping-My Father"; New York; 1995

Mao Zedong; In "Chung -Yang tung-hsin" (Central Newsletter) No.3; August 30th 1927

Mao Zedong; "Summary of a Talk With the Representatives of Press and Publishing Circles"; 10 March 1957; In "The Secret Speeches of Chairman Mao-From 100 Flowers to GLF"; Ed. R.MacFarquhar, T.Cheek and Eugene Wu. Harvard, 1989.

Mao Tse Tung; "Selected Works"; 1960, Peking.

- "Chinese Revolution and Chinese Communist Party" Vol 2.
- "The Tasks Of The CCP In the Period Of The Resistance To Japan"; May 1937; Vol 1.
- "On Policy"; December 1940; Vol 2.
- "On Coalition Government"; April 1945; Vol 3.
- "Chinese Revolution and Chinese Communist Party"; Vol 2
- "On New Democracy"; Vol 2.
- "Chinese Revolution and Chinese Communist Party"; Vol 2.
- "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People'; February 1957; Vol 5.
- "The Only Road For the Transformation of Capitalist Industry and Commerce"; September 1953; Vol 5.
- "On the Draft Constitution of People's Republic of China"; Vol 5.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick; 'Collected Works'; Moscow, 1976

- "Poverty of Philosophy"; Vol 6
- "Letter to August Bebel March 18-28, 1875. Vol 24

North R.C. and X.J.Eudin; "M.N.Roy's Mission to China: The Communist-KMT Split 1927"; Berkeley; 1963

M.N.Roy, Draft Supplementary Theses On the National and Colonial Question, 2nd Congress CI, Cited in G.Adhikari(Ed); "Documents of the History of the Communist Party of India", Vol 1; Delhi; 1971

- "Memoirs", Bombay, 1964.

Shao-chi'i, Liu, Interview Anna Louise Strong; "The Thought of Mao Ze-Dong", Amerasia, 6, June 1947, p.161; Cited Donald S Zagoria; The Sino-Soviet Conflict 1956-61"; New York; 1966

Shigemitsu M; "Japan and her Destiny"; translated O.White; London; 1958

Snow, Edgar; "Red Star Over China"; London; 1937

Spence, Jonathan; "The Search For Modern China"; 1990; New York

Stalin, J.V.; "Works" Moscow; 1954:

- "The Foundations of Leninism"; April-May 1924; Vol 6.
- "Questions of the Chinese Revolution", Vol 9
- "Political Tasks of the University of the People's of the East. Speech Delivered at a meeting of Students of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East", Vol 7.
- "On the International Situation and the Defence of the USSR"; Joint Plenum of CC and the CPSU Control Commission; August 1 1927; Vol 10.
- "Notes on Contemporary Themes"; Vol 9
- "The Political Complexion of the Russian Opposition"; Vol 10
- "The Right deviation in the CPSU(B)"; April 1929; Vol 12.
- "Stalin's Letters to Molotov"; Edited Lars T. Lih; Oleg V. Naumov; and Oleg V. Khlevniuk; Yale 1995.

Ta-Tung, Kuan; "The Socialist Transformation of capitalist industry and Commerce in China"; Peking; 1960

Teiwes, F.C.; "The Establishment and Consolidation of the new Regime 1949-1957. In R.MacFarquhar: "Politics of China 1949-1989" Cambridge; 1993.

Tuchman, Barbara: "Sand against the Wind. Stillwell and the American Experience in China 1911-1945"; London; 1985.

Tu-hsiu, Chen, Telegram to ECCI; June 15th 1927; in M.N. Roy; "Revolution and Counter revolution in China"; Calcutta; 1946.

Winnington, Alan; "Breakfast With Mao - Memoirs of a Foreign Correspondent"; London; 1986.
