

RED STAR

FREE

ORGAN OF THE NOTTINGHAM COMMUNIST GROUP

NO. 3 FEBRUARY 1980

SPECIAL ANTI-REVISIONIST ISSUE

CONTENTS

COMRADE JOSEPH STALIN: A CENTENARY TRIBUTE ----- p. 2

CONTROVERSY OVER CHINA: A LETTER AND A REPLY ----- p. 10

MAO ON REVISIONISM ----- p. 16

BOOK REVIEW: CHILE - AN ATTEMPT AT "HISTORIC COMPROMISE" ----- p. 20

EDITORIAL

This issue of Red Star is mainly concerned with revisionism and the ways it has been fought against by some of the leaders of the Marxist-Leninist movement. Revisionism is a most dangerous although sometimes beguiling enemy of the world revolutionary movement. The danger in revisionism is that it is the outlook of the bourgeoisie but in disguise. It pays lip service to Marxism but in reality it is a distortion of Marxism that is used to advance the interests of the capitalist class, not those of the working class. In the course of this century revisionism has perverted the two great proletarian revolutions, those of Russia and China. It is absolutely imperative that Marxist-Leninists clearly understand revisionism and develop a clear line to fight it.

The name of Joseph Stalin strikes terror into the hearts of most people of leftist inclinations in Britain. Sadly, most of these people have never read a word that Stalin wrote nor made any serious historical study of his role in the proletarian revolutionary movement. Their opinion of him is mainly culled from the bourgeois media and the demonological eschatology of Trotskyism. Our centenary tribute tries to give a scientific assessment of Stalin including both his strengths and weaknesses. When the tissues of distortion and downright lies are removed a true picture of the man appears, not a monster but a genuine revolutionary facing the most appalling difficulties in leading the construction of socialism for the first time in human history.

In our last issue of Red Star we voiced some of the disquiet we felt over recent developments in China. (See the article 'Counter-Revolution in China'). This prompted the editor of New Age, the newspaper of the Communist Workers Movement, to write to us sharply criticising our position. In this issue we reprint that letter in full and also our reply. Events in China in the latter part of last year have reinforced our assessment that a revisionist clique is now in power and the progress made under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung is now being reversed.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung's own statements on revisionism are extremely important both as an aid in understanding this phenomenon and also in fighting it. 'Mao on Revisionism' is a brief introduction to the struggle waged against revisionism in China. This article makes it clear that Mao was fully aware of the revisionist elements within the Communist Party of China and it details the different forms of struggle initiated against them, including that of the Cultural Revolution.

COMRADE JOSEPH STALIN: A CENTENARY

TRIBUTE

In understanding and assessing the parts played by great leaders in the course of historical development Marxist-Leninists do so in terms of class analysis. We do not regard the individual characteristics of persons as providing an adequate explanation of their historical roles. Rather it is a case of certain individuals rising to key positions because they embody and express the interests, outlook and aspirations of the dominant class in their society during a particular period. Thus the historical roles of Oliver Cromwell and Napoleon Bonaparte are correctly explained in terms of them being representatives of the rising capitalist class while the parts played by V.I. Lenin and Joseph Stalin can be grasped when it is seen that they gave expression to the class forces of the working class and poor peasantry in their country.

Joseph Vissarionovich Djughashvili was born on the 21st December 1879. His parents were Georgian, one of the oppressed national minorities of the Russian Empire. They were the children of peasant chattel slaves who had become proletarians. Joseph's father worked in a shoe factory and his mother was a washerwoman. Unlike most of the Bolshevik leaders, Djughashvili's origins embraced the social forces that gave rise to the Russian Revolution: the workers, poor peasants and national minorities. The young Djughashvili received some formal education in a seminary but was expelled for engaging in political agitation. He joined the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party in 1898 and thereafter was engaged in full-time revolutionary activity during the course of which he adopted the code name "Stalin" which means "man of steel". Stalin's early years as a revolutionary were spent in organising workers in Georgia which meant that he had experience of working class struggles in a more first-hand way than most other Bolshevik leaders. When the R.S.D.L.P. began to split into two wings, the revolutionary Bolsheviks and the revisionist Mensheviks, Stalin took a firm stand on the side of the Bolsheviks. He was exiled to Siberia for a long period and, in his absence, elected to the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party. He played a prominent part in the October Revolution of 1917 and became General Secretary of the Bolshevik Party. After Lenin's death in 1924 Stalin emerged as the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the international communist movement, positions he was to retain until his death in 1953.

In assessing Stalin's role as a proletarian revolutionary our primary aims should be to objectively evaluate both his achievements and failures so that we can learn from both the successes and mistakes of the revolutionary movement under his leadership. Only if we do this will we be able to deepen our grasp of the theory and practice of proletarian revolution and then be in a position to help carry this great movement forward. It is quite futile to fall into the errors of either uncritical adulation or sweeping condemnation as, for example, the arch-revisionist Nikita Khrushchev did at different times. At one time Khrushchev was one of the leading exponents of the cult of excessive praise for Stalin, referring to him in 1939 as the "greatest genius, teacher and the leader of mankind", while after Stalin's death Khrushchev denounced him as a "despot of the type of Ivan the Terrible"! By way of contrast the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism is to establish in what respects Stalin's actions advanced the cause of proletarian revolution and in what respects his actions failed to advance or even retard the revolutionary movement. First of all we will outline the major achievements under Stalin's leadership and then go on to consider the shortcomings.

SOCIALIST INDUSTRIALISATION

In the early 1920s the Soviet Union was a country where the proletariat, supported by the poor peasantry, led by the Communist Party, had seized state power and consolidated its rule by defeating both the White Russian

forces and the armies of intervention sent by the imperialist powers. The task of proceeding with the socialist transformation of society had yet to begin. The Soviet Union was economically backward and had been devastated by the years of war and civil war. All the attempts at revolution in European countries had failed so the Soviet Union was isolated as the only socialist state in a capitalist world. Some elements in the Communist Party were very pessimistic as to the possibility of proceeding with and sustaining socialist construction within one backward country. Leon Trotsky and other "left" factions had pinned their hopes on proletarian revolution in the advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe coming to the timely aid of the struggling and besieged Soviet state. The "rightists", such as Nicolai Bakharin held that exclusive socialisation of the means of production and rapid industrialisation would have to be postponed until such time as agricultural output had been greatly increased by means of allowing capitalism to develop in the countryside.

In opposition to this defeatism Stalin and others upheld Lenin's thesis that because of the uneven development of capitalism on a world scale, proletarian revolution would break out in different countries at different times and that the least developed countries, the weakest links in the chain of imperialism, were the ones where revolution was most likely to occur first. Furthermore, they argued, because of the contradictions both within and between the imperialist countries the Soviet Union did have some respite from immediate invasion, during which time socialist construction could be commenced. Indeed, if socialist industrialisation did not proceed then sooner or later the Soviet Union would collapse as a result of both internal contradiction and external attack. Stalin realised that if the revolutionary enthusiasm of the workers and poor peasants was aroused then the severe shortage of modern techniques of production would be overcome. Stalin, unlike his opponents, offered the Soviet working masses a way forward.

It was precisely for this reason that Stalin and his supporters emerged victorious in the internal debates of the Communist Party during the mid-1920s. Their line represented the interests and aspirations of the working masses. The first Five Year Plan, which began in 1928, had the collectivisation of agriculture as a vital objective. It was necessary to combine small peasant plots into large collective farms so as to increase productivity, provide raw materials for industrial development and release labour power for work in industry. The poor peasants favoured collectivisation but the rich peasant capitalist farmers did not and so engaged in bloody retribution and destruction of crops and livestock. Nonetheless the policy was carried through and by the late 1930s greater agricultural output was achieved with a smaller labourforce. On the industrial front development proceeded at a speed unprecedented anywhere in the world, either before or since. By the end of the 1930s the Soviet Union had a powerful industrial base under the ownership and control of the Soviet state and agriculture was partly collectively owned by the peasants and partly state-owned. This tremendous achievement certainly entailed a very high level of revolutionary commitment on the part of the workers and peasants. It also involved great sacrifices, for example, a shortage of some consumer goods, but for the most part the Soviet people made these sacrifices willingly for they knew, as Stalin stated in 1931, "We are fifty or a hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must make good the distance in twelve years. Either we do it or they crush us". Practice had shown that sustained socialist industrialisation was possible within one country.

NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLES.

Following in Lenin's footsteps Stalin placed great importance on the national liberation struggles of the oppressed nations against imperialist domination and exploitation. He realised that these struggles, for example in China and India, helped to weaken and undermine imperialism, even when the national movements were led by bourgeois or even feudal classes. Stalin held that it was in the interests of the international

proletariat to support national liberation struggles and that the proletariat and its party in the oppressed nations should strive to lead an alliance of all anti-imperialist forces, including the peasantry and national bourgeoisie. But just as Trotsky and others had not seen the revolutionary potentialities of the poor peasantry in the Soviet Union so they were contemptuously dismissive of the struggles of the Communist Party of China to unite the proletariat, peasantry, urban petit bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie in the task of carrying out the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal national democratic revolution as the first stage in a revolutionary process which could eventually lead on to a socialist transformation.

Now, with the benefit of hindsight, it is easy for us to see what great blows against imperialism have been struck by the national liberation movements. But this was not so obvious back in the 1920s when these struggles were only just beginning to get under way and Stalin's ability to grasp the significance of this rising trend is a clear indication of his capacity as a materialist dialectician. The advice given to the Communist parties by the Communist International, under the general leadership of Stalin, was not always appropriate for the concrete conditions of struggle in particular countries. For example, in China in 1927 the Communist Party of China suffered a severe reverse at the hands of the Kuomintang, led by Chiang Kai-shek, at least partly because the leadership followed incorrect policies recommended by the Comintern Executive Committee in Moscow. While in theory it had seemed like a good idea for the whole of the international communist movement to be led and co-ordinated from one centre, in practice this did not always have a positive outcome. Commenting on the debacle in China in 1927 Stalin pointed to the inadequacies of "conducting revolution by telegram". Nonetheless the CPC, under the leadership of Mao Tse-Tung, recognised Stalin's consistent, although not always helpful, support for the revolutionary struggles of the Chinese masses and upheld his reputation as a great proletarian revolutionary in the face of Khrushchev's denunciations.

THE FIGHT AGAINST FASCISM

Stalin's period of leadership of the communist movement coincided with the rise and defeat of the first wave of world fascism. He correctly saw the treacherous role that would be played by the social democratic parties when confronted with growing fascist movements and realised that when social democratic politicians and trade union leaders were faced with the choice of either uniting with the communists against fascism or capitulating to a fascist regime that the latter would be the most likely outcome. Even so, he urged the Communist Party of Germany to spare no effort in forming a united front with the German social democrats against Hitler and the Nazi Party. But the social democratic leadership, already guilty of the murders of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, would not enter into such an anti-fascist allegiance. In the Reichstag the social democratic deputies actually voted in favour of giving Hitler the draconian powers which enabled the Nazis to smash the working class movement in Germany. Just as the social democrats had capitulated to the monopoly bourgeoisie in World War 1 so they assisted in the imposition of outright bourgeois dictatorship in 1933.

Stalin and other communist leaders, for example the Bulgarian Georgi Dimitrov, realised that in the conditions of a deepening world crisis of capitalism fascist dictatorship was a growing danger in all the capitalist countries. They held that the immediate task of revolutionaries in these countries, where the Communist Parties had not yet won overall leadership of the working masses, was to defend the hard-won bourgeois democratic rights of the people against the threat of fascist dictatorship. In no way was this to constitute an abandonment of the ultimate aim of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie but it was purely a defensive tactic appropriate for the period when the proletariat were not yet ready for revolutionary insurrection. The triumph of fascism would have been a massive setback for the revolutionary movement. At the Seventh Congress

of the Comintern in 1935 the policy of the United Front Against Fascism was debated and adopted. This initiative directed Communist parties to strive to create an alliance of everyone and anyone, including sections of the bourgeoisie, who would oppose the rise of fascism.

In France in 1936 a Popular Front government with some Communists participating came to power while in Spain in the same year a broad coalition of democratic parties was elected with Communist support but without their direct participation in government. Almost immediately the Spanish fascists, representing the monopoly bourgeoisie and landowners, staged a military revolt against the liberal democratic republican government. The fascists had the active support of the German and Italian fascists who sent troops and military supplies. The Republican Government was deserted by all of its military forces, except for a small section of the police. However, the workers, peasants and a section of the petit bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie stood by their liberal democratic government and formed militia units. The Communist Party of Spain, although quite small, played a very active role in organising this popular resistance. This, together with the military supplies sent by the Soviet Union, greatly enhanced worker and peasant support for the CPS. The Comintern sponsored the formation of the International Brigade, fighting units of volunteer anti-fascists from many countries.

However, there were some "Ultra" Leftist elements who did not see that the immediate vital task was to defend the liberal democratic republic and even as the fascist armies advanced on the Republican-held regions of Spain these people wanted to stage a socialist revolution behind the front lines! This suicidal line was put forward by the Trotskyist inspired P.O.U.M. and also some anarchists. In 1937 they staged an armed uprising in Barcelona and other places and the Communists led the suppression of this disruptive mutiny. These insurrectionists were severely dealt with, many of them being shot. This is supposed to be one of Stalin's "crimes" but in fact the effective outcome was the preservation of the fragile unity of Republican forces who were able to carry on their fight against fascism. This struggle lasted for another two years. It was probably this particular act of lunacy by Trotsky's followers that led to Stalin and other Comintern leaders to decide upon the assassination of the renegade, as indeed he had been calling for Stalin's assassination since 1934, so as to cut off the head of the petit bourgeois movement that was doing all it could to wreck the anti-fascist United Front.

In 1938 Hitler demanded that Czechoslovakia handover the Sudetenland to Germany. It became clear that the leaders of Britain and France were not going to oppose this Nazi aggression, France had a pact of mutual non-aggression and defence with Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union whereby if one country was threatened with invasion the other were pledged to come to its defence. The French Government, no longer the popular Front coalition, reneged on its commitment to Czechoslovakia but Stalin assured the Czechs that the Soviet Union would stand by them. Units of the Soviet Air Force were sent to Prague but the social democrat President Beneš changed his mind, having become fearful of upsetting the British and French governments, and ordered the Soviet forces out of Czechoslovakia. Britain, France and Italy signed the Munich Agreement with Nazi Germany agreeing to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia with the neo-fascist regimes in Poland and Hungary getting a slice of the cake. In Germany the army commanders had been preparing a putsch against Hitler to be carried out if they were ordered to fight against the Czech armed forces. But the social democratic Czech government ordered its forces to offer no resistance to the Nazi annexation. Once again, the social democrats had capitulated to fascism.

WORLD WAR II

Stalin and his comrades realised that it was only a matter of time before the fascist alliance of German, Italian and Japanese imperialism extended their wars of aggression beyond Spain and China. The Soviet

Government opened negotiations with the governments of Britain, France and Poland to try to form an anti-fascist mutual defence pact. These bourgeois governments responded in an insincere way and talks dragged on for months in 1939. Stalin grew tired of showing delegations of retired British generals around the Kremlin and became convinced that Britain and France were hoping that Hitler's armies would strike east first of all, aiming to smash the Soviet Union, but in the process destroying themselves as well and thus leaving Europe wide open for domination by British and French imperialism. It was at this point that Stalin embarked on his most brilliant diplomatic manoeuvre. The Soviet Government also opened negotiations with Nazi Germany with a view to a non-aggression pact. At the beginning of August 1939 Hitler attacked Poland and a few weeks later the Nazi-Soviet Pact was signed. The Soviet Union was able to re-occupy some of its territories which had been under Polish occupation since the early 1920s and in early September 1939 Britain and France reluctantly declared war on Nazi Germany. So Stalin had saved the Soviet Union from immediate attack, gained valuable time to strengthen the Red Army and ensured that the imperialist powers fought each other instead of forming an anti-Soviet alliance. This enabled the main part of Soviet forces to be concentrated against the Japanese invasion of Siberia which was then decisively defeated.

A little less than two years later in June 1941, over two hundred Nazi divisions attacked the Soviet Union. Stalin and the Soviet Government were taken by surprise at the timing of the attack. Hitler had recently announced that he would never commit the mistake made by Kaiser Wilhelm II in World War 1 of fighting on two fronts simultaneously. The Nazis had failed to conquer Britain and were still fighting in North Africa but, flushed with easy successes, Hitler threw caution to the winds. After initial confusion the Red Army rallied and began an orderly retreat in the face of the Nazi assault. Plans to dismantle and remove industrial plants behind the Urals were successfully carried out, a scorched earth policy was enacted as to leave nothing for the invaders and partisan units were left behind the enemy lines. The Soviet Union now entered into alliance with Britain and then America as well. Within a few months the Nazi armies had penetrated deep inside Russia and were at the gates of Moscow threatening the strategically located city of Stalingrad. But the overwhelming majority of the Soviet people remained firm in their support of the Soviet government and carried on a brave and desperate struggle against the massive Nazi onslaught. In far less critical conditions in World War 1 the support for the Tsarist regime had collapsed with the Russian soldiers refusing to fight and leaving the front. If the Soviet people had been suffering under a terrible tyranny, as people like the Trotskyists suggest, then here was a golden opportunity for defection and revolt. But in fact it was precisely because the Soviet people were committed to the socialist system and were proud of their achievements that they fought a bitter war of resistance.

Throughout 1942 the ferocious fighting continued with the Soviet forces managing to contain the already extensive Nazi advance. Britain and America promised to open a second front in Western Europe so as to take some of the pressure off the Eastern Front in the Soviet Union. But the Western allies had postponed such an offensive. Churchill and Roosevelt were waiting to see which side would be victorious in the East. They still hoped that Russia and Germany would destroy each other and leave the field clear for Western imperialism. But gradually the Red Army began to turn the tide. In February 1943 the Nazis suffered a massive defeat at Stalingrad. This is now generally recognised as the turning point of World War 2 and from then on the Nazi invaders were slowly but surely pushed back. Finally in July 1943 America and Britain opened a second front in Europe by invading Sicily. The military commanders were hesitant, claiming that if there were more than two German divisions in Sicily they doubted whether the Allied forces would prevail. This was at a time when the Red Army was facing over two hundred Nazi divisions! As the Red Army pushed towards the West the leaders of Britain and America became anxious. So in June 1944 the D-day landing opened up another front in France. But even after this the main theatre of war was still on the Eastern Front. A maximum of thirty German divisions were deployed to the Western Front and some of these were withdrawn to strengthen and reinforce the Eastern Front!

We can now see that the main brunt of the war against Nazi Germany was borne

by the Soviet Union under the leadership of Stalin. In strategic terms the West European fronts were sideshows. This in no way detracts from the bravery shown by the American, British and other forces engaged in the West. But the fact of the matter is that the might of Nazi Germany was smashed by the Soviet forces. The Soviet people paid a terrible price for this victory with around 25 million casualties and much of their recently constructed industry and agriculture destroyed. This victory was perhaps Stalin's greatest achievement. He led the Soviet people in smashing the main forces of the first wave of world fascism. The people of the whole world are forever indebted to the Soviet workers and peasants, under the communist leadership of Stalin and the C.P.S.U. for this.

This then is the positive side of Stalin. He led the Soviet people in the first great attempt at socialist construction in conditions that others claimed were impossible; he led the international communist movement in sustained support for the national liberation struggles; and he led the Soviet people in defeating the main fascist power in World War 2. But now we must turn to the negative side of Stalin's political leadership, the actions of the communist movement which retarded, rather than advanced the cause of proletarian revolution.

THE CONTRADICTIONS OF SOCIALISM

In his approach to socialist construction and transformation Stalin displayed certain "economist" tendencies. In other words, while it is true that he had great confidence in the revolutionary enthusiasm and creative abilities of the working masses he also placed too much emphasis on the sheer acquisition of advanced techniques of production. While it is true that a socialist society can only come into existence on the basis of modern industry and mechanised agriculture it is also the case that only if the relations of production are revolutionised as well will the end result be socialism as opposed to capitalism. Up until 1928 the Soviet Union was a country where a proletarian state operated a system of state capitalism. With the beginning of the first Five Year Plan the long term aim was to progressively transform the economy into a socialist one, involving the gradual abolition of the division between mental and manual labour, between industry and agriculture, between town and countryside.

At first a sort of cultural revolution did accompany economic construction with the colleges and universities being thrown open to workers and peasants, with bourgeois tendencies in education and culture being criticised and with workers and peasants being encouraged to participate directly in the management of their places of work. But after 1931 these policies were dropped. The emergence of a highly educated and trained elite corps of managers, administrators, scientists and technologists was facilitated by the policies of the Soviet Government. This new "socialist" manageriat and intelligentsia were given high salaries and many other privileges so as to encourage people to aspire and join in the expansion of its ranks. Also wage differentials for skilled workers were widened and other material incentives were introduced to try to boost productive output. Control of enterprises was in the hands of managers who were supervised by Party Committees. The theory was that workers and peasants would exercise control over the means of production, but indirectly through their Communist Party. Managers would be kept in line, prevented from mistreating workers and failing to achieve production targets and standards, by means of draconian penalties for deviations and failures. The whole economy was run under the direction and tight control of the State Planning Commission, which in turn was directly responsible to the Soviet Government.

The view of Stalin and the C.P.S.U. was that only as the forces of production became more developed and advanced would it be possible for the relations of production to be progressively transformed. It is certainly true that the nature of the forces of production sets limits on the possible relations of production. But only if the working class, under the leadership of the Party, continually transforms the relations of production into socialist ones will a socialist society emerge. There is nothing automatic about this process. It has to come about from politically conscious mass action on the part of workers

and peasants. Otherwise the industrial managers and state officials will gradually coalesce into a new and nascent state bourgeoisie who will eventually usurp state power and turn the social system into one of state monopoly capitalism.

THE ENEMY WITHIN.

Right from 1928 in the Soviet Union there were many cases of deliberate disruption and sabotage of production brought about by managers and technicians. Some of these people were bourgeois specialists left over from Tsarist times and who opposed socialism, others were actually agents of reactionary emigre groups working in collaboration with one or the other of the imperialist powers. Also there were new managers and officials, of worker and peasant origins who had developed a bourgeois outlook as a result of their privileged position in the social division of labour, who took to corrupt practices for personal gain. These wreckers were severely dealt with by, in the main, being sent to labour camps. Stalin called for campaigns of mass criticism from below to counteract bourgeois tendencies but these were never carried out on a wide or substantial enough scale to be very effective.

In December 1934 Sergei Kirov, leader of the Party in Leningrad, was assassinated by a Communist Party member. This was the event which sparked off the Great Purge of the mid-1930s. At this time the Soviet Union was still the only socialist state in the world and surrounded by imperialist countries where fascism was on the advance. The Soviet Union was effectively in a state of siege and agents of the imperialist powers were certainly active inside the country. In these conditions Stalin and his comrades quickly moved towards the view that all dissident elements in the Soviet Union, both inside and outside the Party, were involved however indirectly with counter-revolution inspired by imperialist powers. This opinion was reinforced by the fact that by the mid-1930s practically all the means of production had passed into state ownership and then, it was held, the material basis for a dissident bourgeoisie had been eliminated and while the workers, peasants and intelligentsia still existed as classes their relationship with each other were essentially non-antagonistic.

There certainly were elements at the highest levels of the Communist Party and the Red Army who were of a defeatist outlook and were pessimistic about the prospects of the Soviet Union surviving the coming world war. These included top leaders such as Zinoviev, Kamenev and Bukharin. It was essential to struggle against the defeatist line of these people and remove them from leading positions but in most cases they were probably not actually involved in conspiracies with foreign powers. However a paranoid hysteria swept the Soviet Union and hundreds of thousands of people were accused of being "enemies within" and imprisoned or executed. There certainly was an enemy within; a new, nascent bourgeoisie emerging from the ranks of top managers and officials. But this development was almost entirely overlooked by Stalin and the Party and it was precisely at this time that many of these new bourgeois elements, Khrushchov for example, rose to important positions by unjustly denouncing their superiors as wreckers and enemy agents. It is true that many honest communists were persecuted and killed in this period.

Stalin was caught in a dilemma he was never able to resolve. If the means of production were entirely under the ownership and control of the proletarian state then how was it that elements with a bourgeois outlook kept reappearing? On the one hand Stalin claimed that the bourgeoisie as a class had been eliminated and on the other hand he correctly pointed out that the class struggle would intensify as socialist transformation was pushed ahead. Increasingly Stalin used imprisonment and execution of individuals, instead of leading and rallying the working masses in criticism and struggle against those taking the capitalist road as a means of combating bourgeois tendencies. In pursuing this incorrect policy he unwittingly advanced the careers of many of those who, after his death, seized state power and began the process of capitalist restoration in the U.S.S.R.

In 1939, after the Great Purge was over, Stalin admitted that there had been "grave mistakes". But since the fundamental cause of the new generation of bourgeois elements had not been correctly identified, i.e. the persistence of some

capitalist relations of production, the problems persisted and there were further purges after World War 2. In Stalin's last published writings, for example, Economic problems of the U.S.S.R. written in 1952 it comes out clearly that Stalin realised that the continued existence of socialism in the U.S.S.R. was in grave danger. At last he realised that too little attention had been given to transforming the relations of production along with the forces of production. But it was too late. The Party and the State apparatus was now dominated by those intent on capitalist restoration. In March 1953 Stalin died and only three years later the Khrushchov clique denounced him as a "criminal", purged the Party, state and armed forces of genuine communists and rigorously set about the full restoration of capitalist relations of production.

THE STALIN MYTH.

Since that time a massive derogatory mythology has been propagated about Stalin and his historical role, by the Russian state bourgeoisie, the Western bourgeoisie and the revisionist and Trotskyist elements throughout the world. Stalin is equated with Hitler and no accusations, however preposterous or petty, are ruled out in this campaign of vilification. Among the ridiculous charges made are that he was an agent for the Tsarist secret police, that he poisoned Lenin, that he shot his second wife, that he had greasy fingers (?) that he wrote The British road to Socialism etc etc. In the U.S.S.R. no pains have been spared by the new state bourgeoisie in trying to eradicate the memory of Stalin and his achievements from the minds of the people. His writings are banned, there are virtually no publicly-displayed pictures of him, encyclopedias and history books have been re-written to expunge references to him, paintings have been doctored to eliminate his presence and even old films have been re-made so as to cut him out.

But this campaign to turn Comrade Stalin into a non-person has not been entirely successful. Following Khrushchov's denunciation of Stalin in 1956 there were many protests, marches, demonstrations, strikes and riots by workers and peasants upholding Stalin and his political line. Since the 1960s underground Bolshevik groups have been formed in the Soviet Union and in the 1970s slogans such as "Long live the memory of Stalin" and "Bring back Stalin" have appeared in public places. Outside the U.S.S.R. there are many people who remember Stalin with respect and affection. In Britain many people of the older age groups have not forgotten Stalin's leadership of the struggle against fascism. During World War 2 many working people, and especially those serving in the armed forces, recognised that Stalin and the Soviet Union were their true friends. Just one instance of this identification was evidenced at Players in Nottingham immediately after World War 2. Before the war there had been very strict management discipline with workers being fined for making mistakes etc. When the workers returned from the war they painted slogans on the factory walls such as "Good Old Uncle Joe". The management of Players quickly dropped their old work regulations.

STALIN'S REVOLUTIONARY HISTORICAL ROLE.

So how then, from a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist point of view, are we to judge the historical role of Stalin? We must make an all-round assessment, seeking to learn from both his achievements and failures so as to strengthen our grasp of revolutionary strategy and tactics. In our view the positive side of Stalin's politics far outweigh the negative side. Under his leadership socialist transformation was carried forward in the Soviet Union for a period of thirty years, firm support was given to the national liberation struggles which made great strides forward and the first wave of world fascism was defeated. It is also true that the first attempt to build a socialist society eventually failed because of inadequate and incorrect policies applied under Stalin's leadership. At times he and his comrades resorted to what can only be described as criminal methods. It has been justly said of Stalin that he tried to "fight barbarism with barbarism". But in spite of all this it is nonetheless true that at the time of Stalin's death in 1953 the struggle of the working class and other oppressed people had made great advances over the position of thirty years before. The Peoples Republic of China had been established and the national liberation movements were, and still are, surging forward.

Stalin came to the fore as a proletarian revolutionary leader during the early stages of open working class insurrection. Similarly Cromwell and Bonaparte became bourgeois revolutionary leaders at the early stages of the bourgeois revolutions in England and France. While both these bourgeois leaders were certainly guilty of serious crimes, for example the slaughter of the Irish and the atrocities in Spain, they nonetheless stood at the head of and advanced what was a progressive cause in the social and economic conditions of their era. It is also true that the bourgeois regimes they led were overthrown by counter-revolutionary forces after a very short time. Both in England and in France the bourgeois revolution suffered many reversals and fully-fledged capitalism only emerged after a long period of class struggle against the remnants of the feudal aristocracies. But despite these errors and failures the progressive role of these bourgeois leaders is undeniable from the standpoint of historical materialism and so it is with Stalin as a leader of the proletarian revolution.

The Marxists-Leninists will continue to uphold Stalin as a great revolutionary. We know that if we throw out the proletarian political line which he upheld then we throw out the line of Lenin, Engels and Marx. This is precisely what the revisionist "Communist" Party of Great Britain and the various Trotskyist groups have done. Just like their predecessors, who Stalin opposed, they avoid encouraging and helping the working class to embrace the revolutionary outlook and instead peddle around and try to pass off militant trade unionism as "revolutionary" politics. Instead of fighting the practical and theoretical struggles necessary for the building of a truly revolutionary party they never tire of prostrating themselves in front of the bourgeois Labour Party and encouraging the working class to do likewise. We Marxist-Leninists are determined to fight and defeat these petit bourgeois elements who dress up their capitulationist politics in Marxist language and in doing so we do not hesitate to use the sword of Stalin. We are confident that as the socialist revolution develops and expands on a world scale the true revolutionary stature of Stalin will be appreciated once again.

C O N T R O V E R S Y O V E R C H I N A .

Letter from the Editor of "New Age".

Thank you for the copy of "Red Star" from the Nottingham Communist Group to which I must reply. The article on "Counter revolution in China" made the biggest impact - negative I must admit - and will attract all my attention.

As I remember the things that upset you most about the recent developments since the overthrow of the Gang of Four was the new educational policy which you feared - and now seem convinced - has restored educational elitism. By definition you must believe that up to this point it was being eliminated, particularly by the Cultural Revolution. Also you must believe that there was no such thing as ultra leftism in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution since you obviously think that everything that emerged from it was good. Such culminations of ultra leftism as students handing in blank examination papers and millions of youth permanently moving into the rural areas you would applaud as wholeheartedly correct.

You, like me, had a very idealised picture of Chinese society, still made up predominantly of peasants - 80% of its population. As petty bourgeois intellectuals we are very prone to over-estimate achievements and under-estimate difficulties. The enormous problems faced by the C.P.C. in leading the Chinese people away from feudalism, imperialism and bureaucrat-capitalism, through the anti-imperialist wars and the national liberation struggles, the establishment of the People's Republic and the consolidation and promotion of socialism (not just from 1966 but long, long before); these are all easily underrated by the

petit bourgeois flush of enthusiasm for those aspects of the Cultural Revolution which were all-destructive (or anarchic). Destroy all authority, eliminate all bourgeois learning, reject all things foreign, cast aside all the past, denounce all technology, get rid of those who cut their teeth in the national democratic struggles as capitalist roaders, transform the world by shouting - nay screaming - slogans, deify Mao as utterly infallible, demand absolute conformity from all in all things, take on all enemies in every sphere in one go. The CPE (ML) adored these things, many Maoists of the day extolled these things to such an extent that it was possible to imagine that Cultural Revolution had replaced Armed Revolution, that in fact the revolution to wrest political power from the bourgeoisie by force of arms receded into a secondary role and intellectuals became workers at a stroke. Now only the youth were revolutionary and those "idiots" - Chou En-Lai included - who had survived the arduous earlier struggles for national democracy - could be brushed aside by the "redder than red" new revolutionaries, and labelled capitalist-roaders. Glib, easy and blind - blind obedience of the type Hitler demanded of his followers, is what those of the Gang of Four-type ultra left demanded: blindness to reality, to the workers' needs, to the need for unity, for the people's material welfare, the country's defences and the threat of war.

Was it not significant that Lin Piao, another grand ultra revolutionary, died while fleeing to the Soviet Union when his plot was uncovered?. The Gang of Four too would have handed their country and peoples as a nice prize to the Russians. Hopefully they and their ilk will never get the chance again to pretend that People's War means scoffing at modern weaponry. What even Lenin knew very well that socialism has to outstrip capitalism and overtake it by demonstrating its superior productive capacity. Stalin certainly realised that he had to match and out-match the Nazi aggressors' weaponry if the Russian people were to win the war of resistance. Are you saying that People's War precludes developing the best possible weapons?. You seem to have forgotten that Mao said "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" - and there is no virtue in sticking to peashoots when the enemy has ICBMS.

Yes the Gang of Four would have destroyed Socialist China. They would have established their fascist dictatorship, stifled the workers and peasants into automatons and pleased imperialism no end.

I could go into detail about all your points but I doubt if it would be helpful. You see, now that you have decided that China is revisionist, you will very soon find yourself nodding with the isolated sectarian Albanians and in the arms of Russia. There is no way else for you to go - unless you are happy to remain in splendid isolation for the rest of your political life. And the problems and questions you are creating for yourself are enormous - and most pleasing to the superpowers.

You have been silent about the implications of your analysis. If China is revisionist then will you side with no-one when the Russians launch the next war? If China is virtually a superpower (give or take thirty years) then why aren't you condemning her "aggression" against Vietnam?. When the Cubans, Vietnamese and Russians attempt to split the non-aligned movement in Havana next month will you be pleased - or just indifferent?. When China normalises her relations with the USSR will you then claim she is also collaborating with them for world supremacy - or do you think she's in too deeply with the Yanks?. What about reminding yourself that Lenin introduced NEP and allowed foreign investment in the Soviet state because of the great backwardness of the economy- or was he a revisionist too?. Surely Stalin was a revisionist for trading with Nazi Germany and signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact.

There's a lot of trash that I have not replied to but will get round to sooner or later. You say China only supports movements opposing Soviet Imperialism. That is just bullshit. The half-truth contained in those turds of yours consists of the fact that it is the Soviet Union who intervenes and interferes in more and more parts of the world and is very rapidly replacing - nay - has replaced US imperialism as the more aggressive superpower. So where are there the

most militant movements likely to develop?. Where oppression is greatest surely?. It seems to me you are just trying to say that it is unfair to be so obsessed with the Soviet threat. And it was the very Teng you so abhor who told the ASEAN countries that the support of the C.P.C. for the Communist Parties of Kampuchea, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and Phillipines would not cease and was a different question to the one of promoting better inter-state relations.

Revisionism may have surged in China but it is certainly nowhere in command. There is an absolute necessity to unite all the anti-superpower forces at this time and when united fronts are developing, right deviations become more common. That matter is being very well handled by all accounts and the dangers it poses are far outweighed by the advantages of strengthening Socialist China. The consternation of the Russians and the checking of their puppets in Indo-China, the emergence of China as a positive political force in a world on the brink of being dragged into a war, is only to be welcomed. Mao called for China to have the Atom Bomb in 1956 and he called for overtaking the industrial countries by twenty or so years. Modernisation is absolutely essential and is being achieved in the most revolutionary way possible by the present revolutionary government. It is very encouraging to see how self-critical they are and have corrected some of the over-ambitious initial plans. I have no doubt that the Chinese people will win great victories in the present struggles to promote production because in the main, they have grasped revolution, something that very very few British Marxist-Leninists have done.

I'm suprised that you don't see that you are moving towards a Trotskyist position. Any kind of alliance with non-proletarian classes is seen as reactionary, any kind of alliance with one imperialism to destroy another is seen as counter-revolutionary, any slogan which is exclusively for the Left is good (Trotsky was fond of calling on the inexperienced youth to throw out tempered cadres). The article is written with his kind of sophistry. Why didn't you say outright that China is imperialist instead of counting on the next war to give you a way out). As a matter of fact, the upheavals you hope will restore revolution in China will also cause upheavals in the U.S.S.R. and U.S. - doesn't that excite you too?. Like a good Trotskyist you didn't firmly state your position or work out the implications for Britain. Let me refer you to the R.C.P.B. (ML) - successors to the C.P.E. (ML) - who take your view but much more consistently - they only back Albania and have removed Mao's head from their banners - for, alas it turns out that he too was a revisionist. Maybe you too will realise this when you read earlier works of his and see how he emphasised the need for production to be developed, for the past to be retained and developed when useful, for the need to learn from foreign technology and for order to be restored and the Cultural Revolution to come to an end. (This is as one-sided as your article and meant to restore the balance!). That quote at the end from Mao refers to class struggle within socialist society. If China is revisionist then there is a bourgeois dictatorship and the quote is thus very misplaced. Or could you be taking the view that China is a degenerated "socialist" state - run by the revisionists (who are not quite the bourgeoisie) - yet needing to be supported but its deformities attacked?. The class struggle in a socialist country takes a very different form to the class struggle in capitalist - original or restored - society. What Mao meant in this passage was that socialist society would last a long time - possibly "several centuries". Looking at China on such a time scale can you honestly hold that she has gone revisionist and that counter-revolution is now in command?. If you recognised the seriousness of the threat of war from social-fascist Russia, I doubt if you would. But as I said before, you will soon find yourself lined up against the wall with the Albanians, at first playing down the Soviet imperialist threat and finally capitulating to it - to keep these Chinese "revisionists" at bay and fully exposed.

Oh yes - it was Lenin who admired American efficiency and wanted to introduce it to the Soviet Union. Added to electrification and Bolshevik leadership he said it equalled socialism! !. Don't wear strait jackets. Marxism-Leninism - Mao Tse Tung thought can liberate your mind. Apply it creatively - to Britain primarily. Attacking China the way you did was very opportunistic and destructive. I doubt whether you have tried to understand why there have been so many

such developmnets or what, after all is socialism.

REPLY FROM THE EDITOR OF "RED STAR"

I have delayed replying to your letter of last August because in it you said you would be sending a fuller analysis of our alleged incorrect position at a later date. This we have now received and studied and now is a good time to reply to your criticisms.

Perhaps it would be relevant to say right at the beginning that we thought your whole letter was permeated with a hysterical viciousness which is in no way conducive to political debate and can easily encourage a tendency towards purely personal abusiveness, surely the last thing that is needed at the present moment. Great changes have taken place in China since the death of Mao Tse Tung: some Marxist-Leninists think these changes are for the good, some do not, but either way we must exchange our views, seek clarification, advance as Marxist-Leninists and conduct our debate in a comradely fashion. Clearly you are perfectly happy with what is happening in China and here you share a common position with many other ML organisations in Britain, though fortunately throughout the world. We consider your position to be fundamentally incorrect and a danger to the development of a revolutionary party in this country. We believe that until Marxist-Leninists here begin to practice Marxism-Leninism in a creative way and analyse in a correct way contemporary phenomena there is little chance we can build our own revolutionary party. The analysis of the present leadership in China is not therefore an abstract theoretical one but is of the greatest importance as the problems faced in China no doubt will occur here in the post revolutionary period and we thus wish to learn from errors made so we can try to prevent them in the future. We therefore reject your allegation that our noses are stuck in books and say that to us this is a practical exercise in understanding the problems faced by the proletariat and its allies in the post revolutionary period.

We accept that at the moment there is a great deal of confusion over China and that detailed analysis and critiques are necessary. Since the article in "Red Star" last June we have tried to deepen our understanding of how bourgeois restoration in the socialist period comes about. In carrying out this investigation we have been greatly indebted to the Revolutionary Communist Party of the United States who have provided a clear, comprehensive critique of the present Chinese leadership. This is mainly contained in their book "And Mao makes 5" (Banner books, New York, 1979) which we would urge you to read and study. We do not accept that the "Red Star" article was either premature or divisive as contemporary events cannot be ignored because they may be embarrassing or difficult to understand and no form of knowledge is ever fixed, absolute and final.

It is clear to us that nowhere in your letter do you actually practice Marxism-Leninism in a constructive and creative way and that your entire position is predicated around the arguement that China cannot be revisionist because you don't want it to be and to hell with reality!. This of course is the worst sort of bourgeois idealism and is directly comparable with "Communist" Party of Great Britain members who, by complex mental gyrations, can ignore the fact of Soviet social-imperialism because they wish so ardently to believe that the Soviet Union is still a socialist country. This position is wishful thinking and has nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism. I will give you a concrete example of this. Your hysterical diatribe against the "Gang of Four" is totally devoid of any political analysis, is simply abuse, is in fact just a repetition of the mouthings of the present regime in China. If the "Gang of Four" were in fact fascists who wanted to sell the Chinese people into slavery is it too much to ask that concrete manifestations of that fascism be given in some detail?. We are suprie that you do not seem to require any evidence as certainly at one time you had every faith and confidence in the aims and gains of the Cultural Revolution.

In fact the present regime in China cannot, dare not, publish in any detail the political line of the "Gang of Four" as they know very well the line of the "Gang of Four" was Mao's line and the line he fought for consistently for the last decades of his life. It was the line for mass class struggle and against revisionism and capitalist restoration within the C.P.C. It is of course

very convenient for revisionists to have short memories and to "forget" the facts and experiences that are no longer useful to them. Let us therefore remind you what Mao said in 1976 about the capitalist roaders within the Party:

"With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the co-operative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticising bourgeois right they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution and you don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party - those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road." (Quoted in People's Daily editorial 10.3.76)

Can anything be stated more directly and unequivocally than this?. Or is it just the senile ramblings of an old man past his prime?. Of course Mao's pronouncements that the bourgeoisie were in the C.P.C, have been ignored by the present clique - it was to them he was referring!. The abuse and invective they hurl upon the "Gang of Four" is an attack on Mao as these four comrades were the closest to him from the period of the Cultural Revolution to his death. The groundless accusations against them have been repeated so often, that in the fashion of the big lie technique it is hoped that people will believe them without question. Sadly, in a lot of cases, this is true and many good people have not practised any proper analysis and have swallowed this rubbish hook, line and sinker. We are told that the "Gang of Four" paid no attention to productivity - where is the concrete evidence for this?. Certainly not in big cities like Shanghai where production rose as major technical innovations were pioneered during the period of "anarchy".

And the same sort of rubbish is repeated about the Cultural Revolution. Again it is conveniently "Forgotten" that the Cultural Revolution was launched by Mao and that its purpose was two-fold being both an ideological struggle against revisionism and an exercise in putting political power into the hands of the great mass of the people, not in an abstract way at the level of Party leadership but in a concrete day-to-day way. And in passing you forgot to mention that the students who handed in blank examination papers did so as a political protest aimed at the children of Party cadres having access to higher education through the back door. Let us not forget what Mao said about the Cultural Revolution:

"Apparently we couldn't do without the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution for our base was not solid. From my observations I am afraid that in a fairly large majority of factories - I don't mean all or the overwhelming majority - leadership was not in the hands of real Marxists and the mass of workers. Not that there were no good people in the factories, there were... but they followed the line of Liu Shao-chi's just resorting to material incentive, putting profit in command and instead of promoting proletarian politics handing out bonuses and so forth".
(Quoted by Chang Chun-chiao "On exercising all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. FLP, Peking)

Again it must be asked is this not direct and unequivocal?. You say that we will soon denounce Mao as a revisionist but we must put it to you that this is what you must do if you wish to maintain a pro-Teng position. These people were Mao's sworn enemies; he fought against them time and time again; this is the reality. The documentations of those struggles still exist here and if you study them you cannot deny it. You must either jettison Mao or the present clique: you cannot reconcile them. So it is up to you.

Apart from your denunciation of the "Gang of Four" and the Cultural Revolution there are two other major points in your letter that we would like to take up: these are the importance of modernisation for China and class struggle during the socialist period. On the question of modernisation in China you, in common with other apologists for the present regime, have been fooled into thinking that there is a fundamentally antagonistic contradiction between the struggle for modernisation and the struggle for socialism and that one must inevitably be at the expense of the other. "China must modernise" is the cry on some people's

lips when any criticism of the present regime is made. You give the excuse that Lenin allowed the New Economic Policy in Russia but it is a complete red herring in the context of present day China. NEP came in just after the Civil War in Russia, that is in a time of great deprivation. Such a situation is not at all comparable with China now. In fact there is no antagonistic contradiction between socialism and modernisation and the latter is a logical and inevitable outcome of the former. Socialism liberates the forces of production in an unprecedented way and allows for rapid development. The truth of this is clearly seen when we look at the fantastic progress China has made since the Liberation and similarly the fantastic progress made by Russia in the twenties and thirties. So its not a question of a bit of class struggle here and a bit of modernisation there and somehow things develop. To pretend this is the case is a revisionist distortion of Marxism-Leninism and this is exactly what the present regime are doing: they put it either socialism or modernisation and they make no bones about what they prefer. They are using the call for modernisation as an excuse to abandon class struggle. Thus it is no accident that one of their first internal policies was to introduce piece-rates. Piece rates as every good bourgeois knows is a form of payment that does not reduce inequalities but actually increases them and also divides and alienates the working class.

Classes still exist during the socialist period and class struggle is of paramount importance. One key way this struggle develops is in the struggle for the socialisation of the relations of production and the progressive abolition of inequalities present in the socialist period. This is the meaning of Mao's famous slogan "Grasp revolution and promote production". It does not mean work harder; it means practice class struggle and fight for the socialisation of the relations of production. This stance is of course totally abandoned by the present regime. They place all the emphasis on expertise and machinery while the only role they allow the working class is that of willing work horses. Machines and tools don't make revolution but people do.

We must also refer you to a recent edition of "Peking Review" (No 46, Nov 16 th, 1979) and the article titled "Fundamental changes in China's class situation". Here again the alleged contradiction between modernisation and class struggle is given emphasis but more important than that it is stated quite firmly that the capitalist class no longer exist in China. If this preposterous statement was true it would of course mean that China is now no longer a socialist society but is a communist one. Obviously there are still people in China who are perturbed about what's going on as the article tries to forestall any criticism that may be made:

"As the capitalists have recently been given back their bank deposits and have been allowed once again to draw high pay some people still think that the capitalists are still exploiting others and wonder why it is said that the capitalist class no longer exist. Such people lack an understanding of the Party's policy of buying out the capitalist" (Peking Review 16.11.79)

We would comment that "some people's" (sic) eyes are perhaps beginning to open and that the present regime seem to be facing some opposition. The whole article spouts the same sort of nonsense that Khrushchev was peddling around in the 50s and is classic revisionism. The fact is that class struggle is vital during the socialist period and the bourgeoisie must be fought tooth and nail wherever they appear. That was the line of the "Gang of Four" and that was the line of Mao Tse Tung. The bourgeoisie re-emerged in China in the form of leading Party cadres taking the capitalist road. The reason for this is because of the inequalities of the socialist period and will be discussed at greater length elsewhere in this edition of "Red Star".

In conclusion we would like to say that with respect to the Chinese people they are in a very bad situation at present but on the other hand they have had the experience of literally decades of class struggle and they also have the guidance of Mao Tse-Tung thought. We hope that the present reversal is only a temporary one and that they will struggle to overthrow the present regime as they have struggled so bravely in the past. As Mao said in 1966:

"If the Rightists stage an anti-communist coup d'etat in China I am sure

COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN
 100, GERRARD STREET, W. LONDON, W1P 3PA
 TEL: 01-253 4811
 FAX: 01-253 4812
 WWW: WWW.COMMUNIST.PARTY.GB

they will know no peace either and their rule will most probably be short lived because it will not be tolerated by the revolutionaries who represent the interests of the people making up more than 90% of the population".

M A O O N R E V I S I O N I S M.

"The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie." - Mao Tse Tung.

Revisionism is the denial of the necessity for the proletariat to bring about the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie; it is the denial of the necessity for the proletariat to exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie; it is the denial of the necessity of protracted class struggle throughout the entire period of socialist transformation of society.

Right from the beginnings of the international proletarian revolutionary movement revisionism has repeatedly appeared within the ranks of revolutionary organisations. Marx and Engels opposed reformist elements in the German Social-Democratic Party, Lenin struggled against the Mensheviks in the Russian revolutionary movement and Stalin battled against the Trotskyist defeatists who denied the possibility of sustaining socialist construction within one country.

In fact the struggle against revisionism will continue right up until the time when communism is achieved on a world wide scale. This is because revisionism is the form bourgeois ideology takes on within the ranks of the revolutionaries. Until such time as the last vestige of capitalist relations of production are abolished, (which are the cause of the division of society into opposed classes). The material basis for the generation of a bourgeois world outlook still exists. Only if the proletariat and its allies never cease to carry class struggle forward will the danger of capitalist restoration be averted.

In the Peoples Republic of China the Communist Party, under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, deepened and intensified the revolutionary struggle against revisionism, both within China itself and in the international arena against the Soviet revisionists originally led by Nikita Khrushchov. At the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union held in 1956 Khrushchov delivered his notorious speech denouncing Stalin and his political line. The Chinese Communists had many differences and disagreements with Stalin but they were aware of the danger of throwing out the baby with the bathwater as this extract from a speech given by Mao in 1956 makes clear:

"I would like to say a few words about the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I think there are two "swords": one is Lenin and the other Stalin. The sword of Stalin has now been discarded by the Russians. Gomulka and some people in Hungary have picked it up to stab at the Soviet Union and oppose so-called Stalinism. The Communist Parties of many European countries are also criticising the Soviet Union and their leader is Togliatti. The imperialists also use this sword to slay people with. Dulles, for instance, has brandished it for some time. This sword has not been lent out, it has been thrown out. We Chinese have not thrown it away. First, we protect Stalin, and, second, we at the same time criticise his mistakes, and we have written the article "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat". Unlike some people who have tried to defame and destroy Stalin, we are acting in accordance with objective reality."

"As for the sword of Lenin, hasn't it too been discarded to a certain extent by some Soviet leaders?. In my view, it has been discarded to a considerable extent. Is the October Revolution still valid?. Can it still serve as the example for all countries?. Khrushchov's report at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union says it is possible to seize state power by the parliametary road, that is

to say, it is no longer necessary for all countries to learn from the October Revolution. Once this gate is opened, by and large Leninism is thrown away."

The Chinese Communists began to campaign against the new revisionist clique led by Khrushchov within the international communist movement. In particular they combatted the erroneous theory that it is possible for the proletariat to seize state power, not by means of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, but through a peaceful parliamentary road. The Communist Party of Great Britain had the dubious distinction of having been the first communist party to openly proclaim a revisionist line when it adopted The British Road to Socialism as its programme back in 1951. Even so, Mao engaged in ideological struggle with its leader, the labour aristocrat Harry Pollitt, but without any success as this comment made in 1957 shows:

"Now the Communist Parties in a number of countries, The British Communist Party for example, only advance the slogan of peaceful transition. We talked this over with the leader of the British Party but couldn't get anywhere. Naturally they may feel proud, for as their leader queried, "How can Khrushchov claim to have introduced peaceful transition? I advanced it long before he did!".

Another first for Britain!

By the early nineteen sixties it was clear that the revisionists in the U.S.S.R. were becoming consolidated into a new state bourgeoisie and were rapidly reinstating capitalist relations of production in Soviet society. Also in China the revisionist elements were strong, their leading representative being Liu Shao-chi who was President of the PRC. Throughout the nineteen fifties there had been many sharp struggles against the revisionists who had opposed the Great Leap Forward of 1958 and the step-by-step collectivisation of agriculture. Drawing from this experience, together with the counter-revolutionary turn of events in the Soviet Union, Mao began a campaign to alert the Chinese workers and peasants to the need for intensifying the class struggle as the key link in the process of socialist transition. In 1962 he said:

"Now then, do classes exist in socialist countries? Does class struggle exist? We can now affirm that classes do exist in socialist countries and that class struggle undoubtedly exists. Lenin said: After the victory of the revolution, because of the existence of the bourgeoisie internationally, because of the existence of bourgeois remnants internally, because the petit bourgeoisie exists and continually generates a bourgeoisie, therefore the classes which have been overthrown within the country will continue to exist for a long time to come and may even attempt restoration. The bourgeois revolutions in Europe in such countries as England and France had many ups and downs. After the overthrow of feudalism there were several restorations and reversals of fortune. This kind of reversal is also possible in socialist countries. An example of this is Yugoslavia which has changed its nature and become revisionist, changing from a worker and peasant country to a country ruled by reactionary nationalist elements. In our country we must come to grasp, understand and study this problem really thoroughly. We must acknowledge that classes will continue to exist for a long time. We must also acknowledge the existence of a struggle of class against class, and admit the possibility of the restoration of the reactionary classes. We must raise our vigilance and properly educate our youth as well as the cadres, the masses and the middle- and basic-level cadres. Old cadres must also study these problems and be educated. Otherwise a country like ours can still move towards its opposite. Even to move towards its opposite would not matter too much because there would still be the negation of the negation, and afterwards we might move towards our opposite yet again. If our children's generation go in for revisionism and move towards their opposite, so that although they still nominally have socialism it is in fact capitalism, then our grandsons will certainly rise up in revolt and overthrow their fathers."

because the masses will not be satisfied. Therefore from now on we must talk about this every year, every month, every day. We will talk about it at congresses, at Party delegate conferences, at plenums, at every meeting we hold, so that we have a more enlightened Marxist-Leninist line on the problem."

In 1966 Mao and his comrades put out a call to the masses for the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The aim of this revolutionary upheaval was to wage mass ideological struggle against revisionist elements who were trying to take the capitalist road in the Party, the State, the economy, the educational system and the cultural sphere. The Cultural Revolution began among the students in the colleges and universities which were the main bastions of bourgeois ideology. But it quickly spread to the communes and factories with workers and peasants criticising persons in authority who were taking the capitalist road, removing them from their positions and establishing direct proletarian control over economic enterprises and public administration by means of the setting up of Revolutionary Committees. This constituted a strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeois elements. However, Mao never underestimated the strength of revisionism in China and he had this to say in a letter to Chiang Ching, his wife and close comrade, written right at the start of the Cultural Revolution in 1966:

"Since 1911, when the emperor was overthrown, a reactionary regime has not been able to hold China for long. If there is a Right-wing, anti-Communist coup d'etat in China, then I am certain that those elements will not know a moment of peace."

"It is very possible that they will be able to retain their dominance for a while. If the Right-wing seizes power, it will be able to use my words to retain power for a time. But the Left will use other quotations of mine, and organise themselves, and overthrow the Right-wing".

The Cultural Revolution achieved many important victories including the downfall of Liu Shao-chi and his close associate Teng Hsiao-ping. Most significant of all was the qualitative rise in the political consciousness of the workers and peasants and the great extension of proletarian democracy which resulted. But the advance and consolidation of the Cultural Revolution was not evenly carried out throughout the whole country, as Mao made clear in 1969:

"It seems essential that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution should still be carried out. Our foundation has not been consolidated. According to my observation I would say that, not in all factories, nor in a overwhelming majority of factories, but in quite a large majority of cases the leadership is not in the hands of true Marxists, nor yet in the hands of the masses of the workers. In the past leadership of the factories was not devoid of good men; there were good men. Among the Party committee secretaries, assistant secretaries and committee members there were good men. There were good men among the branch secretaries. But they followed the old line of Liu Shao-chi. They were all for material incentives, they put profits in command and did not promote proletarian politics. Instead they operated a system of bonuses, etc... There are now some factories which have liberated them and have included them in the leadership based on the Triple Alliance. Some factories still have not done so."

During the Cultural Revolution Lin Piao, an army commander, had risen to national prominence as Mao's main supporter in the anti-revisionist struggle. Mao had always had reservations about Lin and his associates but had not openly voiced these doubts because this would have brought about confusion and splits amongst the workers and peasants at the time of the most fierce struggles against those in power taking the capitalist road. As we have seen with so many opportunistic elements in the past, e.g. Trotsky and co, Lin's political line was left in form but right in essence. In 1971 the Lin Piao group attempted to stage a military coup d'etat and assassinate Mao. This attempt to impose milit-

ary dictatorship failed but the resulting confusion enabled some capitalist ro-
aders to reassert themselves and begin to move back into Party and State posi-
tions, especially in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. By 1974 Teng Hsiao-ping
had fully re-emerged from disgrace to take up leading Party and State positions.
It was in this year that he delivered his notorious speech at the United Nations
in which the reactionary Theory of the Three Worlds was first put forward. By
now Mao was a very sick man but once again he took up the cudgels against revi-
sionist resurgence. In late 1974 he called, in the following four statements,
for a nation-wide movement to study the dictatorship of the proletariat:

"Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie?
It is essential to get this question clear. Lack of clarity on this
question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the
whole nation."

"In a word, China is a socialist country. Before liberation she was
much the same as a capitalist country. Even now she practises an
eight-grade wage system, distribution according to work and excha-
nge through money, and in all this differs very little from the old
society. What is different is that the system of ownership has
been changed".

"Our country at present practises a commodity system, the wage system
is unequal, too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth.
Under the dictatorship of the proletariat such things can only be
restricted. Therefore if people like Lin Piao come to power, it
will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system. That
is why we should do more reading of Marxist-Leninist works."

"Lenin said that 'small production engenders capitalism and the
bourgeoisie continually, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on
a mass scale.' They are also engendered among a part of the
working class and of the Party membership. Both within the
ranks of the proletariat and among the personnel of state and
other organs there are people who take the bourgeois style of
life."

In 1975 Teng Hsiao-ping circulated three policy documents among Party cad-
res. These contained proposals on the course of development to be taken by
China and were of an openly revisionist kind. Mao reacted strongly and said:

"What! 'Take the three directives as the key link' Stability
and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle
is the key link and everything else hinges on it."

Also, Mao gave a very direct assessment of Teng's political character:

"This person does not grasp class struggle; he has never referred to
this key link. Still his theme of 'white cat, black cat', making
no distinction between imperialism and Marxism."

and:

"He does not understand Marxism-Leninism, he represents the
capitalist class."

As it became obvious that Mao's days were numbered, the revisionist elem-
ents in the CPC led by Teng became bolder. In April 1976 they organised a
violent demonstration in Peking, ostensibly to commemorate Premier Chou En-Lai
who had recently died, but in reality to attack Mao and his close comrades
Chiang Ching, Chang Chun-chiao, Wang Hung-wen, Yao Wen-yuan and the proletari-
an line they upheld. Teng was dismissed from all his posts and a mass campai-
gn to criticise his revisionist line was launched. It was around this time
that Mao exclaimed to his comrades:

"You are making the socialist revolution, and yet you don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right inside the Communist Party - those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road"

By June 1976 Mao's health was deteriorating rapidly and he gave his last warning against revisionism:

"I have predicted that full-scale capitalist restoration may appear in China."

In September 1976 Comrade Mao died and a month later revisionist elements staged a coup d'etat in which the Four were unconstitutionally removed from their Party and State offices. Within a year Teng was back in leading positions and his revisionist line is now being implemented, although there has been and is mass opposition, including armed uprisings, from workers and peasants. The final outcome of the revisionist seizure of state power in China remains to be seen.

However, the temporary triumph of revisionism in China does not mean that Mao's struggle against it was a complete failure. Comrade Mao and the Chinese masses have helped us to deepen our understanding of the sources and nature of revisionism during the period of socialist construction. It is not simply that bourgeois elements left over from before the revolution attempt to stage a comeback. Neither is it primarily a case of the middle-strata intelligentsia clinging to bourgeois ideology and disseminating it through education and culture. The fundamental factor is the persistence of some capitalist relations of production during socialist transformation. It is true that those persons appointed to leading positions in the state and the economy are experienced party cadres with a high level of political consciousness. But it is social being which determines social consciousness and prolonged occupancy of authoritative positions in the social division of labour will tend to generate a bourgeois outlook in those persons. The only real and lasting safeguard against such high ranking cadres emerging as a new and nascent bourgeoisie is the constant revolutionising of the relations of production by the proletariat and its allies. It is not sufficient for the means of production to be publicly owned only in a formal sense. The proletariat must increasingly take over exercising day-to-day control of the economy and state apparatus at all levels. Significant steps were taken along this road during the Cultural Revolution in China although these advances are now being reversed by the revisionist counter-revolution. Nonetheless, the great revolutionary legacy of the Chinese Revolution, the practise of the working masses as summed up by Mao, is the necessity of Cultural Revolution - not one but many. The struggle to transform capitalist relations into socialist relations of production is in fact the process of progressively abolishing classes in society and thus the erosion of the State apparatus which is the instrument of the domination of one class over another.

"Never forget class struggle"

"Carry through the revolution to the end"

CHILE: AN ATTEMPT AT "HISTORICAL COMPROMISE" BY JORGE PALACIOS.

This book is by far the most authoritative work yet published on the fascist military coup d'etat of September 11th, 1973 and the background and history leading to it. The book also gives a good account of the political situation after the coup and the resistance of the Chilean people. There is also a detailed and scientific analysis of the ideological base of the Popular Unity Government and in particular the role played by the "Communist" Party of Chile and its line of the "Peaceful road to Socialism". The well-documented material

shows the origin of the "Peaceful road ..." thesis as well as giving a full account of how Allende's victory of 1970 was used both in Chile and abroad as an example of the "correctness" of this counter-revolutionary theory. There is also account of the economic policies of the Allende government, including the nationalisation process, the crisis in the state economy and the economic sabotage perpetrated by the opposition with close collaboration from the U.S. The hegemonic conflict between the U.S and U.S.S.R. over Chile is also documented, as is the expression of this conflict within Chile.

In addition there is a detailed account of the various political groups existing before the coup and a study of the differences between them and their weaknesses. It is particularly critical of the failure of the Left to oppose the line of the Popular Unity Government and to warn the Chilean people of the possibility of the fascist coup.

The book is not purely an historical account. It is an attempt to develop Marxist-Leninist analysis of the concrete reality of Chile and what took place there. The main objective is to show that it was not socialism that failed in Chile but a revisionist distortion of it. Palacios affirms that the only genuine way forward to national liberation and true socialism is by developing a true Marxist-Leninist strategy and that, coupled with the heroic fighting capacity of the Chilean people, will rid it of fascism.

Thus one of the great strengths of the book is its powerful refutation of revisionism and especially the theory of the "peaceful road to Socialism". Another major strength is the clear analysis of the task facing Latin American countries in their quest for national liberation. The book is also invaluable to anyone interested in the history and politics of Chile, even if they do not agree with the conclusions reached by the author. A great deal of original research has gone into this book and it contains a deal of material not available elsewhere.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR.

Comrade Jorge Palacios was born in Valparaiso, Chile on November 3rd, 1926. Before the fascist coup of 1973 he was professor of philosophy in the University of Chile. He is also a founding member and a member of the secretariat of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile (R.C.P.Ch.). Before the coup he appeared in a weekly television programme called "Now one improvises" which was seen by more than one million people each week. In this programme he warned the Chilean people that the reactionary armed forces were preparing a coup and attacked the Law to control arms which dis-armed the people while the fascist forces built up their arms stores. He also affirmed the programme of the R.C.P.Ch and its revolutionary strategy as an alternative to the reformist strategy of the Popular Unity Government. He called for a united opposition to the fascist forces but this call was not heard.

Palacios wrote "Chile: an attempt at "historic. . compromise"" because no systematic work had then been written about the coup and the events leading up to it. Furthermore the book is a fierce attack on the "Communist" Party of Chile because their revisionist theories did much to pave the way for the fascist offensive. Palacios is now living in Europe in exile. gr

Printed and Published by the Nottingham Communist Group, NCG, c/o Flat 2, 10 Villa Road, Nottingham NG3 4GG. Phone: 0602 604991.

(continued from front page)

The final article is a review of the book Chile: An Attempt at "Historic Compromise" by Jorge Palacios, a member of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile. Here again the dangers of revisionism, especially the theory of "the peaceful road to socialism", are exposed. In Chile "the peaceful road to socialism" turned out in practice to be a violent road to fascism resulting in the deaths of tens of thousands of people and a great setback for the Chilean people's revolutionary struggle.

As in the past, we welcome comments and criticism.

THE NEW RED STAR

The proletarian revolutionary movement and its ideological expression, Marxism-Leninism, has never been strong in Britain, this most bourgeois of all countries. At present in Britain the dozen or so small organisations claiming to uphold this proletarian ideology are in a state of confusion and disarray following the revisionist resurgence in China and the alliance of the Hua-Teng clique with U.S. imperialism. Most of these organisations have abandoned a revolutionary position and have taken on the role of spokesmen for the hegemonic ambitions of the Chinese state bourgeoisie. Meanwhile, the contradictions both within Britain and the world are sharpening as we enter the run-up period to World War III. Given this deplorable state of affairs, it is more vital than ever that Marxism-Leninism, the only authentic ideological expression of the struggles of the working class against capitalist exploitation, should be sustained, developed and widely disseminated in Britain. This is why in future Red Star will be appearing in a new form.

Later on in this year Red Star will reappear as a regular, quarterly, properly printed and nationally distributed periodical. Its task will be to combat the new, whiter-than-white, revisionism emanating from Peking, to provide a rallying point for genuine Marxist-Leninists in Britain and to reach out to people only just beginning to move towards the revolutionary outlook. We hope to bring about the full editorial participation in the new Red Star of a number of Marxist-Leninist organisations. The contents will be broadened to include articles on the major contradictions in Britain and the world today, commentary on current events, reprints of articles and documents from abroad and a cultural section. A cover charge will be made for the new Red Star and subscription details will be circulated in due course. We urge readers who are willing to participate, in any way, in the production and distribution of the new Red Star to contact us with any suggestions and proposals you may wish to make.

"For a long time now people have been levelling a lot of criticism at dogmatism. That is as it should be. But they often neglect to criticise revisionism. Both dogmatism and revisionism run counter to Marxism. Marxism must certainly advance; it must develop along with the development of practice and cannot stand still. It would become lifeless if it remained stagnant and stereotyped. However, the basic principles of Marxism must never be violated, or otherwise mistakes will be made. It is dogmatism to approach Marxism from a metaphysical point of view and to negate its universal truth. Revisionism is one form of bourgeois ideology. The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line. In present circumstances, revisionism is more pernicious than dogmatism. One of our current important tasks on the ideological front is to unfold criticism of revisionism."

Mao Tse-tung