

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

No 3 PUBLISHED BY THE RED EUREKA MOVEMENT March 17, 1979

EDITORIAL "Discussion Bulletin" will from now on be published approximately monthly as a public forum. It is no longer "internal" and copies or subscriptions are available from AFTER HOURS BOOKS, (Mon - Fri, 5pm to 9pm), 118 Hoddle St, Abbotsford, Vic 3067, Australia, for \$A0.50 cents per copy plus 20 cents postage.

Number 1 (October 1, 1977) and number 2 (Jan 15, 1978) will also be reprinted and are now available to the public.

Following public attacks on Mao Tsetung and Mao Tsetung Thought by leaders of the Party of Labor of Albania, the Red Eureka Movement resolved, in December 1978, as follows:

We reaffirm that: "Our stand is to defend the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung thought against the new revisionist attacks on them in China, Australia and throughout the world", as decided at our foundation meeting in April 1977.

We condemn the attacks on the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought by leaders of the Party of Labor of Albania. This decision is to be publicized.

At the same time it was recognized that serious confusion and some opposition existed within REM, particularly concerning the question of "three worlds" and our policy statement "Opinions on Some International Questions" (adopted in February 1978 and published in The Rebel! Vol 2 No 2 in May 1978). Accordingly, the following resolutions were also adopted:

The internal discussion on international questions is reopened immediately. The policy statement "Opinions on Some International Questions" remains our policy unless and until it is changed after full discussion.

The internal discussion should also embrace all other aspects of REM policy and line and be used for general education in the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought.

Articles hostile to REM policy and Mao Tsetung Thought may be published in the Discussion Bulletin. The Discussion Bulletin is to be public. Articles unsuitable for the Discussion Bulletin shall be distributed as internal circulars. REM members may air their views verbally outside the organization for the duration of the discussion.

As well as organizing internal study classes and taking part in public seminars etc, we intend to make this Discussion Bulletin the major vehicle for both our "internal discussion" and "general education". We want to initiate a program of serious theoretical work to deepen our understanding, not only of international affairs, but especially of the Australian revolution and how to win it.

Contributions from outside REM are invited and can be forwarded care of the bookshop address above. Brief notes and comments and recommendations for further study also welcome. Items already typed on stencils or supplied in 500 copies will receive priority.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and Contents	2 pages
2. A suggested program for political discussion	2 pages
3. Study guide	2 pages
4. There are no models	2 pages
5. Albania and Mao Tse-Tung: Reference Material	12 pages
6. Was Mao a great M-L ?	4 pages
7. Are Mao's critics M-L's ?	30 pages

.....

A SUGGESTED PROGRAMME FOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION

27.12.78

It has been suggested that the political discussion undertaken by REM in the coming months should not be confined to those issues which are currently contentious in our ranks, but should also embrace other areas in which there is a crying need for greater clarity. The following four areas have been suggested for discussion (and/or education -

- * the international situation
- * the nature of the Australian revolution
- * basic Marxist theory
- * political economy

What follows is a proposal from an REM member as to how we might go about studying these issues.

International Situation

No discussion meetings on this topic should be scheduled by REM for a few weeks. In the meantime every effort should be made to promote study of international questions, especially by those who have not so far taken an active part in discussion of these issues. Articles for the Discussion Bulletin should be encouraged, particularly from people with different views from what has already been published (i.e. those who are not fiercely partisan for or against the theory of the three worlds). Articles need not necessarily arrive at conclusions - if some of the questions were clarified it would be helpful.

(The Movement for Independence and Socialism is holding a meeting in early February to discuss motions concerning the three worlds theory and the road to socialism in Australia. Attendance at this should be useful for people attempting to come to grips with these issues. Details of the meeting will be notified in an MIS Newsletter, which will be available from the Afterhours Bookshop.)

Nature of the Australian Revolution

The first step should be to organize Discussion Bulletin articles to spark off the discussion - either by individuals or small teams. The aim should be to publish these articles by the end of January, and hold a general discussion meeting in the second half of February. This meeting would probably organize groups or individuals to investigate specific aspects and report back to later meetings.

The initial articles on this subject should deal with such questions as -

- * What are the classes in Australian society and their relationships to each other?
- * What is the relationship of the ruling class to foreign imperialism?
- * What is a 'new democracy' (or 'anti-imperialist people's democratic dictatorship' or whatever) and how is it different from a proletarian dictatorship?
- * What is the significance of 'small' business-people in Australia and how would a revolutionary government deal with them?
- * When we speak of the leading role of the working class (or proletariat), what do we mean by (a) 'leading role', (b) 'working class' (or 'proletariat')?
- * What sort of revolution would we fight for if we were living under (a) fascism, (b) military invasion or occupation by a foreign power?
- * How does Australia's class structure compare with other developed capitalist countries?
- * How Does Australia's relationship with foreign imperialism compare with that applying to other countries?

Basic Marxist Theory

Included under this heading are such topics as dialectical materialism, the materialist conception of history, the nature of the state, the nature and role of revolutionary parties, the origins and nature of revisionism, etc.

SUGGESTED PROGRAMME FOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION, continued

We should draw up a list of important books and articles from the 'classics'. We should then draw up a list of REM members (and other interested people?) who are capable of studying such works and allot each of these people a work, or a number of short works dealing with the one topic. Each of these people will have the job of studying his/her work(s) and producing a written report. Reports should at the very least be a summary of what has been studied, but preferably will also contain a commentary on its significance to us. Deadlines will be set, taking account of the magnitude of the task in each case. Those seeking exemption will have to plead incapacity - lack of inclination or time will be no excuse, although shortage of time will be grounds for extending the deadline. Swaps will be permitted. The reports will be published in the Discussion Bulletin and could perhaps also be the basis of talks to discussion groups, which would be open to people who are not REM members. If this work is done well it could be an important contribution to our education/propaganda work.

Political Economy

There are two main tasks here -

- *studying Marxist political economy
- *applying it to the current Australian situation

Because the level of knowledge of Marxist economics seems to be quite low in most of REM's membership, we must start with the first of these, probably as an internal education programme to begin with. Fairly formal classes would probably be appropriate initially. We should call for voluntary enrolments in a series of such classes. People who begin the course would be expected to continue, unless they had a good reason for dropping out. The aim would be that as the course progressed, the classes would become more like discussion group meetings. An important aim of the group would be to produce written material both for publication in the Discussion Bulletin and for pamphlets or broadsheets suitable for fairly wide distribution.

While this is going on, two or three people who already have a reasonably good understanding of Marxist political economy should be assigned the task of investigating and reporting on the current economic situation. The main sources for this would be statistical and other factual material, and a critical survey of recent bourgeois and 'radical' economic writings, especially those dealing with Australia.

The above proposals have been drawn up in the belief that without political clarity we cannot expect to achieve any thing, and that there is no short cut by which we can achieve such clarity without thorough study. Any comments would be appreciated.

Eric

Further study guides and reference lists, including other material from various 'ML' groups, will be prepared shortly. This will include a study guide on the question of Mao Tsetung, the history of the polemics in the international communist movement and other issues recently raised by the Albanians. See also 'Reference Material from Overseas' issued on December 3rd, 1978.

REQUIRED READING (by January 31, 1978⁹)

1. "Opinions on Some International Questions". Policy statement adopted by R.E.M. in February 1978, included in The Rebel! Vol 2, no2.
2. "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution", Albanian editorial of July 7, 1977, included in Study Notes No.3.
3. "Three Worlds" by Alan Ward, Discussion Bulletin No 1. (3rd Aug.77)
4. "Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism", Chinese editorial of November 1, 1977.
5. "Reject the Theory of Three Worlds" by Martin Connell, 24 August, 1978. (Previously issued as an internal circular, now included with this Discussion Bulletin, No 3).
6. Discussion Bulletin. All the articles published in past and future issues are required reading. As well as this issue, No.3., and No.1 already referred to, issue No.2 also contains several relevant articles.
7. "Albania and Mao Tsetung", reference material issued 28.10.78 and now included in this Discussion Bulletin.

The above material should all be carefully studied again, making notes while doing so, even if it has been read before, in order to gain a clear idea of what the debate is about.

Notes should also be made on all future material published in Discussion Bulletin, and on classical and other material studied (see below).

ESSENTIAL BACKGROUND

(Foreign Languages Press, Peking edition unless otherwise stated).

8. Stalin, "Problems of Leninism", Foundations of Leninism, VI, The National Question, pp 67-68. Report to XVIIth Party Congress, I, Sections 2 and 3, pp 679 - 694. Report to XVIIIth Party Congress, I, sections 2 and 3, pp 881 - 890.
9. "Lenin on the National and Colonial Questions, Three Articles".
10. "Lenin's Prediction on the Revolutionary Storms in the East".

...(over)

Study Guide, cont'd, 21,12.78

11. Lenin, "the Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up", Collected Works (hereafter ICW) Vol.22, pp.320-360, July 1916).
12. "The Junius Pamphlet", ICW 22, 305-319, July 1916.
13. "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialism Economism", ICW 23, 28-76, August - October 1916.
14. "An Open Letter to Boris Souvarine", ICW 23, 195-2)4, Dec.1916.
15. "War and Revolution", ICW 24, 399-421, May 14 (27),1917.
16. "Speech Delivered at a Meeting of Activists of the Moscow Organization of the R.C.P. (B). December 6, 1920", ICW 31, 438-459.
17. Lenin, "Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder", VII, No Compromises? pp 62-76. IV pp 16-25, Appendix I, 112-114.
18. Stalin, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.", Remark 6, pp 32-37.
19. Mao Tsetung, Selected Works (Hereafter MSW), "On Policy", pp 441-449, Vol.II.
20. "Win the Masses in Their Millions for the Anti-Japanese National United Front", MSW I, 285-294.
21. "Conclusions on the Repulse of the Second Anti-Communist Onslaught", MSW II, p.p. 463-468.
22. "Introducing The Communist", MSW II, 285-296.
23. "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism", MSW I, pp.153-178.

OTHER BACKGROUND

24. "Outline of Education on Situation for Companies" (March 1973) in Classified Chinese Communist Documents: A Selection, Institute of International Relations, Taipei, Taiwan, 1978, pp.492-536.
25. "Chiang Ching's Address to Diplomatic Cadres" (March 1975) ibid pp.537-545.
26. "Chiao Kuan-hua's Address..." (May 20, 1975), ibid pp.546-71.
27. "Theory of ThreeWorlds Enriches Marxism-Leninism", Australian Communist No.83, June 1977, pp. 19-27.
28. Enver Hoxha, "Report Submitted to the 7th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania", November 1, 1976, Ch.V and VI, pp.158-252.
29. Study Notes No.3 Other articles reprinted, especially first one (Brazil).
30. Items listed in "Reference Material from Overseas", nos. 3, 4, 5, 7, 19, 20, 23.
31. "Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement", especially pp. 1 - 55, 185-220.

.....

THERE ARE NO MODELS

Workers in Australia at the moment feel pretty downtrodden and are sceptical of winning any victories. They feel isolated and deserted and also feel that there is nothing they can do to take or change decisions that have been made. Why? Many large battles have been lost. S.E.C. Yallourn, Medibank, Railways, metalworkers and teacher unemployment struggles have all suffered either clear defeats or large setbacks. It is important to understand why. The KEY lies in a clear understanding of the previous victories and the current situation. The victories of the past stemmed from mobilization of massive forces of workers to the streets and into the campaigns. The Trade Unions and the ALP were of great assistance in this. The method of organisation that was developed then in a situation that was comparatively 'easy' was for the raising of political demands within the mass of progressive Trade Union and ALP workers who would then, because they were convinced, bring about policy changes within both these bodies. Simultaneously we raised strong and persistent arguments within the intelligentsia via the universities, schools and professions. This brought about a situation of mass politicization on a number of questions, e.g. Vietnam, South Africa (racism), freeways, pollution, community identity. All of this occurred in a climate where capitalism was running smoothly, unemployment was minimal and workers viewed the situation as being relatively stable.

Our method of organization was geared to this situation and to a large extent, still is. Also, the Trade Unions and ALP mainly operate best in a situation that is stable and demands therefore are easily accommodated.

In 1974, we saw large changes take place within the political arena, the economic situation and unemployment. Internationally, massive upheavals were beginning to occur as the U.S. began to see large flaws developing in its own economy. Pressure was put on its 'dominions' to assist the limping U.S. Imperialists. This occurred not only in Australia, but in England, Europe, Japan and Chile, etc. Some of the 'dominions' resisted this pressure, Japan and Western Europe being the most obvious, and confidence in the U.S. dollar (i.e. the U.S. economy) was put in severe doubt.

Back in Australia, unemployment continued to rise, markets dried up, investment lagged and competition from neighbour countries undercut local manufacturers or distributors. All of this heightened the unemployment situation and put great stress on the Australian economy. The Trade Union movement, when faced with this situation, began to be more and more reluctant to push 'political' struggles (Medibank), and began to back peddle and to some degree appease the system for the purposes of maintaining a non-conformist stance.

Clear leadership from Trade Union leaders and leaders of all political parties was NOT forthcoming. This included 'militant' trade unions, the ALP, the CPAs or any of the well known progressive leaders. All of them are geared to work within the system because all have continued to depend on the base trade union mobilization. Even the communist unions who have been outspoken against the system now maintain a position of not wishing to be 'isolated'. The only clear leadership coming at the moment is from the forces of reaction, PAC., Fraser, Country Party, etc. Even where Labour governments achieve victories in the states, no significant victories have taken place but rather capitalism in those states runs smoother and with less corruption.

The future, should this trend continue, will be a massive growth in the reactionary forces, the development of a fascist para-military force to put down what little resistance there may be to intense repression, and generally the demoralisation and destruction of the aspirations of the workers in this country. The CPA M/L, because it too at the moment relies too heavily upon the mobilization by the Trade Union movement, will be, should it continue with this position, ineffective.

There is a need at the moment for action, not inaction, for clear leadership, for a restructuring of our approach to organization of mass struggles. CLEAR LEADERSHIP IS NEEDED. Victories need to be won to instil confidence in workers in this country. The method of mobilizing masses of workers and people must not be so dependent on Trade Union

(....2)

leaders and the union organization or the ALP because THEIR organizations are part of the capitalist system.

.....
There is a glaring need for action, demonstrations, acts of civil disobedience, attacks on the government (both physical and verbal), on imperialist companies (mining, meat, car, etc.), which either make massive profits, mine or export uranium, sack workers, or attack their working conditions. In all actions that we undertake, it must be made very clear why we are attacking.

There is also a glaring need for the development of a longish term strategy. We must at this stage begin to work out some basic directions to assist us in a) formulating tactics, and b) development of a real understanding of the nature of Australia's revolution. To make it easier to understand where we are going, certain rough guidelines must be set down now! Realistic tasks must be set, and progress reports on the fulfilment of these tasks must be given. It cannot be stressed too strongly that the key to all understanding of the development of the revolution in Australia will come from the actions and the analyses that follow. But first there must be clear direction!

.....
M.I.S. should play a vital role in the development and initiation of mass campaigns. We must be prepared to unite with many people whose political opinions are varied. The revolution in Australia will require a leadership that is able to unite vast numbers of workers and people who have differing views of where we are going. The question of recruitment of members for M.I.S. is very important and a recruitment campaign should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity. We must reduce the emphasis on the 'paper war'. The 'propaganda machine' principle works on the basis that we convince or develop enough people in Australia by words alone to adopting a position identical to our own and then seizing state power with a minimum of struggle. This view is of course WRONG. Some people find it 'safer' or 'easier' to remain anonymous through hiding behind leaflets, newspapers, etc. This is one of Mao's manifestations of liberalism. DO NOT SAY, WE MUST BE SEEN TO BE DOING, JUST SAYING IS EASY.

.....
One of the principles of scientific socialism is that when tasks are set, priorities or order of importance must also be given to these tasks. This principle has been adopted by REM. But in setting these tasks, time must also be allowed for constantly changing the 'main task' (or campaign) in a period when we should be consolidating. In the short period of REM's existence, some 5 or 6 main tasks (or campaigns) have been adopted. This is bloody ridiculous. We think that REM must give serious consideration to the development of a fighting revolutionary party. We must be concerned about party building. We must make an analysis of the Australian situation and where we are going. We must cease this constant change of priorities. We must avoid endless academic debates about questions that we are not in a position to know (e.g. China v. Albania, 2 worlds or 3). To have a real grasp of the implications of either of these questions will require detailed understanding of the situation in Australia. Further, the position of fighting for real independence is embodied in the fight for socialism. The question of the 3rd world or 2 worlds is largely irrelevant to the internal situation in Australia and becomes important in international relations.

REM should have one main publication. This should be of the magazine type (say, monthly) and should be an open publication with photos, etc. and containing both topical and theoretical articles (aimed at fairly ordinary people - without underestimating them). It is also our view that REM should act as a party organization. MIS on the other hand should be seen as a mass open organization to which we would give high priority.

The question of Australia's revolution is a difficult one. The Chinese revolution was waged and was successful because Mao adopted an analysis of the Chinese situation and understood the culture, the economy and, most of all, the Chinese people. This was done in a situation where the Soviet Union 'advised', and in many cases the advice was ignored. The Chinese, and particularly Mao Tse-tung decided that there are no models. The revolution in China, as had been the revolution in Russia, had to be determined, fought and won by the people. Situations that existed in Russia did not exist in China and vice versa. EACH REVOLUTION IS BASED ON THE REALITY OF ITS OWN SOCIETY. So, too, Australia. Before we can make the revolution in Australia a reality, we must know Australia, its people, our strengths, our weaknesses, the strengths of our enemy and its weaknesses.

.....

(Reference Material)

28 October 1978

Excerpts from the Letter of the CC of the PLA and the Government of Albania to the CC of the CCP and the Government of China (July 29, 1978). "8 NENTORI" Publishing House Tirana, 1978:

1. "3. In Summer 1964 Chinese propaganda took up the Sino-Soviet border problem. Referring to a talk of Mao Tsetung with a group of Japanese socialist parliamentarians, it claimed that China had been dispossessed by the Russian Czars of vast territories of hundreds of thousands of square kilometres, that in Europe, too, the Soviet Union had territorial problems which had emerged as a result of the Second World War.

"The Party of Labour of Albania did not approve of Mao Tsetung's raising the problem of rectification of borders..." (p28)

2. "...The Chinese thesis on the rectification of borders... expressed the chauvinistic spirit of the great state and bourgeois nationalism, it was an instigation of war in Europe.

"In keeping with Leninist norms, in the spirit of complete correctness and in a comradely manner, the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania informed the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Chairman Mao personally of its opinions on these questions in a letter addressed to them on September 10, 1964..." (p29)

3. "The Chinese leadership never gave our Party any explanation on this question of so great importance. Mao Tsetung limited himself to a verbal statement to the effect that "we will not reply to your letter because we do not want to stir up polemics"..." (p30)

4. "Our Party supported the Cultural Revolution at the personal request of Mao Tsetung..."

"By supporting the Cultural Revolution our Party nurtured the hope that it would find the road of true revolutionary struggle, led by the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party. The entire period of the great Cultural Revolution was a very difficult period for socialism in China, it created a complicated and chaotic situation. This situation was the logical outcome of the factional and unprincipled struggle which took place within the ranks of the Communist Party of China during the time of the struggle for the carrying out of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and after 1949, around the road which China would follow for the further development of the revolution.

"The great ideas of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the Marxist-Leninist ideology were not properly made the example for, the pillar and the compass of, the Communist Party of China in the concrete conditions of its country. This accounts for the fact that the Marxist-Leninist nucleus of the Party slipped into dangerous eclecticism, which gave rise to a chaos of unbridled struggle for power between factions, persons and groups holding various non-Marxist-Leninist views, something which seriously hampered the laying of the foundations of socialism in China. This political-ideological and organizational chaos in the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state enabled capitalist and revisionist elements to seize key positions in the Party,

in the state power and in the army. In these conditions, the Cultural Revolution, inspired and led by Mao Tsetung personally, broke out..."

"The Cultural Revolution, more often than not, preserved the spirit and actions of an unprincipled struggle, which was not led by a genuine party of the working class which should strive for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus these clashes among factionalist groups ended in the establishment in China of a state power dominated by bourgeois and revisionist elements." (p34-36)

5. "The events that were taking place revealed ever more clearly that the political and ideological struggle of the Communist Party of China against the Khrushchevites did not proceed from a sound basis, in reality, its aim was not to defend Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and the liberation of peoples. It was waged simply for pragmatic ends and selfish interests. This became evident in the radical change of the Chinese strategy, to which Nixon's visit to Peking officially set the seal..." (p40)

6. "With Nixon's visit, China joined the dance of imperialist alliances and rivalries for the redivision of the world, where China, too, would have its own share. This visit paved the road to its rapprochement and collaboration with US imperialism and its allies. At the same time, the inauguration of the alliance with the United States of America also marked the abandoning on the part of the Chinese leadership of the genuine socialist countries, the Marxist-Leninist movement, the revolution and the national-liberation struggle of the peoples.

"This alliance and meeting in Peking, between the Chinese leadership and the American President Nixon, were taking place at a time when the US was waging its predatory imperialist war in heroic Vietnam, when it was using all its most up-to-date means of war, except the A-bomb, to kill the fraternal heroic Vietnamese people and to reduce Vietnam to ashes. This monstrous alliance and the Sino-US contacts were condemnable acts of disastrous consequences for the peoples." (p41)

7. "9. After its rapprochement with US imperialism and overtures to the United States of America and its allies, the leadership of the Communist Party of China proclaimed the anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary theory of the "three worlds",..." (p44)

8. "Under the hoax of defence of national independence from Soviet socialimperialism which it regards as the only danger and threat today, China requires the peoples to give up their struggle for national, economic and social liberation, to submit to US imperialism and the other capitalist powers of the West, the former colonialists. It presses for the strengthening of the Common Market and the European Union, organisations set up to keep the proletariat of Europe in capitalist bondage and to oppress and exploit the peoples of other countries. By fanning up the armaments race of the superpowers and relying on such instruments of war of US imperialism as NATO and other military blocs, the theory of "three worlds" instigates imperialist world war..."

"The Chinese leadership is not the first to display its "affection" and "care" for the so-called "third world". The imperialists, the social imperialists and the other neo-colonialists have worked out various theories on the "third world" long ago before it, in order to dominate and subjugate the countries and peoples of this "world". Therefore, it is a futile effort on the part of the Chinese leadership to claim that it is the first, as early as 1974, to have produced this theory on the basis of an allegedly objective analysis of the international situations made by Mao Tsetung. It is common knowledge that the theory of "three worlds" has been concocted by world reaction. The Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian Government exposed and combated the theoretic and practical speculations in regard to the "third world" in the international arena as far back as 1960, and even before, as bourgeois-capitalist, neo-colonialist and racist manoeuvres and conspiracies to suppress the peoples who were fighting for freedom and independence.

"The "contribution" of the Chinese leaders to the theory of "three worlds" consists only in its "substantiation" of the need for reconciliation of the "third world" with imperialism; they have discovered nothing; they concocted the alliance of the "third world" with US imperialism and the other imperialists to solicit their aid and to make China an imperialist superpower.

"Therefore, it is not the Party of Labour of Albania which attacks the Chinese inventor or the champions of this theory; it is precisely the latter who were the first to attack the Party of Labour of Albania and the struggle it has waged against this theory of world reaction, the struggle it has conducted in support of the freedom and independence of the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America, etc.

"The implementation of the theory of "three worlds" led the Chinese leadership to unite even with the "devil", to unite with the US imperialists and the monopolists of Europe, with fascists and racists, kings and feudal lords, most rabid militarists and warmongers, Pinochet and Franco, former nazi generals of the German Wehrmacht and the Japanese imperial army, dyed-in-the-wool criminals like Mobutu and bloodthirsty kings, American bosses and presidents of multinational companies, became its allies." (p46-48)

9. "11. Continuous changes have taken place in the leadership of the Communist Party of China as to its line, strategy and composition. The Party of Labour of Albania never defended this or that groups of individuals that were removed from the leadership of the Communist Party of China. We have had and still have our opinion on everything and on every person or group of the leadership acting in China. This is natural.

"The present Chinese leadership wanted the Party of Labor of Albania to support its acts with regard to the changes made at the head of the Communist Party of China. As we did not do so, it comes to the conclusion that we are partisans of Lin Piao and "the gang of four". It is wrong in both aspects, and this is one of the unavowed major political, ideological reasons which have urged the Chinese leadership to cease aid to Albania. The present Chinese leadership has wanted our Party to support its illegal and non-Marxist-Leninist activity to seize state power in China. Our Party has not fulfilled and will never fulfill this desire of the Chinese leadership." (p51-2)

Excerpts from "Chinese Warmongering Policy and Hua Kuo-feng's Visit to the Balkans", editorial of Zeri i Popullit, organ of the CC of the PLA, September 3, 1978:

10. "Hua Kuo-feng came to the Balkans at a time when the Chinese leadership, proceeding from its expansionist and hegemonic aims, has instigated the bloody conflict between Cambodia and Viet Nam, two neighbouring fraternal countries."

11. "The treaty China signed with Japan recently serves this end, too. It is a treaty which is meant as a barrier against the Soviets in the east of Asia and, at the same time, as a means for an eventual Chinese march on the Soviet Union. U.S. imperialism stands behind the Sino-Japanese treaty. Decked out in an anti-social-imperialist garb by the Chinese leadership and its partners, this treaty instigates world war."

12. "The expansionist policy of China's leadership is now most evident in Africa where it is engaging in very feverish activities. On this continent it is coming out in support of U.S. imperialism and other capitalist powers, trying to preserve their neo-colonialist positions."

13. "China's opening to Europe, and the creation of a favorable political and ideological area for its activity in the Balkans, are part of the Chinese strategy of instigation of war. The Chinese have been crying themselves hoarse for many years now with warnings about an impending danger of war in Europe, that it is precisely here and nowhere else that social-imperialism will first launch the war. Therefore, they are calling on NATO to increase its military budgets to the extreme, and on the U.S.A. to dispatch more troops and neutron bombs to Europe, to lay nuclear mines from the North Pole to the Mediterranean, on the West European countries to dispatch troops and naval fleets to the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and around Africa, in order to protect the oil and raw material routes, in order to avoid being caught in difficulties as a result of an impending war."

"As the aggressor it is, the Soviet Union may launch the war, not only in Europe, but also in the Far East, against its number one enemy, as China declares itself to be. But this cannot happen, the Chinese leaders allege. China will have to work for its "modernization" till the year 2,000. Meanwhile, the superpowers may clash among themselves in Europe, the European peoples may be burnt and killed by nuclear bombs, people may be wiped out by neutron radiation. By the time this catastrophe descends on the world within 20 years, until the end of the century, China will have been through with its "modernization" programs and become a superpower; then, it will be able to establish its domination over the world without firing a shot!

"The open statements of the Chinese leadership to the effect that war between U.S. imperialism and Europe, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other, will be declared by the latter in a very near future, express the Chinese strategy whose aim is to drive the Soviet Union into attacking Europe and avoid Chinese involvement in a war in the Far East. ..."

14. "But the Chinese leadership makes a miscalculation, not because the revisionist Soviet Union is not an aggressive imperialism and does not dream of occupying oppressing and exploiting the peoples, but because the imperialist Soviet Union will surely attack first that part of the world where

its interests are greatest and the link in the chain of the countries it plans to attack is weakest. This is what the Soviet Union is practically doing with its various acts of interference in Africa. In the present-day situation, it is more probable that it will launch its offensive against China rather than against Europe. The war of the Soviet Union against NATO would be a large-scale world war, a nuclear war. Besides, the U.S.A. wishes and strives to see the two imperialist powers, the Soviet Union and China, clash with and destroy each other first. U.S. imperialism, just as Soviet social-imperialism and China, is well aware of its own interests and knows where it can draw profit from.

"Therefore, the calculations of Chinese imperialism to set Europe ablaze, its attempts to instigate war between the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and the United States of America and its allies, on the other, for the sake of its own hegemonic interests, cannot be realized.

"But the war-mongering plans of the Chinese leaders are unrealizable, also due to another very important reason, namely that they are met with resistance and opposition on the part of the anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces, progressive public opinion, the revolutionaries and the patriots everywhere in the world."

15. "Chinese logic is strange enough. Mao Tsetung considered the adjustments made after the Second World War in Europe unfair and proposed to have them rectified, while Hua Kuo-feng considers the unjust decisions of the 1913 Conference of Ambassadors of the Great Powers on the Balkans fair..."

Excerpts from reports made by various Albanian leaders to a scientific session on "Problems of Present-Day World Development" organized by the Institute of Marxist-Leninist Studies at the CC of the PLA, Tirana October 2 to October 5, 1978. Published by the Albanian Telegraphic Agency (ATA) or transcribed from Radio Tirana by People's Canada Daily News. (PCDN).

16. "The Chinese version of modern revisionism, in its fight against Leninism, goes even further than all the revisionist predecessors, opposing it with the so-called "Mao Tsetung Thought" and its by-product - the theory of the "three worlds", which is tantamount to denying the revolution wholesale." (Ramiz Alia, Political Bureau member and CC Secretary of the PLA, ATA 3/10/78 p5)

17. "At present, says Comrade Enver Hoxha, an explosive revolutionary situation exists everywhere in the world..."

"As a result of the undermining activity of the Soviet, 'Eurocommunist', Yugoslav, Chinese and other modern revisionists, new difficulties have been created as a consequence of which the subjective factor still does not respond to the requirements of the explosive revolutionary situations which are being created in the world..." (Ramiz Alia, PCDN 4/10/78, see also ATA 3/10/78)

18. "It is our task to expose and ward off all these attempts of the enemies, either when they come from the Khrushchovite, Titoite, Eurocommunist revisionists, or when they are an offspring of the so-called "Mao Tsetung Thought". (Ramiz Alia, ATA 5/10/78 p2)

19. "Chinese revisionism, the trend which has come out in the open only recently, but which is in fact an anti-Marxist trend with deep roots, is a very great danger to the cause of the revolution and socialism and the freedom and independence of the peoples at the present time. A characteristic feature of this revisionist line is that it proclaims a theory which it proclaims to be the highest stage of Marxism-Leninism, a third stage in the development of Marxism. However, as a theory, Chinese revisionism is nothing but a conglomerate theory, a hodge-podge of all sorts of ideologies ranging from the idealistic mystical ones of antiquity to the theories of present-day bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologists of right and "left" opportunist views, ideas of Proudhon, of Bernstein and Kautsky, of Trotsky and Bukharin, of Yugoslav, Soviet and "Eurocommunist" revisionism and so on.

"The entire ideological platform of the Chinese revisionists, all of the theses propagated by them concerning the cardinal questions of Marxism-Leninism and the question of the revolution and socialism in the context of each specific country, and on the international plane, are anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary from start to finish. Likewise their strategy and political tactics, which are based on such an anti-Marxist ideological platform, as well as the actions inspired by it, are completely anti-proletarian and reactionary. Thus, in regard to China itself, both during the Chinese revolution and after it, the standpoint of the Chinese leadership has been that of liberalism and bourgeois democracy both in theory and in practice. At no time has it been for the hegemonic role of the proletariat and in favour of the waging of the class struggle in favour of the working class. Instead, in theory, it has preached the thesis: "the countryside must liberate the city", which denies the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution and is a deviation from Marxism-Leninism, while in practice, it has acted in such a way that the petty bourgeoisie and even middle bourgeoisie have a dominant role in the revolution, whereas after the revolution, the Chinese revisionist leadership has followed the line of class conciliation and of permitting the existence of the bourgeoisie as a class. It has maintained an opportunist, benevolent stand towards the exploiting classes, as Comrade Enver Hoxha has put it, and in practice it has shared the state power with them. At no time have the Chinese revisionists been for the undivided leading role of a party which is fully a party of the proletariat, a party of the Leninist type, but they have propagated and practised the principle of political pluralism, the principle of the existence of many parties, including parties of the bourgeoisie, which, according to their views, should continue to exist in China as long as the communist party exists.

"Later on, they came out against the Marxist-Leninist ideology being the only prevailing ideology in a socialist country, and preached ideological pluralism with "let a hundred flowers bloom, and a hundred schools compete", which is being widely propagated today by the "Eurocommunists", with whom the Chinese revisionists have points in common in their revision of Marxism-Leninism on many other questions too.

"On the international plane, the Chinese revisionists revised Marxism-Leninism, proceeding from their strategic goal, which regardless of the fact that they come out with the banner of anti-social-imperialism and anti-hegemonism, is in essence identical with the strategic aim of the Soviet revisionists and is intended to make China an imperialist superpower, to justify the typically imperialist and

hegemonic policy of this great power which is doing everything it can to become a superpower. This strategy is served by the theory of the "three worlds", which the Chinese revisionist leadership presents as a world strategy. It is self-evident that in a conglomerate theory like that of the Chinese revisionists, genuine socialism cannot be conserved and neither can it be built with their practices. Socialism, conceived on the basis of an anti-Marxist theory, cannot be anything else but petty-bourgeois or bourgeois socialism, which, for ample reasons, has the support of the big bourgeoisie world-wide, especially the U.S. imperialists, and finds support from such an old agency of imperialism as Yugoslav revisionism as well as all sorts of other revisionists."

(Figret Shehu, Directress of the V.I. Lenin Higher Party School and CC member, PCDN 5/10/78. ATA 4/10/78 includes only the first and third sentences of the first paragraph above, omitting the second sentence and all the other paragraphs which make it abundantly clear that the "Chinese revisionism" referred to is in fact Mao Tsetung Thought and the whole theory and practice of the Chinese revolution).

Excerpt from the speech of Hysni Kapo, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC of the PLA at a meeting to commemorate Enver Hoxha's 70th birthday organized at the "Enver Hoxha" automobile-tractor complex in Tirana:

20. "These savage enemies of Marxism-Leninism with their chauvinist arrogance of the big state, strove for a long time and in a disguised manner to make our people submit to their anti-Marxist and counterrevolutionary line, support their notorious theory of "three worlds", based on the so-called "Mao Tsetung Thought", a theory which completely denies the socialist revolution and serves the darkest imperialism and reaction alone. To achieve their aim, to overthrow the situation in Albania, they resorted to the group of putschists and plotters, headed by the traitors B. Balluku, A. Kellezi, K. Theodhosi, etc. But the Chinese revisionists were wrong in their calculations about Albania, they suffered the same defeat all the sworn enemies of our people had suffered..." (ATA 15/10/78)

AND BEFORE THE CHINESE REVISIONISTS CUT OFF AID...

21. "The work of this outstanding Marxist-Leninist represents a contribution to the enrichment of the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat. The Albanian communists and people will always honour the memory of comrade Mao Tse-tung, who was a great friend of our Party and people." (Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, November 1976)

AND BEFORE THE REVISIONIST COUP D'ETAT IN CHINA...

22. "The Albanian Communists and people bow in honour and respect to his memory and to the brilliant work which Chairman Mao Tsetung, the strategist of the Chinese revolution, the inspirer of all the victories achieved by the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people, has left behind..."

"Comrade Mao Tsetung was an outstanding thinker and theoretician of Marxism-Leninism, who continued the brilliant work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. To him belongs the great merit of the elaboration, defence and application of the general line of the Communist Party of China in the revolution and the socialist construction. He personally led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China and directed the struggle for smashing the counter-revolutionary revisionist traitor groups of Liu Shao-chi, Lin Biao, Teng Hsiao-ping and other enemies of the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China.

"As a great Marxist-Leninist, Comrade Mao Tsetung waged a resolute struggle against the enemies of Marxism-Leninism, led by Khrushchovite revisionists, and has rendered the international communist and workers' movement outstanding service.

"The Albanian Communists and the Albanian people will keep for ever in their hearts and minds the memory of Comrade Mao Tsetung, their most beloved and respected friend, the architect of the revolutionary fraternal friendship and the unbreakable unity between our two Parties, two peoples and two countries. They will never forget the great love and respect that Comrade Mao Tsetung cherished for our people and Party, the great and continuous care he displayed in a fine internationalist spirit to help the Albanian people in the successful building of socialism..."

(Message of condolences on Mao Tsetung's death from the CC of the PLA, Presidium of the People's Assembly and Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Albania to their equivalents in China, September 9, 1976)

Excerpts from speeches made at memorial meeting in Tirana on September 17, 1976 during the three day period which Albania designated as days of national mourning, during which flags would be flown at half-mast and there would be no recreational or sporting activities; (Peking Review No 41, 1976, p26-27):
23.

"...Comrade Mao Tsetung was a great Marxist-Leninist and the successor to the genial work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin...

"...Today, we share the deep grief of the fraternal Chinese people over the passing of Chairman Mao Tsetung and wish to assure them that the Albanian people and Albanian Communists will be with them unflinching, both in times of adversity and in moments of felicity, as Comrade Mao Tsetung expected of us, as Comrade Hoxha has taught us and as is demanded by the interests of our two peoples and two Parties and the interests of socialism and revolution." (Mehmet Shehu, Member of the Political Bureau and Chairman of the Council of Ministers, "with grief")

"For half a century and more, Comrade Mao Tsetung firmly led the Communist Party of China in various stages of the Chinese revolution and socialist construction, charted the road to victory and trained and tempered it into a new-type revolutionary Party in the uncompromising class struggle against all anti-Marxist ideological trends..."

"Comrade Mao Tsetung was the direct inspirer and leader of China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which has overthrown capitalist-roads, mobilized hundreds of millions of labouring people to plunge into a vigorous revolutionary movement and served them as a great school of lively class education. The victory of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a victory of the Proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a victory of revolution over counter-revolution, a victory of socialism over capitalism and a victory of the revolutionary line represented by Comrade Mao Tsetung over the bourgeois revisionist line represented by Liu Shao-chi and his partners."

"Chairman Mao Tsetung was not only the beloved and great leader of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people but also an eminent Marxist-Leninist thinker and theoretician and the successor to the ideas and genial work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The Marxist-Leninist ideas of Comrade Mao Tsetung on continuously carrying out class struggle in socialist society, on the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads, and on continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat are an immensely valuable and creative contribution to the theory of scientific socialism."

"The name of Comrade Mao Tsetung is dearly loved and highly esteemed by the people of all countries and the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary Communists of the world. His works on anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggles contain theses of tremendous value, both in theory and in practice, to the struggle against imperialism, especially against the two superpowers and their policies of aggression and war, and to the people of various countries engaged in movements for their own liberation." (Hysni Kapo)

Excerpts from Enver Hoxha's speech to a delegation of Albanian and Chinese workers and technicians involved in the construction of the Elbasan Metallurgical Combine:

24. "For some time now," Enver Hoxha said, "the capitalist-revisionist world has been conducting a campaign of allegations claiming that Sino-Albanian relations have cooled. This is the basest slander!...

"A Hungarian newspaper even alleged that the Chinese had halted the shipment of materials for the Elbasan Metallurgical Combine, leaving it half-completed." He went on to say, "Internal enemies and traitors also act against the friendship between our two countries. These enemies and revisionists who have opposed the line of the Party, who attempted to sabotage the construction of socialism and corrode the foundations of our socialist homeland, were discovered, exposed and wiped out by our Party. They also wanted to destroy our fraternal friendship with China and the Communist Party of Mao Tsetung, and connect our country to the Soviet revisionists." (April 29, 1976. See Australia-Albania Friendship, No 5, July 1976, p15)
(According to Albania's letter of July 29, 1978:

"Likewise, the construction of the Metallurgical Complex began with delay and to this day, also, for the fault of the Chinese side, investment in its construction has been realised only to a measure of 67 per cent as against the volume of the total value of the Complex, and China has delivered only 74 per cent of the equipment." p13)

ON MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT...

25. "Before the peoples and all revolutionaries everywhere in the world rises Mao Tsetung's giant figure as a great Marxist-Leninist and outstanding master of revolution, who has developed and raised the all-conquering ideas of Marxism-Leninism to a new and higher stage. Whole generations of revolutionaries on all continents are educated by and throw themselves into the flames of revolution under the teachings of Mao Tsetung..."

"The all-conquering thought of Chairman Mao Tsetung fill all the revolutionary forces with confidence and is a beacon light for them in the struggle for the great cause of the freedom of the peoples, of revolution and socialism."

(Zeri i Popullit editorial, May 22, 1970. Peking Review No 22, 1970, p10)

26. "All the progressive peoples of the world see in the great China a courageous and disinterested friend who helps them openly and sincerely by all ways of means, as a real socialist country, where the all-conquering Mao Tsetung's thought has triumphed, should do. Nowhere in the world can you see a Chinese soldier, nowhere in the world can you find a single Chinese military base. There is no people and state in the world to pretend that they have been occupied by China. All the peoples and states - and they are not few - who have demanded and received financial aid in form of loans from socialist China or trade with it have nothing but words of praise and gratitude for its generosity, for its correctness, for the exemplary conduct and artlessness of its people, for the rapid aid it gives with no strings attached. Every commodity China sends to the friendly and allied nations is of high quality, which proves the deep political significance China attaches to the aid it gives its friends, confirming, at the same time, the high technical level the People's Republic of China has reached in the development of its socialist economy and culture.

"But the aid China extends to the peoples of the world is invaluable, first and foremost, from the political and ideological point of view, for Mao Tsetung's glorious thoughts have educated a Marxist-Leninist party and a 700-800 million strong people. It is for this reason that the policy of the Chinese state, too, is a correct and glorious policy serving socialism, revolution, the national-liberation struggles and the freedom and independence of nations. Therefore, the communist parties, the revolutionaries, the peoples of the world and the progressive states see in China and Mao Tsetung a great comrade, a friend, a brother, an assistant and supporter in any situation, in sunny or stormy weather." (Enver Hoxha, "It is in the Party-People-State Power Unity that Our Strength Lies", September 18, 1970, "Naim Frasherit" Publishing House, p68-69)

AND TWO YEARS AFTER THE NIXON VISIT TO PEKING...

SIX MONTHS AFTER TENG HSIAO-PING'S SPEECH AT THE U.N.

REFERRING TO "THREE WORLDS"...

27. "The Albanian people and all the people of the world nurture an ardent love and place deep trust in great socialist China, in her glorious Party and in Mao Tsetung, the great and beloved leader not only of the Chinese people and communists, but also the dear and respected leader of all the peoples and communists of the world. This infuriates modern revisionism which, with the Moscow renegades at its

head, and in collusion with US imperialism, is waging a fierce and diabolical struggle to oppose the peoples and China. This comes to us as no surprise; this is in conformity with their logic. The greatest enemy of US imperialism and of Soviet social-imperialism are the peoples of the world, with great Mao Tsetung's China at the head. The struggle is being waged between freedom and socialism, on the one hand, and slavery and aggressive imperialism of the two superpowers, on the other. All the peoples of the world have pinned their hopes of liberation, independence and wellbeing on their efforts and on Mao's China. They are not mistaken, and their conviction is not based on propaganda, but on a great reality, which shines like the light of the sun, on the construction of socialism in China, which is being carried on in a correct way, according to the doctrine of Marx and Lenin and the teachings of Mao Tsetung; it is based on the determined political stand of the People's Republic of China in the international arena, on the concrete moral, political, and economic help it gives the peoples of the world.

"This reality wrecks and exposes the bandit-like and fascist propaganda of Moscow and Washington. The peoples of the world who feel and suffer on their back the oppression of the two superpowers, see and feel that Mao Tsetung, the great Marxist-Leninist, is on their side, they see socialist China stands them in good stead with sincerity and fraternal love. The unity with People's China is a great achievement for the cause of mankind. Old and young should feel and realize that socialism, revolution, the liberation of the peoples make headway because great socialist China marches unswervingly along this road. This is to the liking neither of the Soviet and American imperialists nor of world reaction. They have declared war on us, but we are stronger than them and will defeat them. The wheel of the revolution cannot turn backwards."

(Enver Hoxha, "Our Policy is an Open Policy, the Policy of Proletarian Principles" (sic), October 3, 1974, "8 Nentori" Publishing House, p40-43)

WHEN THE SOVIET UNION WENT REVISIONIST AFTER STALIN'S DEATH, HOXHA DID NOT JOIN THE ATTACK ON STALIN...

28. "Comrade Stalin and his work does not belong to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people alone, but to us all..."

"Then, why was Comrade Stalin condemned at the 20th Congress without prior consultation with the other communist and workers' parties of the world? Why was this "anathema" pronounced upon Stalin all of a sudden to the communist and workers' parties of the world and why did many sister parties learn of it only when the imperialist press published Comrade Khrushchev's secret report far and wide?..."

"The Party of Labor of Albania maintained a realistic stand on the question of Stalin. It was correct and grateful towards this glorious Marxist-Leninist against whom, while he was alive, there was no one among us "brave enough" to come out and criticize, but when he was dead a great deal of mud was thrown, creating in this way an intolerable situation in which a whole glorious epoch of the Soviet Union when the first socialist State in the world was set up, when the Soviet

Union waxed strong, successfully defeated the imperialist plots, crushed the Trotskyites, Bukharinites and the kulaks as a class, when the construction of heavy industry and collectivization triumphed, in a word, when the Soviet Union became a colossal power succeeding in building socialism, when it fought the Second World War with legendary heroism and defeated fascism, liberated our peoples, when a powerful socialist camp was set up, and so on and so forth - all this glorious epoch of the Soviet Union is left without a helmsman, without a leader.

"The Party of Labor of Albania thinks that it is not right, normal or Marxist to blot out Stalin's name and great work from all this epoch, as it is actually being done. We should all defend the good and immortal work of Stalin. He who does not defend it is an opportunist and a coward.

"As a person and as the leader of the Bolshevik Communist Party, after Lenin's death Comrade Stalin was, at the same time, the most prominent leader of international communism helping in a very positive way and with great authority in consolidating and promoting the victories of communism throughout the world. All of Comrade Stalin's theoretical works are a fiery testimony of his loyalty to his teacher of genius, to great Lenin and Leninism.

"Stalin fought for the rights of the working class and the working people in the whole world, he fought to the end with great consistency for the freedom of the peoples of our countries of People's Democracy.

"Viewing things from this angle alone, Stalin belongs to the entire communist world and not to the Soviet communists alone, he belongs to all the workers of the world and not to the Soviet workers alone."

(Enver Hoxha, Speech at the Meeting of 81 Parties in Moscow, November 16, 1960, "Baim Frasher" Publishing House, 1969 p127-131)

YES, EVERYBODY MAKES MISTAKES...

29. "'A bosom friend afar brings a distant land near.' China and Albania are separated by thousands of mountains and rivers but our hearts are closely linked. We are your true friends and comrades. And you are ours. You are not like those false friends and double-dealers who have 'honey on their lips and murder in their hearts', and neither are we. Our militant revolutionary friendship has stood the test of violent storms." (Mao Tsetung, Message of Greetings to the 5th Congress of the PLA, October 25, 1966)

WHERE RED EUREKA STANDS...

"Our stand against wrong tendencies in both directions is not an intermediate, centrist or vacillating position. We unequivocally oppose the new revisionism and we unequivocally reject 'Left-Wing' or closed door errors...

"Australian revolutionaries will continue to support Mao Tsetung's revolutionary line in Australia, in China and in international affairs," ("Opinions on some International Questions", May 1978)

WAS MAO A GREAT M-L?

Was Mao Tsetung a great Marxist-Leninist? Is Mao Tsetung Thought the further development of Marxism-Leninism in the changed conditions of the present epoch? These are questions of great importance to all serious revolutionaries striving to work out a revolutionary strategy to guide their activities. They can be answered only on the basis of an objective scientific analysis of the whole of the activity of Mao Tsetung, including his writings, using the method of dialectical and historical materialism. No clarity can be reached by the eclectic method of selecting such parts of Mao's works as are suitable to produce slick arguments to substantiate an already formed subjective opinion on the matter, as Albert Langer does in his article, "Where is Maoism After Mao", Nation Review, Oct 20-26, 1978. To get to the truth one must put subjective feelings aside and submit all the known facts to objective examination.

In the case of Mao, such a scientific analysis has been extremely difficult because of the paucity of real facts. The vastness of the territory of China and the size of its population have made it almost impossible for anyone, apart from those in the central leadership of the country, to gain even a relatively accurate knowledge of what has gone on there, while the Communist Party of China has remained a closed book to anyone from outside. Breaking the tradition established in the international communist movement, since the 8th Congress in 1956, the fraternal parties have not even been invited to send delegations to the congresses of that party, let alone been allowed to gain any real direct knowledge of its structure and methods. Apart from these obstacles, considering that Mao was the leader of a major party and state for many decades, the amount of published material written by him is quite small.

Despite all the difficulties of knowing the reality of China, however, it is abundantly clear that a great people's revolution took place in China under Mao's leadership, through which the country was liberated from the feudal-compradore capitalist-foreign imperialist regime, leading to very rapid development of the productive forces of the country and vast improvements in the living conditions of the working masses. This, together with the things Mao wrote and said, couched in Marxist-Leninist terms, about building socialism in China, the carrying out of the land reform, the establishment of state industry, etc., convinced the vast majority of progressive people in the world that Mao was indeed, a Marxist-Leninist. However, for the reasons stated above, this was an opinion based on very limited knowledge and has proved to be an error of subjectivism.

The issue is being further complicated today, when the present bourgeois nationalists who have seized complete power in the Chinese party and state, finding a number of Mao's well-known writings a hindrance to them on their course of rapidly building up capitalism in China in the hope of turning that country into another social-imperialist superpower, are actively trying to discredit them and turn their author into a harmless icon. For example Hua Kuo Feng and Co. must be sorely embarrassed by the article, "Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?", which was written under Mao's direct supervision during the polemics between the CPC and the Soviet revisionists.

On the evidence of this article alone, it would appear that Mao had a correct Marxist-Leninist stand towards the revisionist renegade Tito, but now there are other facts which must be taken into consideration. In 1956, when a fraternal delegation from the Party of Labour of Albania attended the 8th Congress of the CPC, the leaders of the Chinese party, beginning with Mao Tsetung, down through Chou En-Lai, Kang Shen etc., one after another tried to convince the Albanians that the line of the international sommunist movement towards Tito was wrong. Mao said, "Stalin was arong about Tito, he is a revolutionary." Perhaps it may be argued that this was simply a misjudgement that was corrected on further consideration. Certainly this seemed to be the case when the article, "Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?" was published later. However, in his speech to the electors of zone No. 209, on 8th November, 1978, Comrade Enver Hoxha said: "The Chinese leaders, through Chou En-lai and company, repeatedly tried to blackmail us to impose a military alliance with Yugoslavia and Rumania on us." If Mao were a Marxist-Leninist, could ha have attempted to impose a military alliance with a known enemy of socialism and an agency of imperialism such as Titoite Yugoslavia is, on socialist Albania? Hence, despite the fine words of the article, it is clear the Mao Tsetung did not have a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary stand towards the traitor Tito, and this has been one of the touchstones for distinguishing genuine Marxist -Leninists from revisionists for the

past thirty years.

After Mao's death, the present revisionist leaders of China made a great display of publishing the report, "Ten Major Relationships", which they claimed was being published for the first time. In fact, this report, which Mao delivered to a plenum of the Central Committee of the CPC on 25th April 1956, or at least large parts of it, had been published many years earlier. For example, the section making a revisionist assessment of Stalin was quoted by the bourgeois-liberal writer, Han Suyin, in the "Morning Deluge", published in 1971 or 1972. Hence the argument of people like Albert Langer, that the gang of reactionaries in control of China today can publish whatever distortions of Mao's writings they please, an argument which is undoubtedly true, does not affect the present issue. In his attitude towards Stalin, which has been a touch-stone to distinguish genuine Marxist-Leninists from revisionists, anarchists, trotskyites and renegades of every hue since the early 1920's, once again Mao was not a Marxist-Leninist.

The report, "Ten Major Relationships" was delivered only weeks after the notorious 20th Congress of the CPSU at which Krushchev launched the full-scale revisionist offensive against Marxism-Leninism and socialism, and Mao was already fully informed about what had occurred at that Congress. The only possible conclusion that can be drawn from Mao's report is that he was in complete accord with the revisionist line of Krushchev of attacking all the achievements of the socialist revolution in the Soviet Union under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. How, then, can it be claimed that Mao Tsetung was a great Marxist-Leninist?

Let us return to the second of the questions asked at the start of this article. The line that Mao Tsetung Thought is the further development of Marxism-Leninism in the changed conditions of the present epoch has been widely propagated from about 1967 onwards. Hence there is no question here of distortion by the present revisionist leadership of China. Mao, himself, clearly did not dissent from this concept. The present epoch is the epoch of imperialism, of capitalism in decay, described by Lenin as "the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat." Despite all the developments that have occurred, the fundamental nature of the epoch has not changed. Hence the entire concept that Mao Tsetung Thought is the new development of Marxism-Leninist in the changed conditions is revisionism of precisely the same order as the claim that the Krushchevite theories of the changed nature of imperialism, 'peaceful co-existence', 'a world without arms and without wars', 'the state and the party of the entire people' etc., are the new development of Marxism-Leninist in the new conditions. And it has led to precisely the same result of building alliances with United States and other imperialisms, which began with Nixon's visit to China in 1972.

From his scientific study of society, and especially of the inherent contradictions of capitalism, Karl Marx showed that the proletariat had been born as the only force capable of resolving these contradictions, which it must do by smashing the state power of the bourgeoisie by revolutionary violence, establishing its own state power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and building socialist society. Lenin showed how the proletariat must build its own party "of a new type" as the leadership of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. There is no other force which can lead the revolution to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and build socialist society.

History has confirmed that the proletariat must exercise the absolute leadership in the revolution through its Marxist-Leninist party. Of course it must establish alliances with other oppressed and exploited strata, but it must not share the leading role with them on pain of having the revolution stop half-way. This is a universal law of revolution in the epoch of imperialism.

How does Mao's idea that the countryside must liberate the cities fit in with this? If this were just a tactical concept developed in the concrete conditions of China where the vast masses of the population were poor peasants who made up the main fighting forces of the revolution, under the leadership of the proletarian party and the proletarian ideology and with coordination of the struggle in the countryside and in the cities, it would not be incorrect and this is what revolutionaries throughout the world thought Mao meant. However, the history of the revolution in China shows that this was not the case. Mao always supported pluralism of leadership, pluralism of ideology, pluralism of political parties, even after the seizure of power in the revolution. (Let a hundred flowers blossom, let a hundred schools contend, the existence of other political parties right up to communism etc) hence he was opposed to the hegemony of the proletariat

in the revolution and the construction of socialism. And when this idea is extended to the international scene, the "third world" countries, (not classes) become the "main motive force of the revolution". This is a flagrant negation of the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principle of the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution. Hence, on this count, too, Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist.

In the last years of Mao's life, and especially after his death, it became abundantly clear that the CPC and its Central Committee were riven by factions. The existence of two lines within the party was raised to a principle, while Mao, himself, spoke of the existence of a "bourgeoisie within the party". Such a thing is utterly incompatible with the Marxist-Leninist concept of the "party of the new type". Of course the pressure of old ideas and the existence of capitalism and imperialism in the world environment make it inevitable that fragmented bourgeois concepts exist in and are expressed by individual members of the party, but the party must struggle to correct those concepts and take stern measures to ensure that they do not develop into a second line within the party, violating its monolithic nature and leading directly to factional activity. Meanwhile to talk of a bourgeoisie within the proletarian party is an absurd contradiction in terms. If such a state of affairs exists then we have to do, not with a proletarian party, but with a bourgeois workers' party, of which history gives us countless examples.

If Mao were a Marxist Leninist, how could he allow such a situation? More and more evidence is now coming to light to prove that to Mao, the role of the Communist party was relatively unimportant, and that the CPC was never a party of the new type that exercised its leading role over everything and everybody in the revolution and the whole of social life. The party which could be seen, which had basic organisation, which held occasional congresses (astonishingly few and irregular congresses for a party in power) was largely a formality. Real power, the true leading role, was in the hands of a special apparatus, the General Directory of the Central Committee and the military detachment described as Mao's bodyguard, which functioned directly under Mao Tsetung, quite independently of the formal party. Thus the proletariat of China was never in the position to exert its leading role in all aspects of life, through its revolutionary party. This, more than anything else, proves that Mao was not a Marxist-Leninist.

It is undeniably true that, under Mao's leadership, a mighty people's revolution changed the face of China and brought one third of the population of the earth out of the stage of mediaeval backwardness imposed by the feudal-compradore-imperialist regime and led to colossal economic and social development in China. It is also true that the Chinese people's armies, under the leadership of Mao Tsetung and the CPC, played an important role in the defeat of Japanese and world fascism during world war 2. None of these things, however, prove that Mao Tsetung was a Marxist-Leninist. The liberation of the productive forces strangled by the old feudal and semi-feudal relations, the land reform, the establishing of industry, including state industry, etc., are all issues which can be decided within the confines of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, as history has proved, while even the western imperialist powers played an important role in the defeat of fascism in world war 2.

Whether or not the state-owned industries in China would become socialist or capitalist industries depended on whether the proletariat or the bourgeoisie held state power. For a number of years the issue hung in the balance, with the national bourgeoisie and the proletariat contending for hegemony. Precisely because of Mao's lack of Marxist-Leninist clarity and proletarian class consciousness, elements of the national bourgeoisie became dominant in the Communist Party of China and Mao realised that his position as leader was threatened by Liu Shao Chi, Peng Chen, Teng Hsiao Ping and Co. Hence he issued the call, "attack the headquarters" i.e. the leading organs of the party, of which had had lost control. But he did not appeal to the proletariat to re-establish their class control of the party, but called on the youth, especially the student youth. Could this be the act of a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary? Only after two years did the working class of Shanghai enter the battle and decide the issue in favour of the proletarian-revolution. Liu Shao Chi, Peng Chen, Teng Hsiao Ping, and many others were disgraced and disappeared from sight, but the victory of the proletariat was only a partial one. The proletarian cultural revolution was never carried out in the armed forces, which remained under the control of the military hierarchy loyal to Mao, personally, rather than to the proletariat. Under the slogan of

loyalty to Mao first, the rebuilt communist party became even more an appendage of the apparatus built up around Mao. Proven enemies of the proletarian revolution were treated with astonishing leniency, not even expelled from the party in many instances, and after several years, many of them were rehabilitated and returned to their former positions. In this way the proletarian class nature of the Communist Party of China was a fiction and the national bourgeoisie re-established itself in key positions. The defeat of Liu Shao Chi had taught it that Mao's personal position was unchallengeable, but since Mao had never built the CPC as a genuine proletarian Marxist-Leninist Party, after his death it was a simple matter for the successor Mao had appointed - something utterly inadmissible in Marxist-Leninist parties - to use the apparatus inherited from Mao to eliminate any forces which might challenge the absolute hegemony of the national bourgeoisie in the party and state.

The amazing history of the rise and fall, rise and fall, only to rise again, of Teng Hsiao Ping, in itself, clearly shows that Mao Tsetung lacks the proletarian class stand of a Marxist Leninist revolutionary. Even after Teng's second disgrace, following the armed insurrection he organised in Peking early in 1976, when the central committee under Mao's leadership decided, "the contradictions with Teng Hsiao Ping have now become antagonistic," he was not expelled from the party. Hence, Mao Tsetung along with the other members of the CC of the CPC tolerated the presence of proved class enemies in the party.

People like Albert Langer, who describes himself as an "unreconstructed Maoist", recognise that the present leaders of China have set a course of capitalist development in China, flagrantly betraying the aims of the Chinese people in their great revolution, but they do not want to see that such a course was the inevitable outcome of the policy of Mao and Mao Tsetung Thought. They base their judgement on certain of Mao's writings and sayings which are, certainly, completely contrary to what is being done in China today. But to judge the role of Mao correctly, one must consider all his writings and especially his actions. The Chinese attempt to place socialist Albania in a position of neo-colonialist dependence on China, the facts of which are only now being made public, began long ago, when Mao Tsetung was alive and fully in command of the situation in China. The recent clearfacts on the Chinese attempts to sabotage the construction of socialism in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, like the theory of three worlds, are the logical outcome of the policies of Mao Tsetung and Mao Tsetung Thought.

To carry out the proletarian socialist revolution and build socialist society requires the consistent application of Marxism-Leninism, the scientific ideology of the proletariat in every aspect of the life and struggle of society. Perhaps it is significant that in his article, "Where Maoism is After Mao", our unreconstructed Maoist, Albert Langer, does not mention this vital factor. Like his mentor Mao, he is not a Marxist-Leninist, but an eclecticist.

ARE MAO'S CRITICS MARXIST-LENINISTS AT ALL?

2 February, 1979

"Was Mao a Great M-L" was sent in untitled from a foreign resident in Albania, employed by Radio Tirana, who asked that his name be withheld. It states more directly than was being done by the Albanian media, a critique of Mao Tsetung current in Albania and now being promoted in the international communist movement. This point by point reply is intended to be read in conjunction with the original article. Questions relating to Yugoslavia, Chinese aid to Albania and the nature of the Chinese revolution etc will be dealt with more fully in separate articles.

1. "The Paucity of Real Facts"

Apparantly scientific analysis of Mao is extremely difficult because China is such a vast country with a large population, because the Chinese Communist Party doesn't invite fraternal delegates to its Congresses, and because Mao has quite a small published output.

Obviously we should only have confidence in views coming from a tiny country with a small population, whose party holds regular congresses attended by fraternal delegates, and whose leader has quite a great published output, at least in quantity.

Unfortunately it is not the Communist Party of China, but the Party of Labour of Albania that has "remained a closed book to anyone from outside".

When the Albanian leaders praised Mao Tsetung in the most extravagant and even sycophantic terms up to and after his death in 1976, they had exactly the same information that is available today. China's population has not decreased, its territory has not shrunk, and its Communist Party has not begun inviting fraternal delegates to its Congresses. Nor has Mao sent us any publications from beyond the grave. There has been no change in the information available about Mao Tsetung, the change has been in Albania.

On October 3, 1974 Enver Hoxha told the world:¹

"The Albanian people and all the people of the world nurture an ardent love and place deep trust in great socialist China, in her glorious Party and in Mao Tsetung, the great and beloved leader not only of the Chinese people and communists, but also the dear and respected leader of all the peoples and communists of the world...All the peoples of the world have pinned their hopes of liberation, independence and wellbeing on their efforts and on Mao's China. They are not mistaken, and their conviction is not based on propaganda, but on a great reality, which shines like the light of the sun, on the construction of socialism in China, which is being carried on in a correct way, according to the doctrine of Marx and Lenin and the teachings of Mao Tsetung; it is based on the determined political stand of the People's Republic of China in the international arena, on the concrete moral, political, and economic help it gives the peoples of the world.

"This reality wrecks and exposes the bandit-like and fascist propoganda of Moscow and Washington. The peoples of the world who see and suffer on their back the oppression of the two superpowers, see and feel that Mao Tsetung, the great Marxist-Leninist, is on their side, they see socialist China stands them in good stead with sincerity and fraternal love..."

That was two years after Nixon's visit to Peking, a year after the military coup d'etat in Chile and six months after the concept of "three worlds" was explained by the Chinese representative at the United Nations.

It may be that in 1974 Enver Hoxha was just using "the eclectic method of selecting such parts of Mao's works as are suitable to produce slick arguments to substantiate an already formed subjective opinion on the matter". Or it may well be that is what he is doing now. Or it may very well be a matter of slick subjective arguments both then and now. But he cannot be right both then and now and we can be certain he was not "making an objective scientific analysis of the whole of the activity of Mao Tsetung, including his writings, using the method of dialectical and historical materialism."

It would be nice to hear some self-criticism before we are asked to accept the latest revealed truth from such an unreliable source.

Obviously Mao Tsetung's international line was not a "closed book" when Enver Hoxha was praising it. But was there a "paucity of facts" about the internal situation in China? Were Mao's published works so few that it was impossible to form any objective judgement of them? In short were the Albanian leaders just talking nonsense when they made statements like these:

"The work of this outstanding Marxist-Leninist represents a contribution to the enrichment of the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat. The Albanian communists and people will always honour the memory of comrade Mao Tsetung who was a great friend of our Party and people" (Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, November 1976)

"Comrade Mao Tsetung was an outstanding thinker and theoretician of Marxism-Leninism, who continued the brilliant work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. To him belongs the merit of the elaboration, defence and application of the general line of the Communist Party of China in the revolution and the socialist construction. He personally led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China and directed the struggle for smashing the counter-revolutionary revisionist traitor groups of Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao, Teng Hsiao-ping and other enemies of the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China."

(Message of Condolences from Albanian to Chinese Party and State leaders, 9 September, 1976)

"The Marxist-Leninist ideas of Comrade Mao Tsetung on continuously carrying out class struggle in socialist society, on the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads, and on continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat are an immensely valuable and creative contribution to the theory of scientific socialism...His works on anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggles contain theses of tremendous value, both in theory and in practice, to the struggle against imperialism, especially against the two superpowers and their policies of aggression and war, and to the people of various countries engaged in movements for their own liberation." (Hysni Kapo, 17 September, 1976, at memorial meeting during Albania's three days of national mourning for Mao Tsetung)

Perhaps these statements should not be taken any more seriously than anything else that comes out of Tirana. But it was not just on the Albanian leaders say so, that progressive people around the world supported Mao Tsetung.

Precisely during the period when the Albanian leaders were praising Mao, there occurred China's Great Proletarian Socialist Cultural Revolution in which the masses were urged to "pay attention to state affairs", and even the most confidential internal party matters were made public.

In this period the class struggle in China took the form of large scale turbulent mass upheavals and the contending political lines were plain for the whole world to see. Not only were the issues at stake clearly and scientifically explained in the official media, but this was supplemented by vast amounts of material in the Red Guard and rebel press, including many confidential party and state documents. Apart from what is available in Chinese, a great deal has been translated into English by the American intelligence agencies and other "China watchers", including documents not published in China but captured by Kuomintang intelligence agencies. There have also been many books and articles by foreign residents who directly observed or participated in these events.

Far from being "a closed book to anyone from outside", the internal affairs of the Communist Party of China have become the subject of a whole industry of "China watching", with large numbers of full time researchers in various institutes with their own specialized journals and so forth. Some of their material is fabricated and many of their conclusions are nonsense, but that, like the past and present stands of the Albanian leaders, is a problem of world outlook rather than lack of information. There has never been so much information available about the internal affairs of the ruling party in a socialist country.

The best proof that there was no "paucity of information" about China is the speed with which Marxist-Leninists outside China were able to form basically correct conclusions about the counter-revolutionary coup d'etat of October 1976, despite the fact that Albania's only contribution to this understanding was its silence (as long as Chinese aid kept coming).

Anyone who studied the material on the campaign to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, the movement to study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to restrict bourgeois right, the struggle against Teng Hsiao-ping's reversal of correct verdicts and so on, could immediately understand what the revisionists were up to.

The accuracy of this information is proved by the fact that when they came to power, the revisionists proceeded to carry out exactly the policies they were accused of advocating.

In the two years since the Chinese revisionist coup d'etat, Albania has published no material exposing the domestic revisionist policies in China, and has even influenced overseas groups that were doing so to follow its example of talking nonsense about the "three worlds" instead. Was this due to a "paucity of real facts"? The whole of the capitalist press were talking about it. They had plenty of facts.

At first one could be excused for thinking that this silence was out of some sort of tactical considerations in not wishing to be the first to interfere in internal affairs. But wishful thinking had a lot to do with that idea. Since Chinese aid to Albania was cut off on July 7, 1978, the Albanians have not hesitated to describe China as a capitalist superpower, but there is still no comment on the reversal of the achievements of the cultural revolution, except to join in the snide revisionist attacks on it:

"The Cultural Revolution, more often than not, preserved the spirit and actions of an unprincipled struggle, which was not led by a genuine party of the working class which should strive for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus these clashes among factionalist groups ended in the establishment in

China of a state power dominated by bourgeois and revisionist elements."

A little thought shows this really isn't very surprising. Albania never went through anything like the cultural revolution and many of the capitalist hangovers now being restored in China were never abolished in Albania in the first place.

How could Albania expose the return to "material incentives" when bonus systems and even piece work are still the norm in Albania?

How could Albania expose the return to an education system geared to producing a privileged elite, with exams, academic titles etc., when Albania has never abolished these things. Could the "Professors of Dialectical and Historical Materialism" in Albania write articles protesting at the restoration of academic titles in China?

How could Albania protest against the suppression in China of literature and art directed against capitalist roaders and advocating rebellion, when no such culture has ever appeared in Albania? How could it take up the regression in the status of women in China when bourgeois concepts of women's role are still being propagated openly by Albanian leaders?

Above all how could the leaders of the Party of Labor of Albania, who always present the Albanian revolution as something to be defended and consolidated against external enemies rather than a continuing process, who deny that there is a bourgeoisie in Albania (but call for "class struggle" against thin air), and whose main focus is on economic progress, expose the abandonment of continuing the revolution and the substitution of the "four modernizations" in China?

Obviously they could not, so we should not be surprised that they did not. In the face of this deliberate suppression and covering up of the facts about what has been happening in China, it takes real gall to talk about a "paucity of real information".

2. "A Closed Book"

Let us turn from the wealth of information available about China, to examine a party and state whose affairs really are so obscure that people repelled from Chinese revisionism have tended to rally around it on the basis of little more than wishful thinking.

In his Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, Enver Hoxha was able to recite three "hostile groups" with eight named individuals who had been "made short work of". Yet despite the very brief remarks in the report, the struggle remains a completely closed book to any outsider. No political lessons are brought out - in complete contrast to the Chinese struggles against Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao, Teng Hsiao-ping etc., which have helped revolutionaries around the world, as well as in China, to distinguish genuine Marxism from sham.

Indeed, not only outsiders were left in the dark. According to the report, Beqir Balluku, Petrit Dume and Hito Çako made up one group, a putschist faction at the head of the army who tried to "introduce in the army the detestable methods of the bourgeois and revisionist armies" (p123). The Albanian people were informed, in documents meant only for Albanian citizens, that Balluku was executed for giving military secrets to the Yugoslavs concerning underground tunnel systems. Far from being accused of complicity, it appears that the Chinese were given detailed information about the case.

Yet in the open letter of July 29, 1978 we read that Beqir Balluku is accused of supporting Chou En-lai's "hostile strategic plan" which included "applying the tactics of partisan warfare" instead of relying on "heavy armament" (p38). Is partisan warfare now "the detestable methods of the bourgeois and revisionist armies"?

Then according to the 7th Congress Report, Abdyl Këllezi, Koço Theodhosi, Kiço Ngjela and others, made up another, separate group, accused of sabotaging the economy, planning, oil, foreign trade etc (rather like the "gang of four"?) and "wanting to introduce "revisionist forms and methods of self-administration". Since Enver Hoxha's deep understanding of Yugoslav "self-administration" has led him to characterize the capitalist regime there as a "state of anarcho syndicalism" (an insult to anarcho-syndicalists, let alone Marxists!) it is quite possible this group is being accused of wanting to introduce the revolutionary committees now abolished in China, in place of the one man management that has always remained in Albania.

The 7th Congress Report links these groups to "certain foreign revisionist states" (presumably Yugoslavia and Rumania) while it explicitly describes China as a socialist country, and does not even hint at any possible connection.

But on October 15, 1978 we read a speech by Hysni Kapo, modestly commemorating Enver Hoxha's 70th birthday, in which Balluku, Këllezi and Theodhosi are presented as a single group, under Chinese direction.

Obviously the Party of Labor of Albania is such a completely closed book that there is no way an outsider can evaluate the political struggles that have gone on there - except from the outcome - which is rotten.

3. Why we support Mao

It was not simply the fact that Mao led the Chinese revolution to overthrow the Kuomintang regime, carry out land reform and establish state industry that "convinced the vast majority of progressive people in the world that Mao was indeed, a Marxist-Leninist." By those criteria, Enver Hoxha, or even Tito, would qualify. If those were the reasons that convinced our erstwhile critic then we can agree that his opinions were "based on very limited knowledge" and were "subjectivism".

What convinced us was not just Mao's leadership of the new democratic revolution in China, but also his leadership of the international communist movement since then.

Mao Tsetung initiated and led the polemic against revisionism in the international communist movement in the 1960s, no matter how much any other participant may want to rewrite history. That was one dividing line that established who was, and who was not, at that time a Marxist Leninist. Mao's polemics with Khrushchev did not center around national issues such as the Soviet Union cutting off aid, or giving assistance to China's enemies like India. They dealt comprehensively with fundamental questions of Marxism-Leninism and in far greater depth than any others at the time. They helped to educate a whole generation of communists. We may be young, but we are not so ignorant the history of that struggle can just be obliterated.

Mao Tsetung also initiated and led the cultural revolution in China. That was another watershed, which established Mao Tsetung not only as a great Marxist-Leninist,

but as the greatest Marxist of the contemporary era, if not of all time. Many who passed the previous test of who was and who was not a Marxist-Leninist failed the test of the cultural revolution.

Mao's enemies, both in China and Albania, are finding that throughout the world, a certain definite generation of communists are the first to speak out and rebel. It is the generation that became communists at the time of the cultural revolution and were inspired by its message that "it is right to rebel against reactionaries" and its demonstration that it is possible to continue the revolution and not just quietly submit to revisionist degeneration.

Our generations refusal to perform backward somersaults on command has prompted comments that we are refusing to recognize the facts because we "were brought up to believe" in Mao. That sounds plausible, but actually the exact opposite is true.

We were not communists when the Soviet Union went revisionist. It was not for us just a matter of transferring allegiance to socialist countries that had not. There was no question of assuming Mao must be alright (or anybody else either), just because he opposed Khrushchev.

Nobody brought us up, we were orphans. When we rallied behind Mao Tsetung, it was not without analysis, but through a fierce struggle against other lines. It was not a matter of joining some recognized and established monolithic communist movement and uncritically accepting its existing leadership. We had to fight our way to Maoism against all comers from modern revisionism, anarchism, Guevarism, Trotskyism and the New Left to social democracy, and we had to know something about what we were fighting for.

Mao Tsetung was never a charismatic individual hero. He made few public appearances and there is nothing about his personality as such that has inspired people to follow him. What inspired support was his stand, his basic approach to problems, and especially his unshakeable confidence in the people as makers of history.

Mao Tsetung thought was developed in the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. It was not the tedious repetition of "universal truths" learned by rote, but was solidly grounded in reality. Australia is not a backward semi-colonial and semi-feudal society like China, and there are no "formulae" in Mao's works (nor in Marx or Lenin's) that we can uncritically apply here. Nevertheless we found enormous practical benefit from our study of Mao Tsetung, in concrete struggles here. In particular his rejection of stereotypes and foreign models helped us to do so too.

The striking thing about Mao Tsetung's works is their practicality. They are not high flown rhetoric, but simple commonsense. Because Mao Tsetung was simply being sensible about how to fight and win a revolution in China, he drew out lessons of universal significance. Many of Mao's major works were in opposition to lines that superficially appeared "left", but were right wing in practice. That has helped us to see through such lines in the international communist today, even when they are disguised as opposition to a right wing line, and also to oppose the right wing line, even when it is disguised as opposition to such a "left" line.

We have found in practice that Mao's concepts of independence and initiative within the united front lead to victories in concrete struggles, while ideas of "striking the main blow at the middle forces" and "everything through the united front" lead to defeats.

We have found that the mass line leads to victories and rejection of it leads to defeats, that the party is built in struggle and attempts to proclaim a "correct line" are disastrous.

In general, studying Mao Tsetung has helped us to grasp the laws of what is actually happening around us, and to use that knowledge to change things. It helped us to liberate our thinking, look at things critically and understand what was going on. That is why we had no hesitation in rebelling against the Chinese revisionists and their flunkys as soon as they seized power.

With this background, we could not for long put up with anyone who wanted us to cramp our minds and abandon the actual revolution to promote blind faith. Whether they spoke in Mao Tsetung's name, or against it. We have learned to think things through for ourselves, starting from the facts, and there is no way in the world we would surrender that for any "authority" whose basic appeal is "join us and you need never think again".

We have learned that real discipline is consciously accepted and cannot be imposed, and that real revolutionaries are people who overthrow reactionaries, not people who endlessly proclaim their solidarity with each other.

We have made and will make mistakes. But we accept responsibility for making them, and learning from them, ourselves. It may be comforting to some to have some authority on whom they can confer responsibility for their actions and blame for their failures. But it is the comfort of slaves. We follow Marx, Engels, Lenin Stalin and Mao because they are models in rebelling against and overthrowing such spurious "authorities" and respecting only the authority of the facts.

So it is not because we were "brought up to believe" in Mao that we have refused to ditch him. In particular, the Albanian critique of Mao's international line is not some new "revelation" that could prompt us to reverse our stand.

Especially since Nixon's visit to Peking, but also long before, we have been continually confronted with a basically similar critique from revisionists, Trotskyites, anarchists and so on. Nor were we unaware of Albania's position at the time. Naturally people had doubts. The whole direction of Chinese foreign policy has for many years been an issue of terrific controversy among revolutionaries in Australia, and no doubt throughout the world. It was not something with which we could, or did, just follow along blindly and uncritically. We were forced to think about it, discuss it, and even fiercely debate it.

The excerpts now published from the August 6, 1971 letter from the Albanian to Chinese Central Committees ring a bell:

"...Welcoming Nixon to China, who is known as a frenzied anti-communist, an aggressor and assassin of the peoples, as a representative of blackest US reaction, has many drawbacks and will have negative consequences for the revolutionary movement and our cause...

"...Talks with Nixon provide the revisionists with weapons to negate the entire great struggle and polemics of the Communist Party of China to expose the Soviet renegades as allies and collaborators of US imperialism, and to put on a par China's stand towards US imperialism and the treacherous line of collusion

pursued by the Soviet revisionists towards it...

"...The visit... will give rise to doubts and misunderstandings among the rank-and-file who may suspect that China is changing its stand towards US imperialism and involving itself in the game of the superpowers.

"...Our strategy calls for close alliance with the peoples fighting all over the world, with all the revolutionaries, on a joint front against imperialism and socialimperialism, and never for an alliance with Soviet socialimperialism allegedly against US imperialism, never for an alliance with US imperialism allegedly against Soviet socialimperialism."

Exactly similar views were held by genuine revolutionaries in Australia, and no doubt elsewhere at the time. As Lenin said regarding a quite comparable situation in the early days of Soviet Russia:¹²

"This sort of supervision from below, this kind of apprehension emanating from the masses, and this kind of anxiety among non-Party circles show the highly vigilant attention that is being paid to relations between us and the capitalists. I believe that on this score we should absolutely welcome this apprehension as revealing the temper of the masses.

"Yet I think that we shall come to the conclusion that, in the question of concessions, we cannot be guided by this revolutionary instinct alone...."

It is not surprising that there were, and still are doubts and confusion about these matters, and it is a good thing that people have been, and are being forced to deepen their understanding rather than following blindly.

But it is rather extraordinary that six years later, after events have proved who was right and who was wrong, we should be served up exactly the same doubts and confusion as some sort of "revelation".

After Nixon's visit, the U.S. went on to complete defeat in all of IndoChina. That is a simple fact. In the face of that simple fact, what is the use of declaring:¹³

"This alliance and meeting in Peking, between the Chinese leadership and the American President Nixon, were taking place at a time when the US was waging its predatory imperialist war in heroic Vietnam, when it was using all its most up-to-date means of war, except the A-bomb, to kill the fraternal Vietnamese people and to reduce Vietnam to ashes. This monstrous alliance and the Sino-US contacts were condemnable acts of disasterous consequences for the peoples."

The only "disasterous consequences" were to the credibility of anti-Communism throughout the world, to the feasibility of US and allied intervention against liberation movements, and to Soviet interests.

True enough, the visit did give rise to "doubts and misunderstandings", and it did "provide the revisionists with weapons", which they are still using. But that is no excuse for joining the revisionists in using those weapons to increase those doubts and misunderstandings. There is simply no comparison between the negative consequences of doubts and misunderstandings being spread among some progressive people by the Soviets, Trotskyites, Albanians etc, and the overwhelming positive impact among ordinary people, and on the balance of forces on a world scale.

When Trotskyites published photos of Mao shaking hands with Nixon and commented that these were being used as leaflets by US psychological warfare experts to demoralize and confuse liberation fighters in IndoChina, we pointed out that the Trotskyites themselves were engaged in exactly the same operation against revolutionaries in Australia and since it wasn't working here it was unlikely to work in IndoChina.

It didn't work in IndoChina. It was the pro-imperialist forces around the world who were demoralized and confused by the sight of Nixon shaking hands with the "threat from the North" who was supposed to provide the justification for counter-revolutionary intervention.

Most of those who were not convinced at the time by analysis and argument, were convinced later by what actually happened. Enver Hoxha could have been summing up the feelings of many such people when he said in the 1974 statement quoted earlier that "This reality wrecks and exposes the bandit-like and fascist propaganda of Moscow and Washington. The peoples of the world...see and feel that Mao Tsetung, the great Marxist-Leninist is on their side, they see socialist China stands them in good stead..."

If Enver Hoxha wishes to justify his now echoing exactly the same tune as the "bandit-like and fascist propaganda of Moscow" concerning Chinese foreign policy (to instigate a world war so they can dominate the ruins etc), then he will have to do better than referring to events that had already taken place two years before he made that statement, and six years before he openly changed sides.

Meanwhile, it is precisely because we were not "brought up" to support Mao, and were not "convinced" by such pathetically subjective reasons as our critics, but fought our way to an understanding of what it is all about, that we are able to continue fighting against all comers.

4. Further Complications

The issue is not being "further complicated today" by the fact that the Chinese revisionists are now trying to discredit some of Mao's writings and "turn their author into a harmless icon".

On the contrary, the issue has been complicated by the fact that until recently both the Chinese and Albanian revisionists loudly proclaimed their support for Mao. We would need short memories to forget about all the articles "proving" that the concept of "three worlds" was diametrically opposed to Mao's line, from groups that are now obediently declaring their agreement with the Albanian conclusion that Mao was a revisionist from the 1930s.

When Mao died, the Albanian leaders made a point of strongly praising him and the Cultural Revolution, and refusing to praise Hua Kuo-feng or condemn the "gang of four". They then took advantage of the confused situation to open up a general polemic on the "three worlds", which had nothing to do with it.

Many Marxist-Leninists were taken in by this and were glad to follow the lead of a "socialist country" apparently opposed to the counter-revolution in China, without really looking at where they were being led.

So far as we know, the Red Eureka Movement in Australia was unique among groups formed in open opposition to the Chinese revisionists and their flunkies in continuing to vigorously, publicly and unequivocally defend Mao's international line by supporting the concept of "three worlds" and the international united front against the Soviet Union.

This has left us feeling somewhat isolated, and therefore lacking in confidence, but at least we are not now in the embarrassing position of either having to eat our words of support for Mao or eat our words about the "three worlds" being a revisionist attack on Mao's line and Albania being the center of its defence. Thus we were able to promptly condemn the Albanian attack on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung thought as soon as it became open just as we condemned the revisionist coup d'etat in China as soon as it took place, and just as we criticized the Albanian editorial "Theory and Practice of Revolution" as soon as it was published (and before the Chinese reply).

We may be lonely, but we haven't got egg all over our face. That doesn't change the fact that we are only a small group and haven't worked out any real understanding of how to make revolution in Australia. But it is a source of some pride when faced with an "international communist movement" in which everybody else seems to be getting so dizzy with backward somersaults that they call "plainly absurd" today, what they called "self-evident" yesterday, and in equally loud and arrogant tones.

Nevertheless, we too were taken in by the "further complications" to the extent that we initially thought the Albanian leaders, although wrong, were in solidarity with revolutionaries in China and the world. We characterized their position as merely a "Left wing Communist error", which may still apply to some critics of "three worlds", but cannot accurately describe a position which more and more openly advocates at the very least appeasement of the Soviet Union.

We were indignant when E.F. Hill publicly insinuated that Hoxha had "ulterior motives" for not hailing the coup d'etat in China, and ~~privately spread rumours~~ that the Albanian position was semi-Trotskyite and soft on the Soviet Union. (after publicly praising the 7th Congress while still in Albania). Although the method of insinuation and behind the scenes intrigue remains contemptible, events of the past two years prove conclusively that on this particular question Hill was right, and we were wrong.

Events proved that the Albanians in no way supported Mao Tsetung, the Cultural Revolution or the "gang of four" but were cynically exploiting the situation to gain support from those who did. That was an "ulterior motive" and there are no two ways about it. Hoxha's past record cannot change the objective facts about his present position. Despite continuing references to "Soviet social-imperialism", the Albanian analysis of many international questions does run parallel to Soviet interests. Their overall theme that China has for many years been trying to incite war between the superpowers so that they can dominate the ruins is exactly what the Russians have been saying all along. It fits in exactly with the Soviet needs to encourage appeasement and avoid at all costs a united front of the countries that could oppose their striving for hegemony. Albania's lack of support for Rumania's recent struggles for increased independence, and lack of opposition to the Vietnamese aggression against Cambodia are "errors" alright. But they can hardly be called "Left wing". The U.S. Progressive Labor Party is an example of a "super-Stalinist" group whose position ended up semi-Trotskyite (and their offshoots are saying "we told you so" about the Albanian position being essentially identical to what they said many years ago). Facts are facts. The facts about Albania are becoming as clear as those about China. Even a member of the Warsaw Pact like Rumania was sufficiently independent of the Soviet Union to condemn the aggression against Cambodia. Albania was not. In fact its stand effectively supports Vietnam.

Until now the Albanian maneuver of attacking Mao's international policy in the guise of an attack on his revisionist successors has been quite successful in confusing and disorienting Marxist-Leninists around the world.

Likewise the Chinese revisionists maneuver of covering their attack on Mao's domestic line by loud proclamations of loyalty to Mao personally and defense against the Albanian attacks on his international line has been quite successful in confusing and disorienting many Marxist-Leninists around the world.

It really is quite an impressive achievement to have apparently wiped out Maoism within two years of Mao Tsetung's death and the Albanian and Chinese revisionists deserve congratulations.

Nevertheless, it was impossible to carry through either of these attacks on Mao's line successfully without attacking Mao directly because his ideas are revolutionary and revolutionaries around the world continually use them to expose and resist the revisionist line. Hence it has been necessary to discredit Mao and deprive revolutionaries of this important weapon, in the same way that Khrushchev had to discredit Stalin.

Mao's opponents in Albania may imagine that it will be easy to discredit Mao because the Chinese revisionists pretend to support him. They seemed to have timed things nicely by waiting until most ML and "ML" groups opposed to the Chinese revisionists had identified themselves with Albania before launching their open assault on Marxism-Leninism.

Unfortunately this timing has been stuffed up because the Chinese revisionists were also waiting until they had solved their internal problems (where it is still difficult to repudiate Mao directly) and until other ML and "ML" groups had lined up with them in support of the "three worlds", before publicly attacking Mao's "mistakes".

Now that Mao's enemies, both in China and Albania are stepping out into the open, they can no longer use each other as a diversion and they will both be discredited more rapidly.

The "further complications" are disappearing and a good deal of support for the Albanian line will disappear along with it. Hardened flunkies will have no difficulty performing more somersaults and they will still take some others with them. But more and more genuine revolutionaries will be forced to think things through and find their bearings again over a period of time.

5. Attitudes to Tito

Certainly "Hua Kuo-feng and Co. must be sorely embarrassed" by Mao Tsetung's consistent stand against Yugoslav revisionism. That is why they have to lie about it.

For example unofficial versions available outside China for many years, of a speech by Mao Tsetung on 30 January, 1962, include the following:¹⁴

"If our country does not establish a socialist economy, what kind of situation shall we be in? We shall become a country like Yugoslavia, which has actually become a bourgeois country; the dictatorship of the proletariat will be transformed into a bourgeois dictatorship, into a reactionary fascist type of dictatorship..."

But the recently published official version, has been fabricated to delete the reference to Yugoslavia,⁵ without so much as a note that the text has been edited, let alone an ellipsis (...) or a footnote.

Obviously this fabrication was prompted by the recent "discovery" that socialism has been re-established in Yugoslavia and Tito was a Marxist-Leninist all along!

But it seems China is not the only place where revisionists are engaged in fabrications because they wish to cover up a changing attitude towards Yugoslavia.

We don't know what Mao Tsetung, Chou En-lai, Kang Sheng etc said to Enver Hoxha and the Albanian delegation to the 8th Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in 1956. But we do know that the Albanians had to wait some 20 years for every single one of the people concerned to be safely dead before saying anything about it. And we also know that this kind of gossip is exactly like Khrushchev's "revelations" about Stalin in his "secret speech". Genuine Marxist-Leninists do not use these despicable methods.

While we don't know what Mao said privately to Hoxha 20 years ago, we do know what Hoxha said about Mao for the following 20 years, and we do know what Hoxha said publicly about Yugoslavia as late as April 17, 1957 (after the Hungarian events), in his joint statement with Nikita Khrushchev:

"It is the unanimous view of the CPSU and APL delegations that the improvement in relations between the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and the other socialist countries which set in in 1955-56, after the healing of the breach with Yugoslavia and the well known Soviet-Yugoslav Declarations, benefited the peoples of these countries and the cause of peace and accorded with the interests of the international labour movement.

"The delegations of the CPSU and APL express regret that in recent months, since the events in Hungary, relations between the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the Communist and Workers' Parties have begun to develop in a different direction, which is not in keeping with the interests of the socialist and working-class parties and of all peace-loving peoples. The delegations have expressed readiness to make the necessary efforts to secure better relations and contact with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and cooperation with it on the ideological basis of Marxism-Leninism, on the principles of proletarian internationalism. They hope that the leadership of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia will likewise take suitable steps to achieve such cooperation. "

The simple fact is that the split in the international communist movement came several years after Khrushchev "healed the breach" with Tito, so such statements should not be considered especially surprising.

Nor would it be surprising if the Chinese leaders told the Albanians that "Stalin was wrong about Tito" at their eighth Congress. In fact they said the same thing publicly¹⁷ and there was even a Yugoslav delegation at that Congress. Since the Albanians had more direct experience of Tito than anyone else (having almost become part of Yugoslavia), it would not be surprising if they were more clear about him than the Chinese in 1956.

But it is surprising that anyone should imagine reference to remarks allegedly made by Mao 20 years ago could either justify the reversal of what has been said about Mao ever since, or successfully distract attention from the recent extremely important changes in Albania's attitude to Yugoslavia.

Those changes are just as significant as the Chinese revisionists rehabilitation of the revisionist Tito and they are expressed in Enver Hoxha's statement on 8 November, 1978: 18

"As you know, the Chinese leadership, through Chou En-lai and company, several times tried to blackmail us in order to impose a military alliance with Yugoslavia and Rumania on us. Of course this alliance was planned to achieve the aims of China against the Soviet Union in the Balkan area and to instigate an imperialist world war."

In the same speech, Hoxha also refers to:

"... the plan of the Chinese leadership, of Chou En-lai and company to create or encourage the creation of blocs of States against Soviet **social-imperialism** and especially to cause provocations in Europe, where it wants the third world war to be waged, in which the Soviet Union, the United States of America and the European countries are to clash with and destroy each other while China escapes the conflagration..."

In addition he talks about:

"...the question of the Albanian minorities in Yugoslavia, contrived by the Junker Bismarck, the Beaconsfields and Lord Greys, whose secret treaties against Albania Lenin exposed and tore up..."

and says:

"...the Albanians living in Yugoslavia, both as regards the extent of their lands as well as the number of their population, amount to more than two Yugoslav republics taken together. They are only one people, but they have been scattered over two republics and one autonomous region..."

These statements must be considered together, and taken together they amount to a public repudiation of Albania's previous attitude towards Yugoslavia, reaffirmed as recently as Enver Hoxha's 7th Congress Report (p202-3) and originally stated in his speech at Bajam Curri in northern Albania on 30 May, 1970: 19

"Our viewpoints about Yugoslavia are known and we publicly state them. We do not interfere with the internal affairs of the Yugoslav peoples, but we do not hide that between us and the Yugoslav leadership there exist deep irreconcilable ideological contradictions which originate from the fact that the Yugoslav leadership is not Marxist-Leninist..."

"But we develop inter-state relations with the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in trade as well as in all the issues of mutual interest. We have stood and stand for the constant improvement of such relations and the goodwill in this direction neither has failed nor will fail on our part. Also in the future, for, as we have said and continuously say, we are friends, and brothers with the peoples of Yugoslavia..."

"...In these last two years the Khrushchov revisionist aggressors have been threatening Yugoslavia and her peoples, their freedom, independence and sovereignty. The people of all nationalities living in Yugoslavia valiantly fought during the anti-fascist war and they will surely know how to fight again and rebuff any aggressor that would attempt to violate their freedom and independence won with blood and sacrifices. The Albanian people, in case of danger, will be on the side of the Yugoslav peoples against any aggressor whatever that would menace the freedom, sovereignty and national independence of our peoples. And the aggressor

should be convinced that he not only cannot break and defeat us, but in such an adventure he would meet with his death. We have said and continue to say this clearly, unequivocally and openly. And this stand of ours is a principled one."

Also repudiated is Enver Hoxha's similar declaration "Revisionist aggressors, hands off Rumania!", made at Kukes in northern Albania on 28 May, 1970 in a speech referring to Soviet "preparations for aggression against Rumania, Yugoslavia and Albania...".²⁰

It is quite clear from these speeches that Chou En-lai and Beqir Balluku were not the only people who could see the logic of a military alliance between Yugoslavia, Rumania and Albania after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, unless of course Hoxha only meant that he would send resolute declarations of solidarity while watching the Soviet troops pass through Yugoslavia towards the Albanian borders.

It is equally clear that by attacking the very idea of such an alliance as a "provocation" against the Soviet Union, Enver Hoxha is himself adopting the gangster logic of the Soviet Union, or at the very least, the logic of Chamberlin and other appeasers who saw collective security agreements as a "provocation" of Nazi Germany and hoped to turn the Nazis east (unsuccessfully).

Quite clearly an alliance between Yugoslavia, Rumania and Albania would pose no security threat to any other state. If the Soviet Union felt provoked it would not be because they feared an Albanian army might march through Yugoslavia to join the Rumanians in detaching Bessarabia from the U.S.S.R. It would be because they regard any declaration that other countries will stick together and not allow themselves to be subjected to Russian domination one by one, as a provocation, just as they regarded Czechoslovak independence as a provocation.

Such an alliance would be quite different from the recent Soviet-Vietnam treaty to pave the way for aggression against Kampuchea, which Enver Hoxha did not find it necessary to condemn. It would be to deter imperialist war, not to incite it.

Contrast this with Hoxha's remarks about the Albanian minority in Yugoslavia, which are exactly the kind of thing that has historically been used by the Great Powers to "incite imperialist war", "turn the Balkans into a powder keg" and so forth. Does Hoxha seriously imagine that Marxist-Leninists are going to be impressed by the undiluted bourgeois nationalism now coming out of Albania²¹ and will support chauvinist demands to dismember Yugoslavia and annexe the Kosmet in the name of "Greater Albania"? Because that is exactly what Hoxha's remarks are intended to pave the way for.

We need not trouble ourselves about Bismarck or Disraeli having "contrived the question of the Albanian minorities in Yugoslavia". Both died long before either a Yugoslav or an Albanian state came into existence. The 1878 Congress of Berlin in which they took part did not define the borders of modern Albania, but the partition of Turkish territory in the Balkans.

The borders of modern Albania were determined by the 1913 conference of Ambassadors in London, presided over by Lord Grey. But it is a deliberate lie to suggest this involves "secret treaties against Albania that Lenin exposed and tore up". The treaty Lenin exposed and tore up was the secret Treaty of London, signed between Italy, Britain, France

and Russia in 1915. This violated the 1913 public agreement by proposing to partition parts of Albania between Italy, Montenegro, Serbia and Greece and place the remainder under Italian domination.²²

None of the Albanian territories which Montenegro and Serbia claimed after 1913 are part of Yugoslavia today. Along with some small areas inhabited by Greeks and Macedonians, they are part of Albania.

The "Albanians living in Yugoslavia" who "are only one people but they have been scattered over two republics and one autonomous region", are not the product of any secret treaty denounced by Lenin. Albania and Yugoslavia are two independent, sovereign states that long ago recognized each others borders. It is clearly no business of Albania's to say where the boundaries of the republics and autonomous regions that make up the Yugoslav federation should lie. The ethnic Albanians of Yugoslavia are Yugoslavs and have no more to do with Albania than Singaporeans or the Hoa people of Vietnam have to do with China (which means that like overseas Chinese, they do have some family and cultural links).

To raise this question is in fact to raise the question of dismembering two Yugoslav republics and one autonomous region. How else could the "question" of "one people" who are "scattered over two republics and one autonomous region" be "solved"? What could happen to an "Albanian Republic" in Yugoslavia except to join it onto the rest of Yugoslavia.

Quite obviously Albania is in no position to dismember Yugoslavia. But the Soviet Union would very much like to and is actively supporting the Croatian Ustasha, Macedonian nationalists and other secessionist forces. No doubt they would welcome a secessionist or irredentist movement among the Yugoslav Albanians.

Enver Hoxha may think he is being very clever in abandoning the internationalist stand of Albanian communists against "Great Albania" chauvinism. But the only time Albania's borders have included Kosova and Metohia under an Albanian state was when this "Great Albania" as well as Yugoslavia was in fact under fascist occupation. Those who think like that should have joined the Balli Kombëtar, not the Communist Party.

In adopting a chauvinist position concerning ethnic Albanians in Yugoslavia, Enver Hoxha is following closely in the footsteps of the Chinese revisionists.

Mao Tsetung's China had a clear stand that while overseas Chinese may have family and cultural links with China they were no concern of the Chinese government unless they happened to be Chinese nationals. China strongly encouraged its nationals abroad to renounce their Chinese nationality and adopt that of their country of residence. In practice, to encourage overseas Chinese to abandon their Chinese nationality, the Chinese government has shown little interest in them even when they remain Chinese nationals. This internationalist stand has made it easier for overseas Chinese to take part in local revolutionary movements²³ and harder for reactionaries to use the Chinese question to stir up anti-communism. Although this policy has been reaffirmed in words, recent Chinese statements concerning the persecution of Chinese in Vietnam (for which there appears to be considerable evidence) have been put in a way that can only encourage ethnic Chinese to see themselves as Chinese rather than Vietnamese nationals, and this has been coupled with criticism of the "gang of four" for having "orphaned" the overseas Chinese. This policy has already been exploited by the Soviet Union to re-kindle fears of Chinese loyalty to the "motherland" in many other Asian countries.

Albania never took such a completely internationalist position as China and never completely renounced its right to speak for the rights of Yugoslav nationals of ethnic Albanian origin. But Albania did clearly accept that they were Yugoslav nationals, it accepted the state boundaries of Yugoslavia and it energetically opposed "Great Albania" chauvinism.

These complicated national disputes, of which we have no real experience in Australia, are of enormous importance in other parts of the world, and especially in the Balkans. It is quite inconceivable that Hoxha could have raised such questions casually.

In his report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, which we are repeatedly told was an outstanding Marxist-Leninist document, Enver Hoxha repeated that:

"The declaration of the Party of Labor of Albania that in case of any eventual aggression against Yugoslavia ~~by the Soviet Union or some other power~~ by the Soviet Union or some other power the Albanian people will stand by the Yugoslav people, will always hold good. But the Yugoslav side must respond to this stand of Albania with just and correct actions towards us." (p202-3).

Now by denouncing "the creation of blocs of states against Soviet social-imperialism" as "provocations in Europe", Enver Hoxha is clearly repudiating this stand. Certainly, if he did not wish to be understood as repudiating it, he would have taken care, in saying such things, to emphatically repeat that Albania's willingness to stand by Yugoslavia against Soviet aggression still stood. Coupled with declarations implying support for the dismemberment of Yugoslavia, such a statement would not have been worth much. But without it, the intention is perfectly clear and no question of "misunderstanding" arises.

While some Marxist-Leninists may still be confused, the Soviet imperialists understand the position very well and have already expressed their appreciation. Here is the full text of a news release from Moscow headed "Albania exposes Peking reaction"²⁴

"The ending of Chinese aid to Albania has signalled a decisive break between the two countries. The letter of July 29 that the Central Committee of the Albanian Party of Labor sent to the CC of the Communist Party of China shows the development of the division.

"In 1968 the Chinese leadership urged Albania to form a military alliance with Yugoslavia and Romania, saying that Albania would not be able to defend itself from foreign aggression. Again in 1975 they tried to impose on Albania the idea of this military alliance, but again it was rejected, Albania seeing it as an attempt to turn the Balkans into a powderkeg.

"Since the Chinese leadership sees the Soviet Union as the main enemy, they would be trying to use such an alliance for attacks on the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, and Hungary(!).

"The Albanian letter accused the Chinese leadership of breaking with Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and of collusion with US imperialism.

"President Nixon was invited to China at a time when the USA was waging a devastating war on Vietnam. It stressed that the theory of three worlds as put forward by Chinese leaders, was to cover up Chinese aims to establish hegemony over the Third World and for the reconciliation of imperialism and the Third World. The letter accused the Chinese leaders of stopping assistance to revolutionary and liberation forces. The letter claimed that the attempt to hamper the development of socialism in Albania only exposed the anti-marxist and counter-revolutionary nature of the Chinese leadership. The letter also made anti-Soviet attacks."

It appears that the Soviet Union has grasped the main point that Albania's line on major international questions is substantially identical to their own. The final sentence about "anti-Soviet attacks" gives these exactly the significance they deserve.

As Enver Hoxha once remarked:²⁵

"If you make such concessions to those monsters, they will allow you even to insult them, call yourselves communists, even pose as adherents of Marx, Lenin and Mao Tsetung. But all this is bluff, for they have gripped you by the throat and you cannot budge: you have become their slave, their agent, have sold out your country and people."

The question has been aptly posed:

"If Mao were a Marxist-Leninist, could he have attempted to impose a military alliance with a known enemy of socialism and an agency of imperialism such as Titoite Yugoslavia is, socialist Albania."

No question of "imposition" or "blackmail" arises since the Albanians have not even claimed that the Chinese ever did more than suggest such an alliance. Aid, apparently including the "heavy armaments" China advised against, continued without let up: until after Mao's death.

But certainly if the Chinese advice to Albania in 1968 was to "incite imperialist wars" and was part of a Chinese plan "...to cause provocations in Europe, where it wants the third world war to be waged, in which the Soviet Union, the USA and the European countries are to clash and destroy each other, while China escapes the conflagration..." then of course, far from being a Marxist-Leninist, Mao Tsetung must have been an imperialist war-monger.

If that's what it was all about, then we must conclude not only that Mao was a warmonger, but also that Hoxha kept quiet about this imperialist war-mongering plot against the human species for a whole decade, actively collaborated with it and praised its author as long as he kept receiving aid.

At least Khrushchev and Brezhnev took steps to warn the world about this Chinese plot, and long before 1968.

It has always been difficult to understand why experienced leaders of a party and state who came to power independently through a united front struggle in the war against fascism, should be able to put forward such a transparently "left" line that it appears exactly the same as Lenin's "infantile disorder".

Now that the Albanian parroting of Khrushchev and Brezhnev is coming into the open, the reason for the complete theoretical bankruptcy of the Albanian polemics is becoming clearer. Their position isn't "left" at all. They had nothing to say because it had all been said before - but they didn't dare say it openly from the beginning because they know that this line will win no support from Marxist-Leninists.

Obviously there is no Marxist-Leninist principle against communists forming military alliances "with a known enemy of socialism and agency of imperialism" like Tito. The alliance between the socialist Soviet Union and the British, U.S. and other imperialists against the Axis powers is a classic example.

The commander of the Albanian National Liberation Army, Colonel General Enver Hoxha knows this perfectly well. After all, his general staff had attached to it military representatives of Great Britain and the United States, as well as the Soviet Union, and it sent military representatives to, and signed a military agreement with, the Allied Mediterranean High Command headed by

General Wilson.²⁶

Indeed Enver Hoxha went rather further than is permissible for a Marxist-Leninist, by placing Britain and the United States on a par with the Soviet Union, in ~~the~~ appealing for recognition of the Democratic Republic of Albania on the basis that it had "publicly declared its allegiance to the great Anglo-Soviet-American alliance."²⁷

It is still necessary to refute the various "left" theories raised in opposition to Mao Tsetung's concept of the united front. But the case of Yugoslavia makes this much clear: Albania's "left" critique of Mao is not the essence of the problem. We are not engaged in a historical dispute over whether Mao was "soft" on Tito, or a theoretical dispute about the correct interpretation of Leninist tactics. "Left" slogans are being raised only to distract attention from a complete capitulation to the basic line of Soviet imperialism. If Albania's line was really a "left" deviation then they would be carrying on about the Soviet schemes against Yugoslavia, Rumania and ~~Laos~~ Kampuchea with just as much fervour as they do against the U.S. (while "of course" refusing to unite with anybody about anything).

Their past experience of united front tactics shows that they are not so stupid as to be taken in by their own "left" propaganda. They know what they are saying and doing, and so should we.

If Hoxha is a Marxist-Leninist, could he spread in the international communist movement theories about never being allied with ~~any~~ imperialists, that he knows from his own experience to be nonsense, to justify backing away from a stand against Soviet aggression in the Balkans? Is there anything "left" about Albanian appeasement towards the Soviet Union?

Although this is the essence, the historical differences between China's and Albania's attitude towards Titoism is worth exploring further, because it does bear on some current issues.

There is some truth in the suggestion that China never took quite the same stand against Titoism as Albania. The Chinese critique ~~was~~ always centred on Tito's revisionist policies which assisted imperialism and restored capitalism. They were never really upset about Tito's "independence" and in fact welcomed the loosening of ties to the Soviet Union within the socialist camp. Albania's critique, apart from focussing on the question of Yugoslav treatment of Albania, centred on Tito's disruption of the socialist camp. It is not to Enver Hoxha's credit that in the past as well as now, he felt closer to the Soviet revisionist leaders than to Tito and called for rallying around the Soviet Union as head of the socialist camp, long after the Soviet Union had replaced Tito as the main center of revisionism.²⁸ These questions will have to be documented later.

6. Stalin and the 20th Congress

The publication of Mao's 1956 report "On the Ten Major Relationships" with its criticism of Stalin, is presented as a new revelation of Mao's revisionism, so devastating that Mao could only be defended by claiming this article was distorted by its revisionist publishers after Mao's death.

Actually, not only this report but many other unofficial versions of Mao's works strongly critical of Stalin have been publicly available since at least 1969 ~~years~~ (years before the discovery that all his writings, right back to the 1930s, are an attack on Marxism). See for example the American translations referred to in Stuart Schram's collection "Mao Tsetung Unrehearsed" published by Penguin, and the two volume "Miscellany of Mao Tsetung Thought" published by the US Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS 61269).

10.

Apart from Mao's remarks about Stalin in the 1956 report having been published before, exactly the same views were stated officially and publicly by the Chinese Communist Party at the time. It is well known that articles like "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and "On the Question of Stalin" were published in defence of Stalin against Khrushchev's attacks, yet they repeat the same criticisms as the 1956 report. So what is the revelation?

Indeed Mao was not like those heroes who prefer to save their criticisms of Marxist-Leninist leaders until they are safely dead. (Khrushchev had the excuse that Stalin would have knocked him off - what is Hoxha's excuse?) Many of Mao's writings were polemics against the "Wang Ming line" which was, as is explained in the articles mentioned above, connected with the Comintern's line i.e. Stalin's line. Interestingly, aspects of Wang Ming's various right and left lines bear remarkable resemblances to the lines pushed by the Albanians on the one hand, and the Chinese Parrots in Australia on the other. He died recently in Moscow.

It is no surprise to learn that Albania never agreed with any criticism of Stalin whatever, but why pretend that it is a surprise to learn that Mao did criticise Stalin? If anyone thinks history has not proved the correctness of Mao's criticisms they should refute them. It will be an uphill job since the facts are clear, but nobody can complain about attempting it.

But this does not give anyone the right to say "The only possible conclusion that can be drawn from Mao's report is that he was in complete accord with the revisionist line of Khrushchev of attacking all the achievements of the socialist revolution in the Soviet Union under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin." That is not a defence of Stalin. It is a despicable lie. Such lies can be spread in Albania, where Mao's works are banned and copies confiscated at the border, but what is the use of peddling this sort of stuff abroad where we can read Mao for ourselves?

Here is what Mao actually said,³⁰ only a few weeks after Khrushchev's 20th Congress speech, in "On the Ten Major Relationships"

"...Some people never take the trouble to analyse, they simply follow the "wind". Today, when the north wind is blowing, they join the "north wind" school; tomorrow, when there is a west wind, they switch to the "west wind" school; afterwards when the north wind blows again, they switch back to the "north wind" school. They hold no independent opinion of their own and often go from one extreme to the other.

"In the Soviet Union, those who once extolled Stalin to the skies have now in one swoop consigned him to purgatory. Here in China some people are following their example. It is the opinion of the Central Committee that Stalin's mistakes amounted to only 30 per cent of the whole and his achievements to 70 per cent, and that all things considered Stalin was nonetheless a great Marxist..." (an explanation of the 30 per cent, which refers to entirely different questions from the "crimes" alleged by Khrushchev, follows).

Here is what Mao said in his "Speech at the Second Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China" on November 15, 1956.³¹

"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 criticizing 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 criticize 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 parliamentary 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 "only possible conclusion" is that Mao was completely opposed to Khrushchov's revisionist attack on Stalin, and had his own quite separate criticisms of Stalin. It is interesting to compare Mao's forthright attack on the 20th Congress as early as 1956, with Enver Hoxha's unqualified endorsement of it at the same time; with statements about "the just struggle against the cult of the individual waged by the 20th Congress" and talk of "the experience and vital lessons of the 20th Congress"² (on which the 3rd Congress of the PLA was based).

Where Mao not only defended Stalin, but also took up the central political questions at stake, and even warned Chinese Communists against giving the Russians any information about internal Chinese affairs,² we find Hoxha only worried about Khrushchev's support for Tito, ~~and not raising~~ not raising the question of Stalin at all, expressing illusions that the Soviet leadership were Marxist-Leninist, keeping the discussion away from the Albanian Central Committee and continuing to share all party secrets with the Russians until 1960.³ As for Hoxha's stand on the actual political questions at the time, try this for size:³⁴

"...It will be known that the 20th party congress, a significant event in the history of communism and of the international communist movement, has not only developed a great number of Marxist-Leninist theses, such as the thesis of peaceful coexistence, the thesis on the possibility of averting wars, on the roads that will assure the conquest of power by the working class etc., but it has also elaborated the grandiose program for the transition from socialism to communism, the task of catching up with and overtaking the per capita production of the developed capitalist countries within a short historic period, for demonstrating the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist by way of peaceful economic competition."

The "only possible conclusion" is that Mao's critics have no independent opinion of their own, but simply follow the wind and often go from one extreme to the other.

We need not adopt our critic's methods to conclude that because Hoxha was unclear about Soviet revisionism in 1956, therefore he has always been a revisionist since the 1930s. But it is strange to find someone with so many skeletons in his cupboard launching these pygmy attacks against the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our era. Did he imagine that with revisionism dominant in China, nobody would reply?

7. Mao Tsetung Thought

We cannot deny that "The line that Mao Tsetung Thought is the further development of Marxism-Leninism in the changed conditions of the present epoch has been widely propagated from about 1967 onwards."

Indeed it has been widely propagated by leaders of the Albanian Party of Labor; who have said:

"Before the peoples and all revolutionaries everywhere in the world rises Mao Tsetung's giant figure as a great Marxist-Leninist and outstanding master of revolution, who has developed and raised the all conquering ideas of Marxism-Leninism to a new and higher stage. Whole generations of revolutionaries on all continents are educated by and throw themselves into the flames of revolution under the teachings of Mao Tsetung..."

"The all-conquering thought of Chairman Mao Tsetung fill all the revolutionary forces with confidence..."⁵⁴

"Chairman Mao Tsetung was not only the beloved and great leader of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people but also an eminent Marxist-Leninist thinker and theoretician and the successor to the ideas and genial work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The Marxist-Leninist ideas of Comrade Mao Tsetung on continuously carrying out class struggle in socialist society, on the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads, and on continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat are an immensely valuable and creative contribution to the theory of scientific socialism."⁵⁵

Some The words "changed conditions" have been deliberately inserted to "prove" that this makes claims for Mao Tsetung Thought, "revisionism of precisely the same order as the ~~theories of the Khrushchevite theories~~ claim that the Khrushchevite theories...are the new development of Marxism-Leninism in the new conditions."

This is an explicit assertion that no further development of Marxism-Leninism in new conditions is possible, which as Stalin points out, is a classic revisionist position.⁵⁶

Obviously conditions have changed in the half century between Lenin's death and Mao's, and even more rapidly than they did in the shorter period between Marx's death and Lenin's.

Mao Tsetung Thought was established as the Marxism-Leninism of our era, precisely in struggle against the Khrushchevite theories of "the changed nature of imperialism", "peaceful coexistence", "a world without arms and without wars", "the state and party of the entire people", just as Leninism was established in struggle against the theories of Kautsky, Plekhanov, Trotsky etc.

It is sheer deliberate deception to pretend that to recognize a new and higher stage of Marxism implies a belief that "the fundamental nature of the epoch" has changed. As Chou En-lai reported to the Tenth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party:

"Chairman Mao has often taught us: We are still in the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution... Since Lenin's death, the world situation has undergone great changes. But the era has not changed. The fundamental principles of Leninism are not outdated; they remain the theoretical basis guiding our thinking today."

Most interesting is the claim that Mao's revisionism "has led to precisely the same result of building alliances with United States and other imperialisms, which began with Nixon's visit to China in 1972".

So we are to believe that the "result" of Khrushchev's revisionism was an alliance with U.S. imperialism, and not the emergence of a new superpower engaged in violent contention with U.S. imperialism (after a period of finding its feet, as China is still doing). This discredited thesis that there was more "collusion" than "contention" between the superpowers was loudly advocated by Albania for several years before being abandoned in the face of the obvious facts. Is it to be revived now?

8. The Chinese Revolution

The remarks about the role of the proletariat in overthrowing the bourgeois state power in a capitalist society are very interesting and very correct. However it does not help us to understand the strategy for a new democratic revolution in a semi-colonial or semi-feudal society like China or Albania, both of which were backward agrarian countries in which the Communist Party led overwhelmingly peasant armies to liberate the cities (or in Albania's case, the towns) from the countryside.³⁷

The confusion and disorientation concerning the defeat of socialist revolution in China does make it necessary to discuss Mao's concept of new democratic revolution, including the questions of proletarian hegemony, "pluralism" etc and the continuation of the revolution into its socialist stage.

As Marx pointed out in his classic "Critique of the Gotha Program:

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

This transition period is usually called "Socialism" but it would be wrong to imagine that there is some kind of "socialist society" or "socialist industries" except in this sense of transition to communism. Hence there is nothing at all amazing about the process being interrupted by the restoration of capitalism under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Here is not the place to open up this discussion. Suffice to say that the attacks on the Chinese Communist Party's reliance on the peasantry, and its co-operation with other political parties are nothing new or original. They were first put forward by the Trotskyite opposition in the 1920s and refuted by Stalin in various articles collected in the book "On the Opposition". History itself has refuted these arguments, but they are still the regular resort of every trend that needs to "explain away" the Chinese revolution. Where Marxist-Leninists can see a process of continuing revolution by stages (permanent revolution), with defeats and reversals only interrupting the overall movement, Trotskyites and revisionists can only compare what is, metaphysically isolated from what was and what will be, against an abstract model of what a revolution "should" be, drawn from inside their own heads.

Pluralism of political parties is not a unique feature of the Chinese revolution. The Bolshevik party first came to power in a coalition government with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries with authority from a Congress of Soviets nearly half the delegates to which represented other parties. The coalition only ended when the Left S-R's ravings about "concessions to German imperialism" (how familiar) were threatening the very survival of Soviet power, and the other Soviet parties were only outlawed when they deserted to the side of the Whiteguards. What is unique in China is the open assertion of Communist Party leadership at all levels of Chinese society, unconcealed by any "Democratic Front". To see the insignificant non-communist parties of China as a threat to proletarian hegemony in a society entirely dominated by the Communist Party takes real creative imagination.

It is the same creative imagination that sees a "flagrant negation" of the leading role of the proletariat, in any reference to peasants, or the "third world", as the main force. The distinction between "leading" and "main" is obvious, and the attempt to confuse the two is pathetic.

History records that the Chinese Communist Party was established as the vanguard of a modern urban industrial proletariat several million strong, that it organized and led a peasant war against imperialism and feudalism, only after having successfully led working class insurrections in the largest cities in the world, and using the working class forces it had accumulated in its leadership of the Chinese labor movement, that it came to power in the big cities of China after many years of revolutionary civil war against the Chinese Nationalist Party (Kuomintang), during which it always retained its leadership of the working class and administered many towns comparable in size to Tirana, that the government it formed had a clear cut proletarian revolutionary program for transition to socialism and that it proceeded to faithfully carry out that program.

If instead the Chinese Communist Party had been established in a country that as well as being backward, agrarian, semi-colonial and semi-feudal, also had no cities whatever to liberate³⁸ from the countryside, and virtually no modern industrial proletariat, if it had only led a resistance to foreign fascist occupation and had come to power in the same way as Tito and in close association with Tito, without having to fight a civil war against the bourgeois parties, but as the only anti-fascist party,³⁹ if it had no program of its own but had concealed the very existence of the Communist Party behind a "Democratic Front" in order to curry favour with Britain and the USA,⁴⁰ if it had raised the flag of some Ming Dynasty (15th century) feudal prince instead of its own flag, if it had boasted that its borders were closed to revolutionary fighters in neighbouring countries and that any who crossed these borders were automatically disarmed and interned in concentration camps.....if any of these were the case then it might be necessary to consider just how far the social content of the Chinese revolution went beyond the bourgeois democratic revolutions that established most, but not all, of the nation states of Europe in previous centuries.

But none of this was the case, at least not in China anyway.

9. The Party Bourgeoisie

The arguments against Mao's concept of a "bourgeoisie within the party" are substantially identical to those now being peddled by the Chinese revisionists and by the Soviet revisionists before them.⁴² These views have been crushingly refuted by the history of the Soviet Union, China and all the other socialist countries (except of course Albania where such a thing could never happen, because Enver Hoxha wouldn't allow it).

To speak of a bourgeoisie within a proletarian party is not "a contradiction in terms", but a contradiction in reality. Such contradictions do exist. Things do turn into their opposites. To deny this either means denying that capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union; or else denying that the Bolsheviks were ever a proletarian party. If Khrushchev and Brezhnev don't represent the bourgeoisie, what class do they represent? And if they do represent the bourgeoisie is this only because Lenin and Stalin's "bourgeois workers party" didn't take sufficiently "stern measures" and "allowed" this factional activity?

Mao Tsetung did not "allow" the Chinese party bourgeoisie to exist, or to overthrow the proletariat, any more than Lenin or Stalin did. Nor did they ask his permission. He fought them bitterly and they fought him bitterly. That fight will continue.

Incidentally, Mao Tsetung did not "allow" factionalism either. He urged communists to "Practice Marxism and not revisionism; unite and don't split; and be open and above board and don't intrigue and conspire."

For example Mao would never have "allowed" Central Committee members of his party, acting as delegates to a fraternal party, to write letters to outsiders criticizing their own party organ and calling for it toe the line of the fraternal party.

Nor would Mao have "allowed" Central Committee members to have their views published abroad anonymously or under a nom de plume because they want to express a view different from their party due to a "bit of difficulty" with the party line.

But people who have an opportunist line to push invariably resort to factionalism whether they are "allowed" or not, so Mao is quite right to recognize that factionalism exists and there are always two lines in the party.

It is fascinating to observe that someone who publicly ~~and~~ (but of course anonymously) advocates a second line in the party and admits in writing that they are doing so, can claim such a state of affairs can only exist in a bourgeois workers party.

It corresponds to our experience in Australia where the people who make the loudest calls for discipline and democratic centralism also show the most flagrant individualistic determination to just go their own way and the most complete disregard for any party spirit.

It is precisely those who deny the existence of the bourgeoisie inside the Communist Party who "allow" it to seize power.

Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Hua Kuo-feng, Teng Hsiao-ping and company deny that there can be a bourgeoisie inside the Communist Party precisely because they themselves represent it. Why does our critic join them?

The utter absurdity of this denial is shown when a few sentences later we are told that on the question of capitalism or socialism in China "For a number of years the issue hung in the balance, with the national bourgeoisie and the proletariat contending for hegemony."

We are further told that the cultural revolution was a partial victory for the proletariat.

That happens to be exactly what Mao said about the situation, emphasizing that the issue would continue to hang in the balance throughout the entire historical period of socialism (transition from capitalism to communism), and that it would take not one or two but twenty or thirty cultural revolutions to win final victory.

So what is the quibble? How can one deny that there is a bourgeoisie in the Communist Party in one breath and talk about it contending for hegemony in the next. How can one deny that there was a genuine Communist Party and talk about the possibility of proletarian hegemony and building socialism? Was there a possibility that a "bourgeois workers party" could have built socialism?

These are contradictions in terms, not contradictions in reality. They arise from an ~~and~~ utterly confused (dare we say "eclectic") position that has not even been fully thought through to its logical conclusions before rushing into the fray.

This position is not only eclectic, but also quite mealy mouthed.

In correspondence our anonymous Mao critic ~~is~~ writes that "Mao's beautiful words were just a mask for counter-revolutionary deeds of a very cunning revisionist" and calls for "a clear line of demarcation between Marxist-Leninists on the one hand, and revisionists, Maoists, trots, anarchists, social democrats and what have you" on the other hand. But in the article for publication we are told only that Mao "was not a Marxist-Leninist" but an "eclecticist" and his "lack of Marxist-Leninist clarity and proletarian class consciousness" is blamed for the revisionists threatening his leadership.

If it wasn't considered heretical, one could say Stalin showed a "lack of Marxist-Leninist clarity and proletarian class consciousness" about the Soviet revisionists who seized power after his death, even though he did oppose them. But since Mao Tsetung went down fighting the Chinese revisionists with the utmost ~~vigour~~ vigour and characterized Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao, Teng Hsiao-ping and company with the greatest clarity, this accusation can hardly be made against him.

To accuse a "very cunning revisionist" of "lack of Marxist-Leninist clarity" in fighting revisionism suggests either total confusion or complete dishonesty. Whichever it is, it won't wash.

Like it or not, there is a bourgeoisie in the Chinese Communist Party just as there is in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and in the Party of Labor of Albania. Look for it amongst those who deny its existence.

10. Working Class Leadership

The argument that the Chinese Communist Party was "largely a formality", that it didn't hold enough Congresses and so forth is another shop worn theme of modern revisionism. The Chinese revisionist press has been full of "revelations" about the "gang of four" (meaning Maoists) having had their own apparatus which functioned independently of the formal party.

A bitter complaint about this can also be found in the 1968 Soviet pamphlet "Developments in China", with exactly the same theme about a "military-bureaucratic dictatorship".

Here too, but with more detail we can read about Mao's use of the "young people, chiefly schoolchildren and students" against "the leading organs of the party" (p6), about the "political departments" (presumably the same as the "General Directory" now "revealed"), which are "handpicked by Maoists from among Army political workers on whom they could rely" (p50). There is the same claim that because they could rely on the working class and peasants "the Maoists saw in the politically immature youth the only force that could be given out as representing the masses" (p55).

Revisionists have always presented themselves as defenders of the working class against revolutionary "youth" and intellectuals. This corresponds to the fact that young people have always been in the vanguard of every revolution and students in particular, because they are able to respond quickly, have often played the role of detonator for the larger mass explosions that follow. One need only look at such mass upheavals as the May 4th movement in China, the 1905 revolution in Russia, the May 1968 events in France or even the Albanian National Liberation War⁴ to see the active role of youth ~~xx~~ and students.

The Chinese Cultural Revolution followed this pattern too, with Red Guards first appearing among students and then rebel organizations spreading among workers and peasants and first of all young workers. Only when the working class moved into action to exercise its leading role did such ~~x~~ victories as the overthrow of the Shanghai Municipal Party Committee become possible. Only the working class was able to carry the movement forward steadily without being side-tracked by petit-bourgeois fanaticism, factionalism etc.

This position was well understood in China, where the greatest attention was paid to direct working class leadership. Under the slogan "the working class must exercise leadership in everything" teams of industrial workers were placed in charge not only of factories, but also of universities and offices. (cf Albania where Professors run the Universities and managers run the factories, all led by a "working class party" dressed in business suits).

Chinese students were encouraged to become industrial workers or to settle down in the countryside, and were not permitted to just go straight into bureaucratic office jobs.

All this is well known. The Chinese proletariat did exercise its leading role in all aspects of life, not by sending delegates to a Congress, but in the only way it can - by a revolution - an insurrection in which one class overthrew another.

Naturally revisionists hate the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are not lying when they describe it as lawless, violent and arbitrary, trampling on the "proper" institutions and operating as the personal apparatus of an individual dictator (whether it be Lenin, Stalin or Mao) - from their standpoint, as the victims rather than the wielders of dictatorship, it really is rather grim and undemocratic. This message comes over loud and clear from the complaints of the Chinese revisionists and the sympathetic comments of their fellow bureaucrats ~~in~~ in Albania (whose nationalist rivalry over foreign policy questions does not over-ride a common hatred of the Cultural Revolution).

Kautsky was very concerned at the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly in Russia and predicted dictatorship within the party as well as dictatorship by the party.⁴⁴ Khrushchev and Brezhnev were much better at holding regular party congresses than Stalin. They are more "institutionalized" because they are counter-revolutionary. Revolution cannot be institutionalized.

The Soviet revisionists have given a clear explanation of why they are so zealous about defending the party institutions against Mao. It deserves careful study by anyone who imagines that "less personal dictatorship" and "more party democracy" would have prolonged socialism in China:⁴⁵

"...despite all the difficulties, delays, deviations and zigzags, matters were moving in the right direction and ultimately they would have brought the CPC round to a complete renunciation of the substance of Mao Tse-tung's ideological and political platform (even if a semblance of leadership by him was retained). That is exactly what Mao Tsetung wanted to avoid and to this end he started the "cultural revolution".

To see whether this analysis is accurate, just take a look at what is happening in China today.

11. Mao's "Successor"

Mao Tsetung did not appoint Hua Kuo-feng as his "successor", and it was not a "simple matter" for the revisionists "to use the apparatus inherited from Mao" to take over. It required an armed counter-revolutionary coup d'etat in which several Chinese cities were placed under martial law, and power was seized by arresting top leaders of the political bureau of the central committee in complete violation of the party and state constitutions. It took more than a year for the revisionists to purge the "apparatus inherited from Mao", purging a third of the Central Committee, half the provincial leaders and so on. Even today, the Chinese press still reports determined resistance to the new policies from within the party as well as outside (describing this resistance as "conservatism", "fear" and so on).

In contrast to Khrushchev's "legitimate" succession through the party apparatus inherited from Stalin, and in contrast to the "peaceful evolution" of many east european party leaderships including Albania's (though not without some sort of upheaval involving a large number of well known top leaders in 1975), the Chinese coup d'etat attracted worldwide attention.

Not only was there a real threat of civil war, as the revisionists admitted, but Marxist-Leninists around the world were able to immediately recognize what was going on.

After two years, the Chinese revisionists are already completely exposed internationally (cf Khrushchev in 1956 or even 1958) and there is no reason to doubt that there are literally millions of Chinese, educated by the Cultural Revolution, who already see through them and are fighting back (why else are former Red Guard leaders now being executed?)

Far from it being a "simple matter", the Chinese revisionists are already finding it heavy going, and it will be much worse for them when the short term benefits of massive foreign investment turn into the long term problems of being tied into a world capitalist economy heading into a depression.

It is depressing to see how many Maoists outside China have been temporarily tricked into going along with either the Chinese or Albanian revisionists, but there is no reason to believe that those in China, who have been through these sort of complicated situations before, are so gullible, or that the present state of confusion is permanent.

12. Teng Hsiao-ping

The history of Teng Hsiao-ping's "rise and fall, rise and fall, only to rise again" is indeed amazing. Stay tuned, it may not be over yet! (Although Hua has more reason to be nervous in the short term).

Clearly it was a mistake to let Teng rise again after he was first overthrown. This mistake was corrected when he was overthrown again. So what is the big deal? The only way to be sure of never having to correct such mistakes is to shoot anybody whoever goes wrong, and that would be an even bigger mistake.

It seems plausible that tolerating "the presence of proven class enemies in the party" was a factor in their ultimate victory. But in fact the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat was not carried out by these "proven class enemies" who had been overthrown before, but by people like Hua Kuo-feng who had not been.

Teng Hsiao-ping was subject to a nationwide campaign of such intensity that he could not be restored to public office until many months after the coup. This campaign was clearly intended to culminate in the expulsion of Teng and many others in the course of a second cultural revolution.

When that campaign was defeated, not only was Teng restored to power after never having been expelled, but so were many other capitalist roaders, like Peng Chen, Lu Ting-yi, Chou Yang, Peng Teh-huai and so on, who presumably had been expelled. Certainly if they had been executed, they would not be in power today. But the Chinese bourgeoisie is not a conspiracy of a few individuals but a social class arising out of the capitalist social relations (commodity production, work for wages etc) that still exist in a socialist society in transition from capitalism to communism. Presumably it would have found other political representatives. Stalin killed many revisionists, but Khrushchev was still his successor.

It seems clear that both Teng's dismissal and the decision to "see how he behaves in future" were a compromise in a Political Bureau that was publicly admitted to have been split at the time (the resolution is carefully worded).

Anyone who wants to understand the complex situations that can arise, should study not only the history of the two line struggles in the Chinese Communist Party, including those against Wang Ming and Lin Piao as well as against Teng Hsiao-ping, but also the history of the Party of Labor of Albania, including the period when Koci Xoxe nearly overthrew Enver Hoxha and Albania nearly become part of Yugoslavia, and

the time a few years later when Enver Hoxha recommended that Tuk Jakova should not be immediately expelled after he rose and fell and rose again and fell again.

Life is much more complex than it would be if the leadership of China really was just a personal apparatus of Mao Tsetung.

13. Chinese Aid to Albania

We are now told that "The Chinese attempt to place socialist Albania in a position of neo-colonialist dependence on China, the facts of which are only now being made public, began long ago, when Mao Tsetung was alive and fully in command of the situation in China".

This would be much more convincing if these "facts" had also begun to be made public some time ago, when Mao Tsetung was alive and in a position to answer back.

Instead, during Mao's lifetime, Enver Hoxha was telling us: ⁴⁶

"All the peoples and states - and they are not few - who have demanded and received financial aid in form of loans from socialist China or trade with it have nothing but words of praise and gratitude for its generosity, for its correctness, for the exemplary conduct and artlessness of its people, for the rapid aid it gives with no strings attached. Every commodity China sends to the friendly and allied nations is of high quality..."

This and similar statements are not just a polite thank you, but an explicit declaration about the character of China's economic relations with other countries, unsolicited and unnecessary if there were any problems. (Cf Vietnam which made no great ado about how exceptionally wonderful the aid was when they were getting it, and no claim that the previous aid had been neo-colonialist when it stopped).

The Albanian letter of July 29, 1978 effectively refutes the hypocritical explanations given by the Chinese revisionists for scrapping existing agreements and it correctly exposes the patronising suggestion that Chinese aid was the main source of Albanian economic progress. But it falls down miserably in attempting to prove that the same attitudes characterized Chinese aid during Mao Tsetung's lifetime as well, and doesn't even assert this explicitly leaving it as an implication to be gradually developed into a myth.

Even these implications are self-contradictory. For example we have the claim on page 13 that delays in the Elbasan Metallurgical complex are "the fault of the Chinese side", yet figures are quoted showing that Chinese deliveries of equipment were far ahead of the actual construction work ⁴⁷ performed in Albania. Presumably if the Chinese were holding things up, construction work should have been delayed waiting for Chinese deliveries. In fact we have Enver Hoxha's explicit public statement, made on April 29, 1976 that delays at Elbasan were not due to the Chinese having "halted the shipment of materials" but were due to "Internal (i.e. Albanian) enemies and traitors" who "attempted to sabotage the construction of socialism" and wanted (interestingly enough) "to destroy our fraternal friendship with China and the Communist Party of Mao Tsetung, and connect our country to the Soviet revisionists." ⁴⁸

Apparently these enemies and traitors succeeded. Either Enver Hoxha was lying then, in which case he is a liar and need not be believed now, or we must conclude that these "facts which are only now being made public" are also "facts" which are only now being invented.

14. Conclusion

Mao Tsetung probably never wrote an article that ~~promised~~ started by promising "an objective scientific analysis... using the method of dialectical and historical materialism".

He probably never ended one by calling for "the consistent application of Marxism-Leninism, the scientific ideology of the proletariat in every aspect of the life and struggle of society."

Instead of endlessly boasting about it, Mao Tsetung actually demonstrated how to apply Marxism-Leninism in what he said and did.

We need not fall into the trap of assuming that Mao's critics were never revolutionaries and never did anything good, even though we can conclude that their past achievements were not as great as they make out, and could not possibly excuse their present betrayal.

But we can be quite certain that the present eclipse of Maoism is temporary and that Mao Tsetung's contributions to the revolution will be remembered long after the boastful pygmies who attack him have been forgotten.

"We'll return amidst triumphant songs and laughter".

15. NOTES

1. "Our Policy is an Open Policy, the Policy of Proletarian Principles", 8 Nentori Publishing House, pp40-43. See Reference Material on "Albania and Mao Tsetung" in this Discussion Bulletin, item 27.
2. Reference Material, items 22 and 23. September 9 and 17, 1976
3. Item 4. July 29, 1978.
4. See "Our Friends Ask", Naim Frasherri Publishing House 1970, p150-55 "The 8th Congress of the Albanian Trade Unions", 8 Nentori 1977 p44-5 See also "A new Victory of the Policy of the Party of Labor of Albania in the Uplift of the General Wellbeing of the People", 8 Nentori, 1976 especially pp7-9.
5. Even after the "new victory" above, bonuses are still paid for academic titles and degrees and royalties are still paid for creative work (if it's per page published, Enver Hoxha must make a fortune!). Contributors to Albania Today still sign as "Professor".
6. See "Getting a Grasp on the Situation: A Woman's Perspective on the USSR, China, Albania and the Theory of the Three Worlds", \$US.50 from Andrea Gabriel, 57 So. Bannock, Denver, Colo. 80223 USA.
7. Almost any PLA documents show an even greater focus on economic progress than the Chinese revisionists. For a classic bureaucrats speech about living in the best of all possible worlds and only needing to defend rather than change it, see Enver Hoxha's speech of September 20, 1978, "Proletarian Democracy is Genuine Democracy".
8. See "Huang Hua's Report on the World Situation", Issues and Studies (Taiwan), Jan-Feb 1978.
9. See "Yugoslav "Self-Administration" A Capitalist Theory and Practice", 8 Nentori, 1978, p38,43 etc.
10. See "Our Friends Ask" pp165-169.
11. "Letter of the CC of the PLA and the Government of Albania to the CC of the Communist Party and the Government of China", July 29, 1978, 8 Nentori, pp42-3.
12. "The Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets", Lenin, Collected Works, Vol 31, pp463-4. December 21, 1920.
13. Letter of July 29, 1978, op cit, p41. Reference Material, item 6.
14. "Mao Tsetung Unrehearsed", ed. S. Schram, Penguin 1974, p167
15. Peking Review, July 7, 1978, p11.
16. New Times (Moscow), No 17, 1957, p40.
17. "Second Session of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China", FLP Peking, 1958, p77.
18. "Albania is Forging Ahead Confidently and Unafraid", 8 Nentori, 1978, p19,23,25.
19. "Important Speeches by Enver Hoxha", CPA(ML), Challenge Press, Melbourne, July 1970 (from ATA reports), pp5-7.

20. *ibid*, p15,19.
21. See "The first centenary of the Albanian League of Prizren - a marked event", Albania Today No 2, 1978. Also "The Work of Our Men of Renaissance Lives on and is honoured in New Socialist Albania" by Mehmet Shehu (June 11, 1978), 8 Nentori, 1978.
22. Kristo Frasherri, "The History of Albania"(A Brief Survey), Tirana 1964.
23. See "Chiao Kuan-hua's Address, May 20, 1975 (Full Text), Issues and Studies (Taiwan), December 1975.
24. The Socialist (Australia), August 23, 1978, p6.
25. *Op cit*, note 1, p57.
26. Enver Hoxha Selected Works I, p378-9.
27. *Ibid* p415. See also p490-1
28. *Ibid* p606-654. Also see "Oppose Modern Revisionism and Uphold Marxism-Leninism and the Unity of the International Communist Movement", Tirana, 1964, p9. Also Enver Hoxha, Speeches and Articles 1963-64, p376, 378, 385.
29. According to "Class Struggle"(English edition, Norwegian Communist Workers Party ML), September 1978, p12.
30. Selected Works of Mao Tsetung, Vol V, p304.
31. *Ibid*, p341.
- 32A. "Albanian Labor Party is 15 Years Old", Pravda, Nov 8, 1956, p3. Condensed translation in Current Digest of the Soviet Press.
- 32B. *Op cit* note 30, pp340-1.
33. See note 28. Also see Hoxha's speech at the meeting of 81 parties in Moscow on November 16, 1960. Contrary to the stories now being spread about Albania's firm stand and China's vacillation, this speech makes it quite clear that Albania, having initially been neutral, decided to agree with a stand the Chinese had been taking against Khrushchov since the 20th Congress, as a result of what happened in 1960.
- 34A. *Op cit* note 29, p15, tr from a transcript in German.
- 34B. Reference Material, item 25. Zeri i Popullit May 22, 1970.
35. Reference Material, item 23. Hysni Kapo September 17, 1976.
36. "7. Revisionism According to Zinoviet" in "On the Opposition", Peking FLP, 1974, p605. Also see "Lenin as the Organizer and Leader of the Russian Communist Party", Works Vol 4, p317-8.
37. "History of the Party of Labor of Albania", Tirana, 1971, p12- 13.
38. *Ibid*, p234. Also see "The Economic and Social Development of the PRA During Thirty Years of People's Power", 8 Nentori, 1974, p9,12,61, 181, 184, 187.
39. *Op cit* note 37 p232-3.
40. *Op cit* note 26, p814-817.
41. *Ibid* Vol II, p71.
42. The bourgeoisie always denies that it exists, even in Australia.
43. *Op cit* note 37, p237.
44. See "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat" by Karl Kautsky, Ann Arbor Paperbacks. ISBN 0-472-06096-1, and see Lenin's refutation in "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky". The way even friendly criticism of Stalin, Mao and the "gang of four" can slip into Kautskyism can be seen by comparing these books with some of Charles Bettelheim's remarks about "democracy" in "China Since Mao", Monthly Review Press, 1978.
- 45.. "Developments in China" ed. Sladkovsky, USSR Academy of Sciences, Institute of Far Eastern Studies, Progress Publishers, Moscow 1968, p14.
46. Reference Material, item 26, September 18, 1970.
47. ~~xxxx~~ 67% of investment in construction completed, 74% of equipment delivered.
48. Reference Material, item 24, April 29, 1976.