

RED



FLAG

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (MARKIST-LENINIST)

Volume I, Number 3

May-June 1966

CONTENTS

C.P.N.Z. National President Mourned.....Page 2

Reply From C.P.N.Z.....Page 2

The Revisionist Gus Hall Clique's "New Draft Program" is a Fraud.....Page 3

The Progressive Labor Party is a Conciliator of Modern Revisionism.....Page 7

The Trotskyites are Imperialist Agents.....Page 11

The Importance of Lin Biao's Article "Long Live the Victory of People's War!".....Page 13

WHERE TO BEGIN by V.I. Lenin.....Page 14

Lenin, Stalin, and the Communist Party of China on Trotsky and the Trotskyites.....Page 19

The Present Military Situation in Vietnam by General Vo Nguyen Giap.....Page 21

The National Question and Class Struggle by Liu Chun.....Page 24

The RED FLAG is published bi-monthly by the Communist Party of the United States of America (M.-L.). The articles appearing in the RED FLAG represent the views of the Party.

The RED FLAG is distributed by the Workers' International Book Store, 9122 So. Compton Ave., Los Angeles, California, 90002, U.S.A. Rates: Single copy \$1.00; Subscription: surface - \$6.00/year, air mail - \$12.00/year - anywhere in the world.

The Editorial Board of the RED FLAG encourages all Marxist-Leninists to send their manuscripts, comments, and correspondence to:

RED FLAG
c/o Workers' International Book Store
9122 So. Compton Avenue
Los Angeles, California, 90002

C.P.U.S.A. NATIONAL PRESIDENT JOURNED

The Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist) wishes to express the deepest sympathy on the death of Comrade Mervyn Williams of the C.P.U.S.A. His death is a loss to the revolutionary fighters for Marxism-Leninism. His contributions to the struggle for Marxism-Leninism and against imperialism and modern revisionism shall not be forgotten.

Signed,
M. I. Laski,
For the Central
Committee,
C.P.U.S.A. (M-L)

REPLY FROM C.P.U.S.A.

Dear Comrades,

Please accept the thanks of our Party for your kind message of condolence on the death of our late President, Comrade M.H. Williams.

Your message has been published in our Party press along with tributes from other countries.

With comradely greeting,
Yours fraternally,
V.G. Wilcox
General Secretary

The Draft Program of the revisionist Hall clique is an opportunist doctrine of the first order. In one nebulous statement after another they distort facts and revise Marxism to suit the dictates of the bourgeoisie. The document was written in the finest tradition of renegades from Marxism-Leninism. The Hall clique ranks high among the revisionists, Kautskys, Trotskys, Browders, Tros, and Khrushchevite revisionists. As was stated by Jacques Grippa, "the essence of modern revisionism is the same as that of reformism and classical revisionism: that is, it is the theory and practice of class collaboration." ("Theory" and Practice of the Modern Revisionists, J. Grippa, p. 3).

The Draft Program has nothing to do with the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Instead it denounces the objectives of the proletariat and the proletarian revolution. It is a document written in the interest of class collaboration to cover and apologize for U.S. imperialism.

How do the revisionists see their role? They see their role as being merely one of many groups on the "Left", covering up for their open betrayal of the interests of the proletariat. By fighting for "democracy" and speaking on public "platforms" they feel that they are fulfilling their role. And indeed they are!

What is the role of the Gus Hall clique? Their role is that of "Left" apologists for U.S. monopoly capital. In this task they are aided by the social-democrats of Norman Thomas, the various Trotskyite groups and the Progressive Labor Party. The "Left" coalition is the vehicle for their collaboration. In their own words, the revisionists state, "We strive, therefore, for unity on the Left as a manifest condition for the realization of its political potential in the community at large. In sum, we seek to make diversity most fruitful and unity most effective." (Draft, p. 112).

Translated into English, that means that not only have the modern revisionists exceeded the social-democrats and Trotskyites in their traitorousness to the proletariat but further that the revisionists are announcing publicly their open collaboration.

The Gus Hall clique does not raise the question of the class needs of the proletariat or the question of the revolutionary Party of the proletariat. They have deliberately omitted this because they are no longer concerned with these questions, not even superficially. They have been collaborating with the bourgeoisie for over 20 years. Commenting upon the revisionists, the Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) states, "...a revisionist tendency within the Party... came to be developed under Browder and finally, in 1944 proceeded to liquidate the Communist Party in the U.S.A., to appease the bourgeoisie. In 1945, the Communist Party was reconstituted in name only. The period... saw the full implementation of a revisionist theory and practice within the Party. Under this situation it degenerated into a social-democratic party defaulting in its historical role as that of the vanguard party of the working class... Under the general leadership of William Z. Foster, the conciliators of revisionism within the Party fought to secure a false "unity" with the open revisionists... to expel the Marxist-Leninists from the Party." (PEOPLE'S VOICE, September 27-October 4, 1965).

The Gus Hall clique has given up the proletariat for some nebulous "people's party" that is based on a hypothetical realignment

of liberals and social-democrats. Can anything be more absurd? They justify their stand by saying, "We are for the maximum political struggle possible within the present two-party vise, but is the creation of a new people's party, whether this party, virtually upon birth, becomes one of two major parties or is a third party or is one among several will be determined by history and is not, at the moment, the important thing." (Draft, p. 77).

This is the American application of the Khrushchevite revisionist line of "mass party of socialist" - the instrument of all classes for the American "peaceful transition to socialism"! This position is essentially the same as the "American exceptionalist" position of Jay Lovestone and the "democratic persuasion" theory of Earl Browder. (See - The Road to Victory, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1941, p. 22). In fact, the Gus Hall clique is the continuator of the revisionist tradition of Jay Lovestone, Earl Browder, William Z. Foster and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn.

Presently, the Gus Hall clique even collaborates openly with U.S. Imperialism. A clear example of this point is the visit of revisionist "theoretician" Herbert Aptheker and "new letters" Staughton Lynd and Tom Hayden to Hanoi to persuade the Vietnamese leaders to accept the U.S. Government's "unconditional negotiations" hook.

The Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) points out that the revisionists are the social prop of imperialism and that revisionism must be combated and defeated along with its source, imperialism. Further, the Communist Party U.S.A. (M.-L.) -- in contrast to the revisionists -- sees its historic role as "...the building of the Party so that it may lead the working class in the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist construction in the U.S.A." (PEOPLE'S VOICE, Op. Cit.).

The comparison is clear. The revisionists see their role as falling after the bourgeoisie, while the Marxist-Leninists see their role as leading the proletariat in revolution.

RHIVISIONIST C.P. - PACE OR VIOLENCE?

The basic question is the question of bourgeois state apparatus. The revisionists have historically obscured this question by calling for "peaceful transition to socialism". The bourgeois state apparatus is the armed instrument of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat. The state apparatus includes the courts, the police and the standing army.

The revisionists conceal the relationship by claiming that U.S. Imperialists, who have over 300,000 troops in Vietnam to fight against a socialist revolution, will yield state power "voluntarily" and "peacefully" in the U.S.A. The Gus Hall clique is merely apologizing for the bourgeoisie!

Here are the words of the Gus Hall clique on this question, "We believe this democratic transformation can be effected through the Constitutional process and Constitutionally established institutions. The Constitution contains within its own provisions, especially those for its amendment, the flexibility that allows for a democratic majority to make the most fundamental alterations in the economic and social order and in the Constitution itself. One would abolish the capitalist form of property..." (Draft, p. 97).

Only a vote is needed and then instant socialist! Never you mind about the bourgeois state apparatus; it will become socialist; it is above classes!

The "New Program" reveals their total betrayal of the interests

of the proletariat. Instead of pointing out the necessity for the proletariat to organize for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the revisionists call for faith in the bourgeois state. They even claim that it can be changed by "constitutional" means to a "socialist" society.

Referring to the early revisionists, V.I. Lenin stated: "In general, it may be said that evasiveness over the question of the relation of the proletarian revolution to the state -- an evasiveness which benefited and fostered opportunism -- resulted in the distortion of Marxism and in its complete vulgarization." (V.I. Lenin, STATE AND REVOLUTION, p. 93). Further: "The point at issue is neither opposition nor political struggle in general, but revolution. Revolution consists in the proletariat destroying the administrative apparatus, and the whole state machine, replacing it by a new one, made up of armed workers." (Ibid., p. 105). The Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) has pointed out that the theory of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and the question of whether or not to make revolution have always been the "dividing line between Marxist-Leninists and revisionists." (PEOPLE'S VOICE, September 27-October 4, 1965). Not even the slick words of the revisionists can cover over the existing class relationships. The Gus Hall clique's anti-working class line of "peaceful transition" will be rejected by the proletariat.

ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The revisionists take the position that "...the prevention of nuclear war is the supreme challenge now before mankind." (Draft, p. 91). They see nuclear weapons as negating the class struggle. They have capitulated and have become the worst of the apologists for U.S. imperialism.

Their position has been refuted by the history of the past 20 years since the emergence of nuclear weapons: during this period the oppressed nations subject to imperialist aggression have risen in people's wars of liberation. U.S. imperialism uses its "nuclear blackmail" to threaten all revolutionary forces. The revolutionary forces, led by the Communist Party of China, have called the bluff of U.S. imperialism and has broken the "nuclear blackmail". The revisionists, on the other hand, are the scared accomplices of U.S. imperialism. They have exposed themselves by their complete support of U.S. imperialism's policy of "nuclear blackmail".

BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY OR PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY?

The program of the renegade Hall clique has as its main theme praise of bourgeois democracy. Democratic self-government is so deeply rooted that "...social change of such magnitude (transition from capitalism to socialism - ed.) can be consummated only through the truly democratic release of the energy and creative capacity vested in the rank and file." (DRAFT, p. 97). They further state that, "We believe that this democratic transformation can be effected through the constitutional process..." The Hall clique, not satisfied with bootlicking, goes one step further in praise of the bourgeoisie by quoting the American Declaration of Independence -- a document of the bourgeoisie -- which, according to the Hall clique, will give the proletariat the "right" to wage revolution (by vote), overthrow the bourgeoisie and administer the "...government of the working people and its allies".

The Hall clique conventionally negates the class nature of democracy and refers to it abstractly as being above class and without class interest. As Lenin stated: "It is natural for a liberal to speak of 'Democracy' in general; but a Marxist will never forget to

ask 'for what class?' (THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE RENE- GADE KAUTSKY, p. 18). Further, "...It is obvious that we cannot speak of 'pure democracy' so long as different classes exist; we can only speak of class democracy." (Ibid., p. 30).

The revisionist Hall clique makes no distinctions, no references to the relationship of class interest to democracy. Bourgeois democracy exists only for the rich and is based on their ability to maintain their rule over the labouring masses. Has the Hall clique forgotten that the reason for the state is for one class to oppress another in its interests and that democracy is one form of that rule - democratic for the class in power? Proletarian democracy can only exist under the dictatorship of the proletariat, not under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. "...Hence, only a reactionary, an enemy of the working class, a henchman of the bourgeoisie, can turn his face to the obsolete past, paint the charms of bourgeois democracy and babble about pure democracy. Bourgeois democracy was progressive compared with medievalism, and it was necessary to utilize it. But now it is not sufficient for the working class. Now we must look, not backwards, but forward - to replacing bourgeois democracy by proletarian democracy." (Ibid., p. 64).

In their attempt to cover for the "liberal" bourgeoisie, the Hall clique invents the "Ultra Right" as "...a potent pressure group for more reckless aggression abroad, more stringent reaction at home" which "...would nullify or adulterate the major democratic, social and economic gains of the American people." (Draft, p. 34). We state simply that the rise of fascism in the U.S. is a result of monopoly capital as represented by the "liberal" Johnson administration's inability to resolve its inherent contradictions. It is the reactionary, racist Johnson administration which is carrying out atrocities against the working class (such as the mass murder in the Watts district of Los Angeles in August, 1965) and is carrying out fascist war policies against the people of Vietnam and Laos. The "liberal" imperialist does not need the "ultra right". It can take care of its own dirty work.

THE MODERN REVISIONISTS ARE DOOMED

Modern revisionists will be defeated just as their predecessors were. The Marxist-Leninists must isolate the revisionists as bourgeois agents within the working class who serve the imperialists, not the proletariat. The class collaboration of the renegade Hall clique must be exposed, while at the same time the struggle against U.S. imperialism must go on. The class enemy of the proletariat will be defeated and so will their flunkies - the modern revisionists.

THE PROGRESSIVE LABOR PARTY IS A CONCILIATOR
OF MODERN REVISIONISM

There is presently some confusion concerning the Progressive Labor Party. We aim to clear up this confusion and show that the P.L.P. is not a party of the proletariat. It is in fact a party of the radical petty bourgeoisie and the aristocracy of labor. Not only will we show the class outlook of P.L.P. but also expose P.L.P.'s opportunist position on questions affecting the American workers today: on nationalism, on the trade union question and on the students. Further, we will prove that the P.L.P. is an open conciliator of the revisionist C.P.

On the Negro question, P.L.P. refuses to recognize the national-colonial question as essentially a class question: this is the key to understanding the Marxist-Leninist approach to the Negro question. The Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) points out that the Negro nation in the South is a direct colony of U.S. imperialism. What constitutes a nation? A nation is "a historically evolved, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and a common culture" (J.V. Stalin, MARXISM AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION, p. 16). The Negro nation in the South meets these qualifications. The Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) stands for the right of self-determination for the Negro nation.

P.L.P. refuses to recognize the Negro nation as a direct colony of U.S. imperialism. Rather, P.L.P. speaks of dozens of Negro "colonies" in all the northern cities (e.g. Watts, Harlem, etc.) thus distorting the question of the Negro nation. How can P.L.P. speak of "colonies" without regard to the fact that colonies are oppressed nations? There is one Negro nation - not many Negro nations - in the U.S., and it is located in the South.

P.L.P. refuses to see the Negro workers in the American nation as an integral part of the American working class. It refuses to use class as the basis of its analysis. It uses only color, thus serving the dictates of U.S. imperialism's racist ideology. P.L.P. takes the stand that "whites work with whites" and "blacks work with blacks", divorcing the Negro workers from the proletariat. This position is a refusal to advance the interests of the proletariat and is a complete betrayal of proletarian internationalism. This is tailism - khvostism - in its most obvious form, falling after the bourgeoisie nationalists.

P.L.P. has consistently taken up bourgeois nationalist ideology as the basis of its political line as do the Trotskyites. P.L.P. even practices bundling or federalism and divides its organization by color: it has "black" clubs and "white" clubs and even "black" and "white" Vice Presidents as regular posts. Further, P.L.P.'s position on the Harlem rioting and on the Watts uprising serve to reveal P.L.P.'s falling position.

What position did P.L.P. take in Harlem? After the spontaneous developments, the P.L.P. issued leaflets explaining how to make a "Molotov Cocktail". What political position did P.L.P. take? P.L.P. issued a call for terror divorced from any political program. After the situation in Harlem was over, P.L.P. then called for "black cops, black firemen and black judges". Here is a perfect example of the successive use of adventurist and reformist positions which is a specific feature of P.L.P.'s petty bourgeois class outlook. First came a call for terror, then a call for reform - in each case as an end in itself and completely divorced from any consistent agitational political program in the interests of the proletariat.

P.L.P. merely talked after the spontaneity of the masses. The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) points out that the use of terror in itself or reform in itself is meaningless. These tactics have meaning only when employed as part of a consistent agitational, political program employing both legal and illegal means of struggle.

P.L.P.'s "rip-tap" action is similar to the action of the Russian petty bourgeois "economists" and "terrorists".

V.I. Lenin stated, "The economists and the terrorists merely bow to different poles of spontaneity: the economists bow to the spontaneity of the 'pure and simple' labor movement while the terrorists bow to the spontaneity of the passionate indignation of the intellectuals who are either incapable of linking up the revolutionary struggle with the labor movement or lack the opportunity to do so. It is very difficult indeed for those who have lost their belief or who have never believed that this was possible, to find some outlet for their indignation and revolutionary energy than terror." (V.I. Lenin, WHAT IS TO BE DONE, p. 73).

Further, Lenin pointed out that "calls for terror and calls to give the economic struggle itself a political character are merely two different forms of EVADING the most pressing duty that now rests upon Russian revolutionaries (American revolutionaries, too - Ed.) namely, to organize an all-sided political agitation." (Ibid., p. 75).

Four days after the Harlem riots, P.L.P. staged a side-show performance. Bill Epton appeared at a demonstration and was arrested and charged with "unlawful assembly". Along with him was his attorney, Conrad Lynn, of the Trotskyite S.W.P. The charge was later changed to "criminal anarchy" when the ruling class saw fit to build up the Progressive Labor Movement as the "new Communist" alternative. The publicity of U.S. imperialism made Bill Epton and P.L.P. a cause celebre among anti-imperialist forces, much as the ruling class had intended it! The imperialists have picked a sham enemy - the P.L.P. - to confuse the anti-imperialist forces internationally. P.L.P.'s lack of a consistent political program and its falling of the spontaneity of the masses place it in a position to be used by the imperialists as the imperialists see fit, since P.L.P. constitutes no threat to the U.S. government!

Concerning the Watts uprising, P.L.P.'s analysis by their "expert" Bill Mcadoo came to the conclusion that the "black people in the South Los Angeles ghetto will shut down the factories, stop production and demand eighty percent of the industrial jobs" (CHALLENGE, April 19, 1966). P.L.P. also made a general call to "arrest the Nazi Police Chief Parker, Governor Brown and Mayor Jorty and bring them to trial for murder". (PROGRESSIVE LABOR, October, 1965).

Compare P.L.P.'s opportunist analysis of the Watts uprising to the Marxist-Leninist analysis by the PEOPLE'S VOICE (Los Angeles) and by the PEOPLE'S DAILY (Beijing). The PEOPLE'S VOICE stated on August 23, 1965, "The Los Angeles uprising is a heroic expression of the working class and of its most exploited and oppressed section, the Negro and Mexican American workers who rose together to strike at their immediate enemies - the imperialist state and its instrument, the police." The PEOPLE'S DAILY stated, "as Chairman Mao Use-tung pointed out: 'In the final analysis, a national struggle is a question of class struggle'."

P.L.P. is incapable of using class as the basis of its analysis of a working class uprising. P.L.P. is too busy falling after the nationalists to notice class as a factor. P.L.P.'s petty bourgeois class outlook is revealed in such actions. It is in the interest of the petty bourgeois to obscure the class question - especially when the nationalists are involved!

On the trade union question, P.L.P. similarly takes an opportunist position. It falls the "left" labor bureaucrats. It takes the revisionists' "lesser evil" theory and applies it in the same manner as does the Gus Hall clique. It sides with Jimmy Hoffa and Harry Bridges in their sham battle with George Meany. The P.L.P. covers up for the fact that all these class traitors are part of U.S. imperialism's labor front. Further, P.L.P. uses its protestations of support for these "left" labor frontiers as an excuse for not conducting any work in organizing rank and file committees in the unions.

The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) position is to organize rank and file committees to oppose the labor front. The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) states that on certain occasions it would support "left" labor frontiers in order to expose their class collaborationist to the rank and file and to expose them as traitors to the working class, to "support" them "in the same way as the rope supports the hanged man" (V.I. Lenin, "LEFT-WING" COMMUNISM, p. 69).

Regarding the students, P.L.P. has been a party of students ever since its inception. P.L.P. concentrates on the college campuses, not among the proletariat. In the San Francisco area, P.L.P. concentrates upon the University of California at Berkeley; in the New York area, P.L.P. concentrates upon New York University, Columbia University and City College of New York.

The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) is not opposed to students as such, but it is opposed to talking after the students - as exhibited by the P.L.P. The C.P.U.S.A. (M.-L.) takes the position of winning those interested students to the side of the proletariat and of concretely involving them in the agitation and organizing among the proletariat.

On the question of the building of the proletarian party, P.L.P. has remained silent in the four and one half years of its existence as the P.L.M. and the P.L.P. But judging from P.L.P.'s practice, we observe the following on P.L.P.'s approach: that P.L.P. is organized along bourgeois federated lines NOT along centralized lines; that P.L.P. sees no need for a party organized along Leninist lines; that P.L.P. is not interested in advancing the interests of the proletariat but seeks only to follow the spontaneity of the struggle. Similarly, P.L.P. has said nothing about the building of the united front against U.S. imperialism. In practice, P.L.P. enters into relations with the nationalists (e.g. the Organization for Afro-American Unity and the Trotskyite Freedom Now Party) and takes the lead from the nationalists.

P.L.P. has similarly maintained regular collaboration with the revisionists and the Trotskyites - specifically with the Socialist Workers Party, Workers World Party and its Youth Against War and Fascism, during all this time, refused to expose the American revisionists or the Trotskyites. Their open collaboration in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and their collaboration in the Vietnam Day Committee are cases in point.

P.L.P. is a conciliator of revisionists. Its opportunist position is one that allows it to fall at the same time the nationalists, the labor frontiers, the students and the revisionists. P.L.P. uses its claims of support for certain anti-imperialist struggles to cover up for its consistent refusal to expose American revisionists. P.L.P.'s "pro-China", "pro-Cuba" and "pro-Vietnam" labels are aimed to confuse honest revolutionary forces and to hide P.L.P.'s conciliatorist position. P.L.P.'s consistent refusal to expose revisionism, either American or Cuban, is the exact opposite of the position taken by the Communist Party of China: the Chinese comrades have undertaken energetically to expose revisionism of all kinds.

Simply stated, P.L.P. has refused to expose revisionists in order not to expose their own conciliationism. Their own position of indifference to principled struggle reveals their petty bourgeois outlook on the socialist movement.

CHALLENGE, April 19, 1966

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE

"Revolutionary Literature from Around the World"

Periodicals

CHINA PICTORIAL - monthly	\$.50
BEIJING REVIEW - weekly	\$.30
WOMEN OF CHINA - monthly	\$.30
VIETNAM COURIER - weekly	\$.50
PEOPLE'S VOICE (U.S.A.) - bi-weekly	\$.30
PEOPLE'S VOICE (New Zealand) - weekly	\$.20
RED FLAG (U.S.A.) - bi-monthly	\$.30

Books

SELECTED WORKS OF MAO TSE-TUNG, Vol. I through IV... each	\$2.50
HOW TO BE A GOOD COMMUNIST by Liu Shao-chi.....	\$.50
DINH BIEN PHU by Vo Nguyen Giap.....	\$.50
THE FACTS ABOUT SOVIET-ALBANIAN RELATIONS.....	\$.00
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.....	1.00
FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM by J.V. Stalin.....	1.50
STATE AND REVOLUTION by V.I. Lenin.....	1.60

Price/copy/postpaid

This is only a sample list. Please write for catalog.

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE
9122 So. Compton Avenue, Los Angeles, California, 90002, U.S.A.

Read the PEOPLE'S VOICE
The voice of all the oppressed and exploited.

The PEOPLE'S VOICE is the political organ of the Party of the proletariat; the voice of all the oppressed and exploited people in the U.S.A. today - daring to speak the truth.

Published bi-weekly by the Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist)

Subscription rates: Surface mail \$ 5.00/year
Air mail \$10.00/year

If you are interested in the PEOPLE'S VOICE, anywhere in the world please write:

PEOPLE'S VOICE
c/o Workers' International Book Store
9122 So. Compton Avenue
Los Angeles, California, 90002, U.S.A.

The question of Leon Trotsky's conciliatorism and his anti-working class line is a settled question. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the 1920's saw the error of Trotsky's position and rejected him outright. Today, his followers are around in hopes of misleading the Communist and workers' movement.

The Trotskyites are enjoying a new lease on life because the modern revisionists, especially Tito, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Kosygin and Gus Hall have given them a new status and publicity as a "leftist" tendency. The class needs of U.S. imperialism and the servility of modern revisionism and Trotskyism to U.S. imperialism have served as the basis for revisionist-Trotskyite collaboration.

As the Communist Party of China has described the situation, "The frantic campaign against Stalin by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. enabled the Trotskyites, who had long been political corpses, to come to life again and clamor for the 'rehabilitation' of Trotsky." (THE BOMBIC ON THE GENERAL LINE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, p. 130).

Presently, we are going to show (1) how Trotsky and his followers changed from a trend within the working class to a group of agents of imperialism, and (2) the political bankruptcy of the Trotskyite groups in the U.S.A. today.

Trotsky, in the period before the October Revolution of 1917, took a "consistent" position of conciliatorism between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. He stated, "Neither Menshevik nor Bolshevik but revolutionary," as a justification for his position of apologizing for the Mensheviks. Such a position is called a "conciliationist" or "centrist" position - taking an approach "in between" correct and incorrect so as to maintain "good will" with both sides while serving the incorrect side.

J.V. Stalin, in commenting on Trotsky's activity in the pre-revolutionary period, stated, "...Leninism was born and became strong in relentless struggle against opportunism of every brand, including Centerism in the West (Kautsky) and Centerism in our country (Trotsky, etc.)." (J.V. Stalin, WORKS, Vol. 13, p. 87). It was only through principled struggle against Trotsky's centrist position that the Bolsheviks were able to build their Party under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. Trotsky's political position changed from an opportunist trend within the working class (composed of the least stable elements - aristocracy of labor, petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia) to a group of agents for imperialism.

During the 1920's, Trotsky had continually opposed the leadership of the C.P.S.U. In 1928, he was expelled for factional activities against the C.P.S.U. Trotsky formed the so-called "Fourth International" in 1933 with the purpose of destroying the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.S.U. though still calling his gang "socialist". At this point in history, Trotsky and his followers changed from mere opportunists to actual agents of imperialism, dedicated to the liquidation of the Communist and workers' movement throughout the world.

In 1937, J.V. Stalin characterized the Trotskyites as follows: "Present-day Trotskyism is not a political trend within the working class, but a gang without principle, without ideas, of wreckers, diversions, intelligence service agents, spies, murderers, a gang of sworn enemies of the working class, working in the pay of the intelligence services of foreign states. Such is the indisputable result of the evolution of Trotskyism in the past seven or eight years. Such is the difference between Trotskyism in the past

and Trotskyism at the present time. (J.V. Stalin, MASTERING BOLSHEVISM, p. 17).

The situation of the Trotskyites has remained the same since then. The Trotskyites have been known for their position of falling all nationalists, revisionists and other bourgeois-oriented groups, in opposition to the Marxist-Leninists. Internationally, they have called Tito, Fidel Castro, Ambed Ben Bella and are presently inter-twined with the modern revisionists.

When the United States, there are three Trotskyite groups: the Socialist Workers Party, the Workers World Party and the Spartacists. The oldest and largest of these groups is the Socialist Workers Party. It was founded in 1937 with the personal blessing of Trotsky. Its main area of work is the college campus, using its youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance.

What is the S.W.P.'s political program? It has none! It simply wants to fall after all spontaneous movements that arise. It makes a fetish of struggle for struggle's sake. It has also set up its own "black nationalist" party, the so-called "Freedom Now Party" - for all practical purposes a defunct group.

The S.W.P. has been in close collaboration with the Gus Hall clique of the revisionist C.P. for the last decade. The Gus Hall clique declared the S.W.P. a legitimate socialist group (PEOPLE'S WORLD, May 21, 1966, p. 12); now the two are seen together publicly with the Progressive Labor Party, a new variety of conciliatorism (which openly collaborates with the revisionists and the Trotskyites). In the Fair Play For Cuba Committee, which was their joint effort, and now in the Vietnam Day Committee, and the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the S.W.P. and the P.L.P. play the part of the "principled left" while the Gus Hall clique plays the part of the "liberals". This is the revisionist-Trotskyite "new left" hoax.

The other two Trotskyite groups - the Workers World Party and the Spartacists - are off-shoots of the S.W.P.. The Workers World Party split from the S.W.P. over the question of the People's Republic of China; the W.W.P. call themselves "pro-China" so as to decoy the anti-revisionist forces. The W.W.P. claims that the S.W.P. has betrayed "Trotskyism" and that they are the "true" Trotskyites. The W.W.P. also tells the "black" nationalists as well as Castro and Ben Bella. They have set up a " Militant" youth group, "Youth Against War and Fascism" as a further means of containing and liquidating the struggle against U.S. Imperialism's wars of aggression.

The Spartacists split from the S.W.P. in 1964 over the question of "support" for Castro. The Spartacists also claim to be the "true" Trotskyites: they criticize the other two Trotskyite groups for supporting the "Stalinist" (sic) Fidel Castro. ("Spartacist", Nov.-Dec., 1965). They are fighting for the "purity" of Trotskyite politics, daring to criticize the "Stalinists" all over the world. The Spartacists are the height of assaninity: a room full of fools calling for the "purity" of the Trotskyites.

The Spartacists also collaborate regularly with the "Stalinist" (sic) Gus Hall clique, the S.W.P., the P.L.P., and the W.W.P. All the Trotskyites follow the same "principle" - liquidate the struggle. None of the Trotskyites have a program or a principled position with which to approach the proletariat. They have nothing to offer to the proletariat except treachery!

Last September, in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the War of Resistance against Japan, Lin Piao, Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Vice-Premier and Minister of National Defense of the People's Republic of China, wrote the article "Long Live the Victory of People's War!" (one section of that document was reprinted in the previous issue of the RED FLAG). This article drew the basic lessons of the Chinese people's War of Resistance against Japan and pointed out their application in the world today. The article presented a basic evaluation of the present situation internationally and dealt with the prospects for revolution, especially in the colonies and semi-colonies in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Basic to the entire document is the role of the Party of the proletariat, which he properly shows as the leading force in the united front and in the revolution. This is most important because without the leadership of the Party, the struggle would then be at the mercy of the bourgeois nationalists who seek accommodation with imperialism. The proletariat is the most decisive class in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, and it was only through the leadership of the Communist Party of China that the Chinese people were able to defeat the Japanese aggressors and likewise to defeat Chiang Kai-shek, the representative of U.S. imperialism.

The article points out people's war as the correct approach to the question of national liberation, and to the question of proletarian revolution. Only by relying upon the people and forming a people's army of the new type to fight against the class enemy, can the Party effectively organize the people for revolution. Lin Piao points out Mao Tse-tung's contributions on these most important questions: on "new" democracy, on people's war, and on the role of the Party. Further, this article points out the bankruptcy of the Khrushchevite revisionists' position on this question. The revisionists fear people's war and collaborate openly with U.S. imperialism in fighting against people's war. They say that if the people persist in revolution, then U.S. imperialism will unleash nuclear warfare and destroy the world. The Khrushchevite revisionists expose their own traitorousness to the proletariat. Lin Piao was correct in pointing out that the revisionists are betrayers of people's war. This point is even more evident today in light of the fact that the Soviet leaders are collaborating openly with U.S. imperialism against the Vietnamese people and have also joined in denouncing Lin Piao's article as "unrealistic" and have heaped other slanders upon the article.

The U.S. imperialists have seen fit to attack this article more than any other writings in the past few years. U.S. Secretary of Defense McNamara called this article "China's MEIN KAMPF" in testimony before the U.S. Senate's Foreign Relations Committee; other imperialist spokesmen, including the revisionist Gus Hall clique, have called it "megalomaniacal", "madness", and other adjectives to show their contempt for this document. The imperialists and their running dogs are scared of the revolutionary content of the article, and so they see fit to denounce it.

The Marxist-Leninists, on the other hand, support this document wholeheartedly because it shows clearly the direction for the proletariat and its Party - toward proletarian revolution!

We are reprinting V.I. Lenin's article entitled "Where to Begin?" because of its relevance to the political situation in the U.S.A. today. The political and organizational conclusions drawn about the role of the Party newspaper as a collective organizer are of special importance.

The question: "what is to be done?" has confronted Russian Social Democrats with particular insistence during recent years. The point is not about a choice of ways (as was the case at the end of the 80's and the beginning of the 90's), but of the practical steps that must be taken, and how to take them, in a definite direction. The point is about a system and a plan of practical work. And it must be admitted that this fundamental question for the character and methods of struggle has not yet been solved by us and is still giving rise to serious differences, disclosing lamentable instability and vacillation. On the one hand, the "Economists" trend, far from being dead, is endeavouring to curtail and narrow the work of political organization and agitation. On the other hand, the unprincipled eclectic trend, as of yore proudly relating its head and ingratiating itself with the latest "trend", is incapable of distinguishing between questions of the moment and the main task and permanent needs of the movement as a whole. As is known, this trend has ensconced itself in RABOCHYE DYLO. Its latest "programme" statement - a pompous article with the flamboyant headline "An Historical Turn" (Listok Rabocheye Dyelo, No. 6.) - bears out with particular emphasis our characterization of this trend. Only yesterday we flitted with "Economism", were furious over the resolute condemnation of RABOCHYE DYLO, "toned down" the Plekhanov conception of the struggle against the autocracy - and today we quote the words of Liebknecht, "If the circumstances change in 24 hours, then the tactics must be changed in 24 hours," we have already spoken about a "strong fighting organization" for direct attack, for storming the autocracy, about conducting "broad" revolutionary political (and how energetic now; and revolutionary and political) agitation among the masses, about "ceaseless calls for public protests," about "holding street demonstrations of a pronounced (sic) political character," and so on and so on.

We could, perhaps, express satisfaction at the way in which RABOCHYE DYLO has so quickly taken over the programme advanced by us in the very first issue of ISKRA, calling for the creation of a well-organized party with the goal not only of winning isolated concessions but of storming the fortress of autocracy itself, but the absence of any firm point of view on the part of those who have taken it over is capable of completely spoiling our satisfaction. The agitation tactics in relation to a particular question or the tactics with regard to some detail of party organization can be changed in twenty-four hours, but only people devoid of all principles are capable of changing their views in twenty-four hours or for that matter in twenty-four months as to whether in general it is always and absolutely necessary to have a militant organization and mass political agitation at all. It is ridiculous to plead different circumstances and changed periods: the building of a militant organization and engaging in political agitation are obligatory in all

kinds of "drab", "peaceful" circumstances, in all periods of "dec- line of the revolutionary spirit"; what is more, it is precisely in such circumstances and in such periods that work of this kind is especially necessary, since at moments of explosions and outbreaks it is already too late to form the organization; it must be in a state of preparedness, ready to launch activity at a moment's notice. "Change tactics in twenty-four hours!" But in order to change tac- tics it is necessary first of all to have tactics, and without a strong organization tested in political struggle conducted in cir- cumstances of all kinds and in all periods, there can be no talk of a systematic plan of activity illumined by firm principles and stead- fastly carried out, which alone is worthy of being called tactics. Let us look at the matter; we are told that the "historical moment" confronts our party with a "completely new" question - that of terror. Yesterday the "completely new" question was that of political organization and agitation, today it is terror. Is it not strange to hear these people, who have such a poor recollection of the kinship, discussing a radical change in tactics? Fortunately, BABOCHAYE DYELO is not right. The question of terror is far from being a new question, and it will suffice to dwell briefly on the views of the Russian Social-Democrats on this question. In principle we have never rejected and cannot reject terror. Terror is a form of military action which may be perfectly suitable and even necessary at a given moment of the fighting, depending on that state of the troops and on the particular circumstances. But the essence of the matter is that at the present time terror is advanced not as the operation of an army active in the field, closely linked and interwoven with the entire system of struggle, but as an independent form of individual attack unrelated to any army. And without a central body and in view of the weakness of the local revolutionary organizations terror cannot be anything else. That is why we have resolutely declared that in the present circumstances such a means of struggle is untimely, unsuitable, diverts the more active fighters from the actual tasks, which, from the standpoint of the interests of the movement as a whole, are more important, and disorganizes not the government, but the revolutionary forces. Re- call the recent events: before our eyes broad masses of the urban workers and "ordinary folk" rushed to the struggle, but the revolu- tionaries lacked a staff of leaders and organizers. Is this not fraught with the danger that in such circumstances the most energetic revolutionaries may go over to terror, and the combat detachments on which alone it is possible seriously to rely, be weakened? Is it not fraught with the danger of rupturing the contact between the revolutionary organizations and the dispersed masses who, discon- tented, protesting, and ready for the struggle, are weak precisely because they are dispersed? And is not this contact the sole guarantee of our success? Far be it from us to deny the signifi- cance of individual heroic blows, but it is our duty to utter the most serious warning against being diverted by terror, against seeing in it the chief and basic means of struggle - to which very many people are so strongly inclined at present. Terror can never be a regular feature of military action: at best it is suitable as simply one of the methods of the decisive assault. But can we issue the call for the decisive assault at the present moment? BABOCHAYE DYELO, apparently, thinks so. At any rate, it explains: "Line up in the shock troops". But this is a notion all over again, not reason. The main mass of our military forces consists of volunteers and rebels. We have only a few small units of permanent troops, and even these are not mobilized, are not linked with one another, and

have not been trained to line up in military columns in general, let alone form shock troops. In these circumstances it must be clear to anyone capable of observing the general conditions of our struggle - and individual of them at every "turn" in the historical development of events - that our slogan at the moment cannot be "forward to the assault," but should be, "lay regular siege to the enemy's fortress." In other words: the immediate task of our party is not to summon all our existing forces to the attack right now, but to call for the establishment of a revolutionary organization capable of uniting all the forces and of guiding the movement not only in name, but in practice, that is, an organization that will be ready at any time to support every protest and every outbreak and utilize them for the purpose of building up and reinforcing the military forces required for the decisive battle.

The lesson of the February and March events is so instructive that it is doubtful if anyone can be found now who would disagree in principle with that conclusion. But what is needed at the present time is not a solution of the problem in principle, but its practical solution. It is necessary that not only we ourselves be clear about the precise kind of organization needed, about the precise kind of work for which it is needed - it is necessary to work out a definite plan for an organization so that the building of it can be tackled from all sides. In view of the urgency and importance of the question, we on our part submit to the comrades the outlines of a plan which is developed in greater detail in a pamphlet now being prepared for publication.

In our opinion, the starting point of activities, the first practical step towards creating the organization desired, and finally, the main thread by following which we would be able steadily to develop, deepen and extend that organization, should be the establishment of a political newspaper on an all-Russian scale. What we need above all is a newspaper; without it we cannot systematically carry on that all-embracing propaganda and agitation, consistent in principle, which form the chief and constant task of Social-Democracy in general, and the particularly urgent task of the present moment, when interest in politics and in socialism has been aroused among the widest sections of the population. And never has the need been so great as it is now to reinforce the dispersed agitation carried on by individual action, local leaflets, pamphlets, etc., with the generalized and systematic agitation which can be carried on only by means of a periodical press. It will hardly be an exaggeration to say that the frequency and the regularity of printing (and circulating) a newspaper can be the most exact measure of the firmness with which we have based this paramount and most essential branch of our military activity. Further, we need long as we are unable, to combine our influence on the people and on the government by means of the printed word, it would be utopian to think in terms of combining other, more complex, difficult, but more decisive means of influence. Both in ideological and in the practical and organizational aspects our movement suffers most of all from its fragmentation, from the fact that the overwhelming majority of Social-Democrats are almost wholly immersed in local work, which narrows their outlook and the scale of their activity as well as their conspiratorial skill and preparedness. It is precisely in this dispersal that one must seek the deepest roots of the instability and vacillation mentioned earlier. And the first step towards getting rid of this shortcoming, along the path of

transforming the several local movements into a single all-Russian movement must be the launching of an all-Russian newspaper. Last-ly, what we need above all is a political newspaper. Without a po- litical newspaper a movement worthy of being called a political movement is unthinkable in present-day Europe. Without it our task- the task of concentrating all the elements of political discontent and protest, of enriching the revolutionary movement of the prole- tariat with them-absolutely cannot be fulfilled. We have taken the first step, we have awakened in the working class a passion for "economic" and factory exposure; now we must take the next step: a- rouse among all sections of the population possessing any degree of political consciousness a passion for political exposure. We must not be discouraged by the fact that at present the voice of politi- cal exposure is feeble, rare and timid. Certainly the reason for this is not a wholesale submission to the police despotism. The reason is that those who are able and ready to engage in this activ- ity have no tribune from which to speak, no audience of eager list- ners expressing approval of the speaker, they do not see anywhere among the people the forces worth turning to with complaints against the "omnipotent" Russian government. But all this is changing with amazing rapidity. Such a force exists in the revolutionary prole- tariat which has already demonstrated its readiness not only to listen and respond to the calls summoning it to political struggle, but boldly to plunge into the fray. We are now in a position, and it is our duty, to provide a tribune for nation-wide exposure of the tsarist government, and the tribune must be a Social-Democratic newspaper. The Russian working class, as distinct from the other classes and strata of Russian society, displays a diligent interest in acquiring political knowledge, and constantly demands (not mere- ly in periods of extraordinary ferment) enormous quantities of li- legal literature. Given this demand, given the experience already acquired by the revolutionary leaders and the concentration of the working class which, in fact, makes it predominant in the workers' quarters in the large towns and in factory settlements and commu- nities, the launching of a political newspaper is a perfectly feas- ible matter for the proletariat. And through the medium of the proletariat the newspaper will penetrate to the ranks of the urban petty bourgeoisie, rural artisans and peasants, and become a truly popular political newspaper.

The role of the newspaper is not limited, however, merely to the spreading of ideas, merely to political education and attract- ing political allies. A newspaper is not only a collective prop- agandist and collective agitator, but also a collective organizer. In this respect it can be compared to the scaffolding erected a- round a building in construction, which marks the contours of the structure, facilitates communication between the builders and per- mits them to distribute the work and to view the common results achieved by their organized labour. With the aid of and in connec- tion with a newspaper there will automatically develop a permanent organization that will engage not only in local but also in regu- lar general activities, training its members carefully to watch po- litical events, to appraise their significance and the influence they exercise upon various strata of the population, and to devise suitable means by which the revolutionary party could influence these events. The technical task alone - of ensuring a regular sup- ply of copy for the newspaper and its proper distribution - will make it necessary to create a network of local agents of the united party, agents who will be acquainted with the general state of af- fairs, get accustomed to carrying out regularly the detailed func- tions of all-Russian work and test their strength in the organ -

ization of various revolutionary actions. This network of agents will form the skeleton of precisely the organization we need. We must be able to carry out its work under all circumstances, at all "turns" and in all contingencies; sufficiently flexible to be able to avoid open battle against an enemy of overwhelming strength when he has concentrated all his forces at one spot, and yet able to take advantage of the unwieldiness of this enemy and to attack him when and where least expected. Today we may be faced with the relatively easy task of supporting the student demonstrations in the streets of the large cities; tomorrow we may have the more difficult task of supporting, say, the unemployed movement in a given area, and the day after we must be at our posts in order to take a revolutionary part in a peasant uprising. Today we take advantage of the tense political situation brought about by the government's campaign against the Zemsstve; tomorrow we support the popular indignation against the waddened tsarist bashi-bazouk and help, by means of boycott, hounding and manifestations, etc. to bring things home to him in such a way as to force him into open retreat. Such a degree of fighting preparedness can be developed only on the basis of constant activity by regular troops. And if we combine our forces for the purpose of producing a common newspaper, then such work will train and bring forward not only more skilled propagandists, but also more capable organizers, more talented political leaders of the party, capable of issuing at the right moment the call for the decisive battle and of leading it. In conclusion, a few words to avoid possible misunderstandings. We have spoken all the time only about systematic, planned preparation, but it has not been our intention to imply that the activity can fall solely as a result of regular siege or organized assault. Such a view would be absurd and doctrinaire. On the contrary, it is quite possible and historically much more probable that the autocracy will collapse under the pressure of one of those spontaneous explosions or unforeseen political complications constantly threatening from all sides. But not a single political party, if it wants to avoid falling into adventurism, can base its activity on the calculation of such explosions and complications. We must go our own way, steadfastly engage in systematic work, and the less we bank on the unexpected, the greater the likelihood that we shall not be caught napping by "an historical turn."

The lesson of Leon Trotsky's degeneration from opportunist to outright service for imperialism must be studied. This pattern has been followed by all stripes of renegades including Kautsky, Trotsky, Lovestone, Browder, Tito, Khrushchev and their followers. The situation with Trotsky and the Trotskyites took place over a thirty year period. The situation is documented in V. I. Lenin's works entitled "Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outlets for Unity", "The Trade Unions, the Present Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky", "The Party Crisis", and "Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Present Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin". The documentation continues in J.V. Stalin's works entitled "The Fourteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.)", "The Social-Democratic Deviation in Our Party", "Some Questions Concerning the History of Bolshevism", and "Mastering Bolshevism". Finally the collaboration between the Trotskyites and modern revisionists are fully exposed in the polemics issued by the Communist Party of China against the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, specifically the polemics entitled "On the question of Stalin", and "The Proletarian Revolution and Khrushchev's Revisionism". Selected excerpts follow from the above-mentioned works describing the traitorous actions of Trotsky, the Trotskyites, and the Khrushchevite revisionists.

I. V. I. Lenin Selected Works, Vol. IV

The old participants in the Marxian movement in Russia know Trotsky's personality very well, and it is not worth while talking to them about it. But the young generation of workers do not know him and we must speak of him, for he is typical of all the five groups abroad, which in fact are also vacillating between the liquidators and the Party.

During the period of the old ISRA (1901-03) these hangers who deserted from the "Economists" to the ISRA-ists and back again were dubbed "Tushino deserters," (Such was the name given during the "disturbed times" in old Russ to warriors deserting one camp for another). The "Tushino deserters" declare themselves to be above factions for the simple reason that they "borrow" ideas from one faction one day and from another faction another day. Trotsky was an ardent ISRA-ist in 1901-03, and Kyzanov described the part he played at the Congress of 1903 as that of "Lenin's trenchman." At the end of 1903 Trotsky was an ardent Henshchevnik, i.e., one who deserted the ISRA-ists for the "Economists"; he proclaimed that "there is a deep gulf between the old and the new ISRA." In 1904-05 he left the Henshchevniks and began to vacillate, at one moment collaborating with "Left" theory of "permanent revolution." . . . During the period of disintegration, after long "non-factional" vacillations, he again shifted to the Right, and in August 1912 entered into a bloc with the liquidators. Now he is again abandoning them, repeating, however, what in essence are their pet ideas. (p. 206-208)

II. J.V. Stalin Marxism and Revisionism

Some Bolsheviks think that Trotskyism is a faction of communism - one which makes mistakes, it is true, which does many foolish

things, is sometimes even anti-Soviet, but which, nevertheless, is a faction of communism. Hence, there is a somewhat liberal attitude towards the Trotskyites and Trotskyite-thinking people. It need hardly be proved that such a view of Trotskyism is profoundly wrong and pernicious. As a matter of fact, Trotskyism has long since ceased to be a faction of communism. As a matter of fact, Trotskyism is the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie which is fighting communism, fighting the Soviet Government, fighting the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

The gave the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie an ideological weapon against Bolshevism in the form of the thesis that it is impossible to build socialism in our country, in the form of the thesis that the degeneration of the Bolsheviks is inevitable, etc. ? Trotskyism gave it that weapon. It is no accident that in their attempts to prove the inevitability of the struggle against the Soviet Government all the anti-Soviet groups in the U.S.S.R. have been referring to the well-known thesis of Trotskyism that it is impossible to build socialism in our country, that the degeneration of the Soviet Government is inevitable, that the return to capitalism is probable. (p.62)

III. J.V. Stalin MASTERING BOLSHEVISM

In the past, seven or eight years ago, Trotskyism was one of such political trends in the working class, an anti-Leninist trend, it is true, and therefore profoundly mistaken, but nevertheless a political trend. (p. 15)

Present-day Trotskyism is not a political trend in the working class but a gang without principle, without ideas, of wreckers, diversions, intelligence service agents, spies, murderers, a gang of sworn enemies of the working class, working in the pay of the intelligence services of foreign states.

Such is the indisputable result of the evolution of Trotskyism in the past seven or eight years.

Such is the difference between Trotskyism in the past and Trotskyism at the present time. (p. 17)

IV. The Communist Party of China THE POLMIC ON THE GENERAL LINE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The frantic campaign against Stalin by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. enabled the Trotskyites, who had long been political corpses to come to life again and clamor for the "rehabilitation" of Trotsky. The Trotskyites made no secret of their joy, declaring that the anti-Stalin campaign started by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. had "opened the door for Trotskyism" and would "greatly help the advance of Trotskyism and its organization" - the Fourth International". (p. 130)

In fact, it is Khrushchev himself who has succeeded to the mantle of Trotskyism and who stands with the Trotskyites of today. Trotskyism manifests itself in different ways on different questions and often wears the mask of "ultra-Leninism", but its essence is opposition to revolution, repudiation of revolution. (p. 398)

Therefore, the only logical conclusion is that Khrushchev's revisionism is not only cut from the same cloth as Kautskism, but also converges with Trotskyism to oppose revolution. (p. 399)

The following item consists of excerpts from an article written by General Vo Nguyen Giap, Minister of Defense of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The item was featured in the VIETNAM COURIER of January 27, 1966. It gives an evaluation of the Vietnamese people's war against U.S. imperialism. We are reprinting this item because it shows the importance of people's war in the present era.

The U.S. imperialists are the international Gendarme, the top-most imperialists, with the most powerful economic and military potential of all the imperialists. By taking a direct part in the aggressive war they hope to rely on their material strength to overcome all difficulties in manpower and politics thereby to retrieve their predicament in the South. With a sizable expeditionary corps which is to be eventually increased they hope to give themselves new vantage grounds on the battle-field: first, to strengthen their military force in general, especially their strategic mobile force, thereby to tilt the balance of forces in their favor; second, to control important strategic areas and set up firm bases as springboards, to launch raids or attacks against the liberated areas; third, to build up their air force, develop their superiority in this arm to dominate our forces and to strike deep into the liberated areas.

Their scheme is to prevent the collapse of the puppet army and administration, to launch offensives aimed at wiping out the Southern revolutionary forces, to strive to consolidate the areas still under their control and gradually to carry out a pacification with key areas as, to attack the liberated areas and to wrest back some of the lost areas; to seek every means to encircle and isolate the Southern battle-field; meanwhile to intensify the war of destruction against the North and carry on their deceptive peace negotiations campaign.... The U.S. imperialists' design is very ambitious, their scheme is most perfidious, and their military and political maneuvers extremely cruel and cunning. However, beside their definite strong points in material strength the American imperialists have most fundamental weak points in political and military fields, in both strategy and tactics.

First of all, the U.S. imperialists are the enemy not only of the Vietnamese people but also of the progressive people throughout the world. In the present situation as the socialist camp is growing the national liberation movement surging, the workers' movement in the capitalist countries, the movement for peace and democracy developing, and as on the other hand the forces of imperialism are declining, the correlation of forces in the world shows that the American imperialists are not in a strong position but in a weak position, and have to scatter their forces to cope with attacks from all quarters. That is precisely why they cannot send to the South whatever number of troops they like without reckoning with their difficulties in every field in the world or even in the U.S.A. and on the Vietnam battle-field.

The dispatch of an expeditionary corps for a direct invasion of our country is itself afflicted with most fundamental weak points they cannot overcome.

Firstly, the sending of their troops directly to invade our country, exposes all the clearer the U.S. imperialists' true colours as aggressors and their lackeys' as traitors, whereby the contradiction between the American imperialists and our nation becomes all the sharper and fiercer.

Second, due to U.S. imperialists' dispatching of their troops to invade our country in the conditions when the strategy of their "special war" has fundamentally gone bankrupt while our people's patriotic war has developed with a very powerful motto, the liberation armed forces have grown up, and the liberated areas have included the major part of the Southern population and territory, though they may bring in hundreds of thousands of troops, they cannot avoid being driven into passivity in strategy, compelled to scatter their forces in the defensive as well as in the offensive, and cannot easily wrest back the initiative as they wish but instead face increasing failure and predicament.

Third, due to their above-mentioned loss of political and military initiative no matter how modern its equipment, the American expeditionary corps cannot bring into full play its combativeness, and cannot escape the inevitable defect which is likely to befall any aggressive army facing a whole nation resolute to resist them.

Fourth, the purpose of the U.S. imperialists' introduction of troops into the South being to prevent the collapse of the puppet army and administration, and create new conditions to consolidate and strengthen the puppet forces, the U.S. imperialists directly invade the South of our country at a moment when the puppet army and administration are seriously weakening. In this situation, the more direct the Americans' aggression, the more isolated and deteriorated the puppet army and administration are, the greater the contradiction between the U.S. imperialists and their placemen, the more conscious those who have any national feeling among the puppet army and administration become and the more numerous those who cross over to the people's side. Consequently, American military buildup not only cannot retrieve the predicament of the puppet army and administration but instead speeds up the latter's collapse in face of our people's resistance. When the American imperialists' crack troops are defeated by our people the disintegration and collapse of the puppet army and administration will be all the more inevitable.

Fifth, the U.S. imperialists having started the war in the South, are more and more sternly condemned by the peace-loving people in the world.

The strong points of the U.S. imperialists are limited whereas their weak points are basic ones. In the process of development of the aggressive war the latter will become more and more visible and aggravated and will surely lead the American imperialists to ignominious failure.

DECISIVE FACTORS OF OUR VICTORY

The first factor is the Party's correct revolutionary line. This line is the condensed expression of the clever and creative combination of Marxist-Leninist general principles with the concrete practice of our revolution. This is the line of the people's national democratic revolution progressing to socialism in a former semi-feudal colony.

The second factor is the unity of the entire people against the U.S. imperialists for national salvation: North and South are of one mind in their determination to defeat the American aggressors and their lackeys, ready to make every sacrifice rather than lose their independence and be enslaved.

The Communist Party U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist) is preparing for the first National Party Congress to be held in September of this year. This Congress will gauge the Party's progress toward its immediate objective - the building of an all-American Communist Party. As the Party's Declaration stated, "...all Marxist-Leninists in the United States will be invited to unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism," (PEOPLE'S VOICE, Sept. 27, 1966). The Party's position is: to unite all Marxist-Leninists into an all-American Communist Party, to destroy revisionism and to lead the American proletariat in revolution. The Party is bringing the Marxist-Leninist forces together and is drafting the Party Program for presentation to the Party Congress. The Congress is an important milestone in the consolidation of the Marxist-Leninist forces in the U.S.A., and in the building of an all-American Communist Party. In the next issue of the RED FLAG there will be additional notes about the preparations being made for the National Party Congress to be held this September.

SPECIAL NOTICE

The third factor is the invincible people's war and the experience to lead this struggle. The fourth factor is the warm sympathy and wholehearted support given us by the people of the brother socialist countries, and the progressive people the world over, including the American people. The question is: Which of the U.S. imperialists who pursue an unjust aggression and our people who uphold a just cause, will win in the end? Our people or the American imperialists? Throughout the past eleven years, every time the U.S. imperialists launch a new aggressive scheme that same question is raised. The liberation struggle of the heroic Southern people has supplied an eloquent answer: whatever trick the American imperialists may resort to they will inevitably fail in the end. And the fundamental law of the Great Patriotic Struggle of our compatriots in the South throughout the various stages is: the farther the U.S. imperialists and their flunkies engage in their scheme to enslave the South of our country the deeper they sink in their morass and the greater their defeats, whereas the more determined the Vietnamese people's struggle the greater their victories. We must further heighten our vigilance over the enemy's perfidious scheme. We must stop up our entire people's patriotic war, resolutely fight until victory, no matter how many hundreds of thousands of troops the U.S. imperialists may dispatch to Vietnam and how far they may escalate their war of destruction against the North. Our people are determined not to shrink from any sacrifice to bring the Great Struggle against the American imperialists for national salvation to final victory.

WHAT FACTS PROVE

The following item is the first section of the article entitled "The National Question and Class Struggle" by Liu Chun. We are re-printing this article because of its importance in dealing with the national question in terms of imperialism and in terms of socialism. The other sections of the article will be reprinted in subsequent issues of the RFD FLAG.

Nationalities and classes are questions which are interrelated. The question of nationalities is in essence a question of classes. As Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out, "In the final analysis, a national-struggle is a question of class struggle." This is a Marxist-Leninist principle. It is a principle that we must keep firmly in mind when we examine and deal with the question of nationalities, whether it is a national and colonial question on the world-wide scale or one of our own country and whether it is a question in the period of democratic revolution or one in the period of socialist revolution and construction in China.

Nationality is a historical concept which grew up in the period when capitalism was in the ascendancy. The origin of the national question lies in the capitalist-imperialist system, in the system of exploitation based on the private ownership of the means of production. Marx said: "The existing relations of ownership provide the condition for the exploitation of one nation by another."

Aside from oppressing and exploiting the working people of their own nationality, the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes of an oppressor nationality always oppress and exploit other nationalities in their own country, while in foreign countries they scramble for markets, regions producing raw materials and places for investment, and enlarge the scope of their exploitation. They strive to establish systems of national oppression and colonialism in order to carry out ruthless national aggression and oppression and subject other nationalities to their exploitation. So long as imperialism, capitalism, the exploiting classes and the system of exploitation exist, national oppression and national exploitation will not vanish.

National oppression is definitely not, as the bourgeois nationalists and other exploiting classes assert, a struggle and opposition between all the people of one nationality and all those of another. It is oppression of the vast majority of the people of an oppressed nationality, mainly its workers, peasants and other labouring people, by the ruling class of an oppressor nationality. The oppressors are a small handful, while the oppressed form the overwhelming majority.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "In the United States, it is only the reactionary ruling circles among the whites who oppress the Negro people. They can in no way represent the workers, farmers, revolutionaries, intellectuals and other enlightened persons who comprise the overwhelming majority of the white people. At present, it is the

handful of imperialists headed by the United States, and their supporters, the reactionaries in different countries, who are inflicting oppression, aggression and intimidation on the overwhelming majority of the nations and peoples of the world. We are in the majority and

they are in the minority. At most, they make up less than 10 per cent of the 3,000 million population of the world." 3

In oppressing other nationalities or carrying out aggression upon them, the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes always do it in the name of their whole nation and proclaim that they are doing it for the benefit of all their people. This is a shameless fraud. Their aggression upon and oppression of other nationalities are not only widely at variance with the interests of the proletariat and other working people of their own nationality but are a complete violation of those interests and stand in basic contradiction with them. Engels already stated: "A nation cannot become free and at the same time continue to oppress other nations." Referring to the hostile attitude of the English worker towards the Irish worker, Karl Marx, in a letter to Meyer and Vogt, said: "he... turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists against Ireland, thus strengthening their domination over himself." Lenin said: "The oppression of 'subject peoples' is a double-edged weapon. It cuts both ways - against the 'subject peoples' and against the Russian people." 5

For this reason, the proletariat and the working people of various nationalities must see through this deception of the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes, and stand against national aggression and oppression of every kind, and support the struggle of oppressed nationalities for liberation.

Marx considered that the development of the national liberation movement is a decisive blow to the ruling classes of the capitalist countries and is necessary to the proletariat for their own emancipation. In his letter to Meyer and Vogt, Marx said that to the workers of England the national emancipation of Ireland "is no question of abstract justice or human sympathy but the first condition of their own emancipation". 7 Lenin developed the standpoint of Marx and Engels He considered it necessary to distinguish the nationality which is oppressed from that which oppresses and put forward the slogan "Workers of All Countries and Oppressed Nations, Unite!" He said: "The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would indeed be a mere deception if complete and close unity did not exist between the workers fighting against capital in Europe and America and the hundreds and hundreds of millions of 'colonial' slaves who are oppressed by that capital." 8 Under the historical conditions of the present age, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has further developed the Marxist-Leninist principle regarding the relation between the national liberation movement and the proletarian revolution. He sets great store on the significance of and the role played by the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In his statement of August 8, 1963, supporting the American Negroes in their fight against racial discrimination, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said emphatically: "The evil system of colonialism and imperialism grew up along with the enslavement of Negroes and the trade in Negroes, and it will surely come to its end with the thorough emancipation of the black people." 9

In his talk with guests from Iraq, Iran and Cyprus on May 2, 1960, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said that the just struggles of the peoples of the various countries in the world have received and will continue to receive firm support from the 650 million people of China. He pointed out that the days of imperialists are numbered. The imperialists have committed all manner of evils and all the oppressed peoples of the whole world will never forgive them. He pointed out that to defeat the reactionary rule of imperialism, it is necessary to form a broad united front and unite with all forces, excluding the enemy, that can be united with and continue to wage various struggles. 10

Among the people of the oppressed nationalities, those who actively suffer national oppression are mainly the oppressed and exploited classes, the workers and the broad masses of laboring people, most of whom are peasants. When their class interests are encroached upon by the imperialists through national oppression, the national bourgeoisie and even certain patriotic kings, princes and aristocrats of an oppressed nationality may sometimes fight against national oppression together with the broad masses of the working people of their own nationality. In this struggle the proletariat should unite with them, while at the same time they must understand that the attitude of these people towards imperialist national oppression is, in the final analysis, based on their own class interests. As to the reactionaries of the oppressed nationalities who are in league with the imperialists, they will never oppose national oppression; on the contrary, they will unite with the ruling classes of the oppressor nationalities, become their lackeys, and collaborate with them in the oppression and exploitation of the working people of their own nationalities. From this we can see that national oppression is in reality class oppression, and that the struggle against national oppression is in reality a struggle against class oppression, and often simultaneous-ly a struggle against the reactionaries and traitors of one's own nationality.

It is precisely for this reason that Marxist-Leninists do not consider the national question as an isolated one. They consider the solution of the national question as a problem of revolution, a part of the general question of revolution. At different stages of the revolution the political party of the proletariat has different tasks concerning the national question. During the period of imperialism the national question is a part of the general question of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In order to achieve national equality and total emancipation, the people of the oppressed nationalities must resolutely carry out national democratic revolution, put an end to the national oppression of the imperialists and overthrow the rule of their lackeys; they must then carry through the socialist revolution and destroy all the exploiting classes and systems. Marx and Engels said in the MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY: "In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end." 11

1. Mao Tse-tung, STATEMENT CALLING ON THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD TO UNITE TO OPPOSE RACIAL DISCRIMINATION BY U.S. IMPERIALISM AND SUPPORT THE AMERICAN NEGROES IN THEIR STRUGGLE AGAINST RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1964, p. 5.
2. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "Speeches on Poland", COLLECTED WORKS, German Ed., Berlin, 1959, Vol. 4, p. 416.
3. Mao Tse-tung, Op. Cit., p. 5.
4. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Op. Cit., p. 417.
5. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE, 1846-1895, International Publishers, New York, 1942, p. 289.
6. V.I. Lenin, COLLECTED WORKS, Moscow, 1964, Vol. 20, p. 238.
7. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Op. Cit., p. 290.
8. V.I. Lenin, SELECTED WORKS, London, 1946, Vol. 10, p. 160.
9. Mao Tse-tung, Op. Cit., p. 6.
10. CHAIRMAN MAO TSE-TUNG'S IMPORTANT TALKS WITH GUESTS FROM ASIA, AF-RICA AND LATIN AMERICA, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965, p. 5.
11. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965, p. 55.

PEOPLE'S VOICE
c/o WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL BOOKSTORE
9122 So. Compton Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90002

If you are interested in the PEOPLE'S VOICE write:

Price 5c per copy Subscription \$5.00 Per Yr. Surface Mail
\$10.00 Per Yr. Air Mail. . . . Anywhere in the world

Communist Party of the United States of America
(Marxist-Leninist)

Published bi-weekly by the

The PEOPLE'S VOICE is the political organ of all
the oppressed and exploited people in the U.S.A. today.
It is the fighting organ of the working class-
daring to speak the truth.

The voice of all the oppressed and exploited.

THE PEOPLE'S VOICE

READ