

AMERICAN WORKERS' COMMUNIST PARTY SECOND CONGRESS

Main Political Report

(On Saturday and Sunday, July 4 and 5, 1970, the Second Congress of the American Workers' Communist Party was held in New York City.)

The Main Political Report and the general discussion corroborated the correctness of the line adopted by the Founding Congress of the Party.

At the same time both the political report and the discussion developed further and implemented the line and policies set by the First Congress.

In this special issue of the M-L Vanguard we publish in a complete and unabridged form the first part of the Main Report of the Second Congress.)

Introduction

The convening of the First Congress of the American Workers' Communist Party on July 5-6, 1968, represented a nodal point or qualitative leap forward in our movement.

It was at that Congress that we, as a Marxist-Leninist movement, finally reached the parting of the ways with our own semi-revisionist past, which was characteristic of the whole "Caucus" (inside the CPUSA) and P.O.C. (Independent) periods or historical phases of our development.

Therefore, it was not until the First Congress of the A.W.C.P. was held that the process of ideological and political maturation in our movement began to jell.

There is no need at this point to go into a full re-examination of the policies and decisions of the First Congress of the A.W.C.P., beyond quoting some Founding Congress projections which clearly established the difference between the A.W.C.P. and the P.O.C.

At the Founding Congress the Main Political Report presented an analysis of the relationship of world forces which sounded the knell of "Centrist" revisionist influence in our movement.

Breaking away from the pervasive counter-revolutionary influence of the "Great Thought" meant, in a most basic sense, reaching the ideological and political plateau from which we could survey history and the class struggle with the fullest objectivity and free from all forms of revisionist symbolism.

Hence, even if briefly, we must refer to the Political Report of the First Congress of the A.W.C.P. in order to link the past with the present as we set out to chart a course for the future.

If our future perspectives were to be measured by the intrinsic tasks facing us, we would conclude that these tasks are overwhelming, and way beyond our power of endurance.

And why did we in P.O.C. choose this most difficult juncture of history to constitute the genuine Marxist-Leninist Vanguard of the American working class? Simply because it is not a matter of subjective choice or volition.

"Because the working class of the whole world will carry this same heavy burden for many years and perhaps for decades to come.

"And since we are not bourgeois intellectual geniuses or self-styled 'makers of history' like Fidel Castro and other such representatives of the 'new left,' we humbly accept the decisions of history and face those tasks with proletarian humility and with full confidence in the future of our class. . . .

. . . The impact of the defeat

of the revolution in Vietnam via 'negotiations for peace' transcends the geographical limits of that country. . . .

"Of course, we could choose to put on the colored glasses that the revisionists of the Right and the 'Center' diligently and generously offer to lend us, and conclude that the revolutionary forces are in reality winning battle after battle and that the American imperialists are just a couple of days away from their final demise. But this we refuse to do. We will examine present social phenomena with Marxist-Leninist objectivity and draw the pertinent lessons of history without allowing ourselves the luxury of indulging in fantasies or self-delusions. . . .

"The revisionists aver that the present rash of student 'struggles' in Europe and North America constitute the 'avant-garde' of some mythical proletarian revolution.

"But forgetting the proletarian revolution for the moment. Even in terms of bourgeois revolution it is sacrilegious to speak about the 'revolutionary' circles which made their recent appearances in several countries of Europe and North America in the same breath with the epic days of '93 in France. The revolutionary struggles led by Robespierre, Marat, etc., were heroic gestures of the middle class during a period of history in which that class could and did play a revolutionary role. But those days are gone forever. . . . Neither the middle class nor the petty-bourgeois elements can ever again play such roles, whether they be tradesmen, college professors or university students. . . .

"A rose-colored estimate of the relative positions of the capitalist and socialist sectors of the world was presented by Nikita Khrushchev in his report to the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. on February 14, 1956. The report stated in part:

"The emergence of socialism from within the bounds of a single country and its transformation into a world system is the main feature of our era. . . .

"The prospects of capitalist economy are in many ways determined by the situation in the capitalist world market. Here substantial changes have taken place during recent years.

THE MARXIST-LENINIST

VANGUARD



"Without a Revolutionary Theory
There can be no Revolutionary Movement!"

Organ of the American Workers' Communist Party
Box 137, Planetarium Station, New York City

Vol. XII, Nos. 8-9

Price 20c

August-September, 1970

The United States of America is losing the monopoly position it held during the first post-war years. As a result of competition from other countries, the United States' share in world exports, after reaching a peak in 1947 (32.5 per cent), later dropped sharply (to 19 per cent). In 1947-48 the United States accounted for nearly three-fifths of the industrial output of the capitalist world, but today it accounts for only half. The United States has already made the most of its post-war economic opportunities; no new markets are in sight. There is therefore no prospect of a further substantial increase in production. . . .

"The problem of markets is becoming all the more acute, because the capitalist world market is steadily shrinking as a result of the formation of the new and growing socialist world market. Besides, the underdeveloped countries, on casting off the colonial yoke, begin to develop their own industry, which inevitably leads to a further narrowing of markets for industrial products. All this means that the struggle for markets and spheres of influence will become still sharper within the imperialist camp. . . .

"... the strike struggle has assumed much wider scope during the post-war years than it did before the war. . . .

"What conclusion should be drawn from the analysis of the situation in the capitalist countries?

"... The contradictions between the capitalist states are growing and their struggle for markets and spheres of influence is becoming increasingly acute. Social contradictions are deepening, and the struggle of the working class and the broad masses for their vital rights and interests is becoming more vigorous. Thus, capitalism is steadily moving towards new economic and social upheavals." (Main Political Report to the 20th Congress of the CPSU delivered by Nikita Khrushchev.)

"Marxist-Leninists, real ones, should steer away fast from Brezhnev and Co.'s type of 'Marxist analysis.' It represents the road projected by the American-Soviet imperialist Entente. It is the road to the burial ground of the revolution, at least temporarily.

"That world painted by the modern revisionists is a false one. Instead of the 'collapse of colonialism,' neo-colonialism reigns supreme and unchallenged in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The national bourgeoisie has sold out to the imperialists in practically every struggle for national liberation in those areas.

"American imperialism has not collapsed, nor has it been

outstripped by the other imperialisms; on the contrary, it continues to lord it over the other imperialist beasts — it has expanded its economic holdings and its political influence in the colonial and semi-colonial world.

"It is true that the capitalist system is living on borrowed time — and that 'extra time' is the direct result of the treachery of the revisionists of the Right and 'Center.' It is true that without the counter-revolutionary actions of the modern revisionists, capitalism would have already passed from the stage of history.

"It is also true that the collusion between the modern revisionists and the leaders of the national bourgeoisies of Asia, Africa and Latin America has resulted in the continued existence of colonialism, thereby temporarily stymieing the effect and impact of the contradiction between oppressor and oppressed nations within the capitalist system.

"It is a fact that because of the treachery of the modern revisionists the labor movement in North America and Europe has become a simple appendage of imperialist policy, externally as well as internally. Hence, the 'optimistic' estimate of class forces in the present stage of history projected by the Soviet revisionists and repeated ad nauseam by all revisionists throughout the world represents a political trap that would result in paralyzing the revolution.

"Based on their record of deception and treachery, nobody listens to the lurid tales, or better said, the damn lies, of the open revisionists anymore.

"And that is precisely the reason why it is the 'Centrists' who have now assumed the role of 'fairy-tale' narrators. It is they, the 'M-Ls,' who at the present time carry out the task of lulling the masses into a false sense of security.

"In Peking Review No. 15 of April 12, 1968 three articles are devoted to singing requiems to American imperialism. That's an easy and convenient substitute for fighting imperialism in general and American imperialism in particular. That is also a convenient smokescreen to hide the sell-out in Vietnam.

"In one of the articles the Peking Review blares away 'Badly Split Imperialist Bloc Nears Its End' and then it continues:

"The meeting of finance ministers of ten capitalist nations, held in Stockholm, capital of Sweden, ended in discord after fierce wrangling between the U.S. and French delegates. The meeting shows that the crisis of the capitalist financial-monetary system with the dollar as its pivot is irremediable and that the further decline of U.S. im-

perialism is inevitable. It also shows that in the process of the total collapse of imperialism the contradictions and in-fighting among the imperialist countries are intensifying daily and that the imperialist camp is further disintegrating. . . .

"The bitter financial and currency war among the imperialist countries is no accident. The balance of forces among them has undergone a change in the twenty or more postwar years. U.S. imperialism's position of "strength" has been considerably weakened whereas that of the West European countries represented by France has been correspondingly reinforced. Inevitably, this leads France and other West European countries to challenge the U.S. hegemony and to demand a share of this hegemony in accordance with the altered "strength." . . . (Peking Review, No. 15, April 12, 1968, p. 22) . . .

"For the benefit of the trusting souls that believe anything that has a 'revolutionary' tag, let us again state that the revisionists, whether of the Right or the 'Center,' never 'create' any of their demagogic sophistries but rather borrow them from the ideological arsenal of the bourgeoisie.

"Four years ago the American people were treated to one of the more or less frequent publicity stunts carried out by the 'organs of public opinion' in the United States. The main pitch was the 'potential danger' represented by the 'negative trend' in the balance of payments and by the so-called gold drain. The apologists for American imperialism rang the 'alarm' from the pages of the newspapers and magazines as well as on radio and TV broadcasts.

"To 'the end of colonialism,' peddled by the revisionists, now they attempt to add the 'bankruptcy and helplessness' of American imperialism. . . .

"For how can anyone believe that such a helpless creature would or could harm anyone? But facts and reality cannot be conjured out of existence. The American imperialist beast is not only alive but on the prowl with the whole colonial and semi-colonial world as its stalking ground. . . .

"Well! For a 'poor businessman' who is presently being pushed around by his 'partners' it seems U.S. imperialism is doing all right for himself. Isn't he? Not only that, his 'partners' appear to be nothing better than hired hands, agents at the most.

"So the flimsy revisionist case for sympathy with 'harmless, harassed and badgered' American imperialism proves to be nothing else than a miserable fraud. . . .

(Continued on Page 2)

(Continued from Page 1)

"... All those who peddle the fable that the American imperialists are actually crumbling through 'internal economic contradictions' are in fact counter-revolutionaries, since the impact of such a conception naturally is to demobilize and disarm the revolutionary forces of the world. We repeat — if American imperialism is dying, as the revisionists of the Right and the 'Center' aver, what the devil is the use of fighting it? This is precisely why at this point the modern revisionists are hawking the propaganda fraud that American imperialism is near its death..." (From the Main Political Report to the Founding Congress of the A.W.C.P., July 5-6, 1968)

It was from these theoretical and political premises set by the First Congress that we started two years ago to fulfill the tasks assigned to our movement by the class struggle and history.

Clearly, great and decisive as the ideological and political leap forward by the Founding Congress was, it nevertheless left an enormous number of questions still unclear and unanswered.

However, within the span of time covering the two Congresses, our Party collective has dug deep into the social and political history of the revolutionary movement to expose the very roots of modern revisionism.

As a result, the present counter-revolutionary role of the Khrushchevs, Suslovs, Brezhnevs, etc., was directly traced to the opportunism of the pack of "Bolshevik" wreckers led by Stalin, Molotov, Mikoyan, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Tomsky, Radek, etc.

Within that period of time our Party collective also exposed the counter-revolutionary "mass line" (the United Front tactic so-called) projected at the 7th World Congress of the C.I. in 1935.

In the series of articles published by our M-L Vanguard entitled "On the Search for the Historical Roots of Modern Revisionism" our Party collective laid bare the whole process of political putrefaction begun as soon as Lenin became too ill to fight off the gang of social-imperialists led by Stalin and Co.

The counter-revolutionary road taken by the Parties of the Third International was exposed to the glare of Marxist-Leninist analysis and its virulent political content uncovered.

The fraud of the "establishment of independent, non-aligned governments" in Asia and Africa was exposed as the concrete form of the "Entente" imperialist colonial policy — neo-colonialism.

The tendency towards the unification of the world bourgeoisie which Lenin had noted in 1920 was completed in the post-Second World War period of history. The total, universal sell-out of the national bourgeoisie in every nation of the colonial world has become fully evident.

Hence, the politics as well as the tactics of the counter-revolution are now as clear as noon light.

Counter-revolution, even in its most disguised and camouflaged form — that of "revolution" — now appears rational in its political context and logical in its tactical form.

The "greatest historical victory of the proletariat," the defeat of the Axis Power Alliance (so much cackled by revisionists of Right and "Center" as well as bourgeois liberals) was found to be the most disastrous defeat ever inflicted upon the

world proletariat.

Hence, the revisionist misconceptions still harbored by us at the time of the First Congress in regards to the socio-political character of the Second World War, disappeared into thin air.

At the Founding Congress we still held to the revisionist concept of the Second World War as a socio-political hybrid — "part just" and "part unjust."

Two years of study and analysis of the causes of the great defeat of the working class have taught us that the Second World War was nothing else than an unjust imperialist war for a new redivision of the world.

We further learned that this "Cold War" gimmick was indispensable and essential if the "Entente" Powers were to succeed in their attempt to redivide the world and become its new hegemony.

In fact, the "Cold War" was, and still remains, the concrete form and specific method of post-war "Entente" unity and cooperation.

This is so true and real that as the "Entente" develops its third basic prop, namely, Chinese imperialism — a particular shift in the "Cold War" tactic becomes observable. The emphasis of the "antagonism" is trans-

ferred from U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. relations to Sino-Soviet relations. Clearly, this interval of time between the First and the Second Congress of the A.W.C.P. has helped us to rid ourselves of other lingering remnants of revisionist concepts which were still with us at the time of the Founding Congress. For instance, the myth of the "two economic world systems" melted away under the impact of a more mature Marxist-Leninist theoretical analysis.

What the Soviet and Chinese revisionists had peddled as "new forms of development of Socialism" — the so-called "New Democracies" — turned out to be nothing but a set of neo-colonialist regimes with "Socialist" signposts. Thus the bubble of the "Socialist sector of the world" was pricked and exploded.

But the greatest and most decisive re-evaluation of concepts was represented by the discovery that the Soviet Union had ceased to be a Socialist State soon after Lenin's death. And it was from

all this new theoretical insight and higher plane of political consciousness that we, inevitably, drew the harsh lesson of history — to the effect that the working class had suffered the most massive and painful defeat in history.

Now all the "optimistic" sloganeering of the Right revisionists about the "superiority of the Socialist system over the capitalist system" and the one about "the triumphal march of the revolution from victory to victory" becomes absolutely logical and rational.

A typical brand of the "revolutionary upsurge" is found in conditions to attack imperialism everywhere in the world." (Vietnam Courier, March 23, 1970)

Of course those slogans did not represent any state of confusion or ignorance on the part of the Soviet or Chinese social-imperialists. On the contrary, those revisionist "paens to victory" were deliberate attempts to palm-off counter-revolution in "revolutionary" garb.

This political shadow-boxing has been particularly manifested in an unending and constant barrage of "revolutionary" rhetoric—denouncing imperialism in words and by giving lip service to every form of anti-imperialist struggle.

Logically, "threatening" imperialism and even "burying it alive" has become an ordinary, daily pastime of the revisionists of the Right and the "Center."

It is impossible to read any so-called "Marxist-Leninist" literature today without meeting the phrasemongering challenges of the modern revisionists. Even that two-by-four tool of the Soviet social-imperialists, Walter Ulbricht, "bravely" picks up his revisionist shovel and begins to heap dirt on the "grave of imperialism" as follows:

"Moribund imperialism, which has long since been condemned by world history to step down from the stage, is becoming increasingly barbarous and misanthropic. . . .

"Imperialism wants to prevent its irresistible fall and to turn back the wheel of history, its military-political blocs on foreign territories are aimed at maintaining international tension and unleashing local wars. . . ." (Walter Ulbricht's speech before World Assembly for Peace held at East Berlin, June 21-24, 1969)

These "anti-imperialist" muscle-flexing and crepe-hanging exercises were not invented by Brezhnev, Khrushchev or Mao. This concrete expression of the "Cold War" logically enough, was first introduced by Stalin and Co. after V-J Day.

In a speech made by V. M. Molotov on March 10, 1950 he stated the following:

"The U.S.A. capitalists did not make bad use of all of the Second World War. They inflated their industry to dimensions it had never reached in peacetime and crammed their pockets with money. They took no little advantage, either, of the grave postwar situation of separate countries, especially the economic decline of vanquished Germany, Italy and Japan, in order to market their wares and stuff more gold into their pockets. But before much time had elapsed after the war, the artificial prosperity bubble blown for American capitalist industry during the war, which brought so much ruin to the peoples of Europe and Asia, began to show signs of bursting.

"As is generally known from the data that have been published American industry during the last few years has been working on a lower level than during the war. It is also generally known that by October 1949, when industrial production sank particularly low, the level of American industry had dropped twenty-two per cent in comparison with October 1948. That happened during the very same time that the 1949 level of Soviet industry rose twenty per cent. The American figure, minus twenty-two per cent, is evidence of the beginning of an economic crisis which is growing in all capitalist countries. The Soviet figure, plus twenty per cent, points to a further mighty upsurge in Soviet industry. [Applause.]

"And what about the prospects of economic development in the (Continued on Page 3)

Veni, vidi, vici! Modern style—"Big Three" at Yalta



This "summit" get-together held on the balmy shores of the Crimea marked the apogee of the "United Nations" Second World War alliance.

The political character of the "United Nations" Second World War entente was irrevocably and indelibly imprinted by the social nature of imperialist U.S.A. and Great Britain. But, how was it possible that a Socialist State "joined" the two most rapacious and predatory States in the world at that moment of history in a "common struggle against the forces of world reaction and for world democracy and freedom"? Simply because no such Socialist State existed then. The Soviet misleaders represented by Joseph Stalin and Co. as far back as the early nineteen-thirties had already re-established the capitalist system of production in the U.S.S.R.

Hence the so-called Yalta Conference merely pinpointed the historical moment when the victorious "United Nations" gang of imperialist marauders began to discuss the concrete task of dividing the war booty among themselves.

Also, aided by this new mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory, we uncovered the true social character of the so-called "fascist menace."

We discovered that "the struggle against fascism" in its initial form was but an ideological subterfuge, a political smoke-screen, a device used to conceal the emergence of the Soviet State as an imperialist world power in the early '30's.

Later on, during the period of the Second World War, the "fascist danger" boogaboo became the main propaganda pitch used to hide the reactionary and predatory nature and character of the "United Nations" gang of imperialist marauders.

Applying the same dialectical method of Marxist-Leninist analysis, we arrived at the conclusion that the main post-Second World War tactic of the "United Nations" Powers was expressed by the political sham struggle which goes under the tendentious name of "Cold War."

ferred from U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. relations to Sino-Soviet relations.

Clearly, this interval of time between the First and the Second Congress of the A.W.C.P. has helped us to rid ourselves of other lingering remnants of revisionist concepts which were still with us at the time of the Founding Congress. For instance, the myth of the "two economic world systems" melted away under the impact of a more mature Marxist-Leninist theoretical analysis.

What the Soviet and Chinese revisionists had peddled as "new forms of development of Socialism" — the so-called "New Democracies" — turned out to be nothing but a set of neo-colonialist regimes with "Socialist" signposts. Thus the bubble of the "Socialist sector of the world" was pricked and exploded.

But the greatest and most decisive re-evaluation of concepts was represented by the discovery that the Soviet Union had ceased to be a Socialist State soon after Lenin's death. And it was from

the following excerpts from an article in the Vietnam Courier which read in part:

"After the Second World War the world situation completely changed. Imperialism was no more the dominant force in the world. Together with the Soviet Union which had asserted its vitality by defeating Hitlerite fascism, new socialist countries came into being, forming a world socialist system, while colonized peoples rose up one after the other in an irresistible upsurge. In the big capitalist countries the worker and popular movement for better living conditions, for the defence of democratic freedoms and peace influenced broad segments of the population roused against monopolist capital.

"These three great currents — socialist revolution, national liberation movement, worker movement and struggle for peace — converged to give the world revolution an offensive posture which created most favourable

(Continued from Page 2)

countries of either camp?

"Only the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, treading the path of Socialism and relying on the support of the U.S.S.R., can give a clear answer to that question."

This tiresome litany continues without let-up today, and is in fact a specific part of the political and ideological "arsenal" of the revisionists of the Right and the "Center."

Just a couple of weeks ago the Soviet imperialists unloaded another ideological "nuclear blast" against American imperialism at the same time that they "reassured" the masses of the world about the "favorable position of the revolutionary forces in the present world." This latest "assault against the citadel of world reaction and aggression" was reported by the New York Times as follows:

"Moscow, June 9—The Soviet Union, in an analysis of the world revolutionary movement, described the United States today as torn by internal crises and rapidly losing influence in Western Europe and Latin America.

"A 5,000-word editorial in Pravda, the Communist party newspaper, said the last year was marked by 'a favorable direction for the revolutionary movement' and setbacks for the United States, which was called 'the main danger for the cause of peace, freedom and security'...

"The United States was the only 'imperialist' nation criticized in the analysis, underscoring Soviet efforts to isolate Washington in the world arena and erode American influence.

"The editorial, presumably written by the party's Central Committee staff, said that in the last year 'new masses of people have joined the struggle against imperialism, people who but recently were far removed from politics'...

"Vivid evidence of the increasing opposition to the imperialist criminal policy is the situation that has now arisen in the United States itself," it said.

"American society is experiencing a profound crisis. The biggest imperialist power demonstrates a conflict between the heights of technical development and the depths of a social system in which the leaders of the propertied class insolently disregard human lives and the interests of the people," Pravda said.

"It said 'broad masses' of Americans were being drawn into 'the movement of protest, which assumes ever greater political acuteness'...

"Growing in many Latin American countries is an understanding of the need for a resolute resistance to the Yankee imperialists and for providing opportunities for independent and free national development of these countries, for genuine economic and social progress," it said...

"In the last two years, the Soviet Union has followed a more active policy toward Latin America while improving its relations with Cuba. Diplomatic ties have been established with a number of South American countries.

"Around the world, Pravda said, there are grounds for encouragement in the support for the Arab and Vietnamese causes, and in such developments as coups in the Sudan, Libya and Somalia that put leftist governments in power." (New York Times, June 10, 1970)

But what is particularly significant today is the fact that this "Cold War" bombardment is a daily feature and practice of the mutual relations between the Soviet and Chinese social-imperialists.

The "Cold War" manifestations between the two "Socialist"

members of the "Entente" triarchy is, naturally enough, explicitly projected in both Chinese and Soviet literature. For instance, in Peking Review No. 24 of June 13, 1969 it is stated:

"Israel, the U.S. imperialist tool of aggression in the Middle East, launched a full-scale war of aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and other Arab countries on June 5, 1967....

"... The purpose was to drag the Arab countries, which were robbed of large tracts of territory, into accepting an unconditional 'ceasefire' and the fait accompli resulting from the U.S.-Israeli war of aggression. This was followed by talks between Kosygin and Johnson at Glassboro where the two reached a secret agreement. On November 22, under U.S. and Soviet manipulation, the U.N. Security Council adopted a 'resolution' based on the Glassboro secret agreement and aimed at browbeating the Arab countries into 'surrender.' In December the United Nations sent its 'special envoy' Gunnar Jarring to the Middle East to peddle this sinister U.N. product....

"... The United States and the Soviet Union recently got France and Britain together for a 'four-power meeting' in New York, and have been working overtime on a 'Middle East Munich' plot. They are hoping in vain to realize their ambition of U.S.-Soviet domination of Middle East affairs."

Already in Peking Review No. 12 of March 21, 1969 the Chinese social-imperialists "attacked" their Soviet counterpart in an article entitled "Soviet Revisionism is U.S. Imperialism's No. 1 Accomplice—Saboteur of Vietnamese People's Struggle Against U.S. Aggression and for National Salvation."

The article read in part: "For quite some time the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has made the Vietnam issue an important stake in its dirty political bargaining with U.S. imperialism. It actively co-ordinates with U.S. imperialism which is writhing in its deathbed struggle in Vietnam, and energetically helps U.S. imperialism in its political swindle designed to stamp out the raging revolutionary fire of the Viet-

namese people and realize its criminal aim of perpetuating the occupation of South Vietnam and dividing the Vietnamese nation. Since the Glassboro talks in June 1967 when Soviet revisionist chieftain Kosygin and U.S. imperialist boss Johnson mapped out the 'blueprint' for Soviet-U.S. redivision of the world;...

"... No wonder U.S. imperialist boss Nixon gleefully praised the Soviet revisionist renegade clique at a March 4 press conference for its close 'co-operation' with and big help to U.S. imperialism on the Vietnam question. Nixon could not contain his joy when he disclosed that the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, taking its cue from U.S. imperialism, has been putting pressure on the Vietnamese people in a hopeless bid to induce and compel them to terminate their war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation. These criminal moves have thoroughly unmasked the Soviet revisionist renegade clique whose diabolic conduct regarding the Vietnam question is sham support but real betrayal of the Vietnamese people and sham opposition but real capitulation to U.S. imperialism.

"To maintain their nuclear hegemony and carry out nuclear blackmail against other countries so as to push their counter-revolutionary 'global strategy,' U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism have for years tried to make a deal over the so-called 'nuclear non-proliferation' question. They have become more eager and impatient than before to reach an agreement on this at an early date ever since China successfully conducted a number of nuclear tests which struck terror into their hearts.

"At the beginning of 1968, when compromises and concessions had been made by the Soviet revisionists, U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism cooked up a so-called 'treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons' and together manipulated the U.N. General Assembly into adopting it last June.

"By virtue of this treaty, the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionists can go ahead to produce and stockpile nuclear weapons and expand their nuclear

bases, while undertaking no obligation whatsoever not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states. The non-nuclear states, however, are totally deprived of their right to develop nuclear weapons for self-defence and are even restricted in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. In blunt language, the treaty is to be imposed on the non-nuclear states, binding them hand and foot.

"The Soviet revisionist clique also joined the U.S. imperialists in manipulating the U.N. Security Council into adopting a so-called 'nuclear protection' plan designed to turn the non-nuclear states into 'protectorates' to be controlled and subjugated at will.

"Greatly alarmed by the remarkable progress of socialist China in the development of guided missiles and nuclear weapons, Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism have in the past few years intensified their collaboration against China on the nuclear question. In actual fact, the Soviet revisionists have formed a nuclear military alliance with the U.S. imperialists against China.

"At present, further deals are in the pot between Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism on the so-called question of 'limiting the anti-ballistic missile race.' The malicious moves by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, made in league with U.S. imperialism under the cloak of 'nuclear disarmament,' add up to an additional grave crime in betraying the interests of the people the world over and in allying itself with U.S. imperialism against China.

"Our great leader Chairman Mao has pointed out: 'Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again... till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic.'

"As a willing accomplice of U.S. imperialism, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has stopped at nothing in the way of committing crimes and has made itself the enemy of the people of the world. The more Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism speed up their collusion for a last-ditch struggle, the

more they will generate the awakening of the people of the world and the more they will hasten their own doom.

"A new historical period of combating U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism has begun today...."

And in an article entitled "Serious Economic Difficulties of Soviet Revisionism in 1969" it is stated:

"At present, grave economic difficulties are hovering over the whole of the Soviet Union and are striking terror into the Soviet revisionist renegade clique....

"The growth rate of national economic indexes of the Soviet Union dropped comprehensively in 1969 and the plans for major industrial production were not accomplished. According to the data published by the Central Statistical Board of the Soviet Union, the annual growth rate of the national income in the Soviet Union decreased from 7.5 per cent in 1968 to 6 per cent in 1969, that of labour productivity in industry from 5.2 per cent to 4 per cent and that of the total value of industrial production from 8.1 per cent to 7 per cent. As for the total value of agricultural production it was 3 per cent below 1968.

"In the field of capital construction, the data published by the Soviet Central Statistical Board show that in 1969 investments in capital construction were 1,900 million roubles less than planned and that 'there exist also substantial shortcomings in building industry'...

"The strained market supply and the serious shortage of food and daily necessities have most clearly manifested the serious economic difficulties in the Soviet Union. 'Pravda' confessed editorially on January 13 that 'difficulties have begun to appear in supplying the inhabitants with livestock products, especially in big industrial centres.' (Hsinhua, March 30, 1969)

"They are fighting words!" And indeed the Chinese social-imperialists swear that they are ready to tear apart the "revisionist-imperialist cabal."

While Mao's gang is making all of those bellicose gestures the Soviet social-imperialists themselves are carrying out what Mao Tse-tung would call "a tit-for-tat struggle" against Chinese revisionism.

From a Soviet propaganda pamphlet entitled World Socialist System and National Liberation Movement we quote some choice paragraphs dealing with the "present role of the Chinese Communists" as depicted by Brezhnev, Kosygin and Co.:

"The dissident activity of the Chinese leaders has been a boon to imperialism, which immediately stepped up its struggle against socialism and the national liberation movement. Since the early sixties US imperialism has committed aggression against Cuba, the Dominican Republic, the Congo (Kinshasa) and is carrying on an aggressive war against the people of Vietnam. Hostile position of the Chinese leaders towards the Soviet Union and other socialist countries made it easier for the U.S. imperialists to escalate the war in Vietnam. Events show that the Chinese leaders have ruled out any possibility of common action by the socialist countries to beat off American aggression against Vietnam.

"Moreover, it became clear recently that Peking is playing a shady game behind Vietnam's back hoping to profit by the tragedy of a neighboring people. The war in Vietnam is one of the political factors which enable the Mao Tse-tung group to explain away many of China's difficulties and divest themselves

(Continued on Page 4)

"Rank and file" imperialist camaraderie!



"The meeting at the Elbe" (on April 25, 1945). The much-ballyhooed propaganda stunt purporting to symbolize the simultaneous reaching of the Elbe River by the "liberating armies of the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union."

The above photograph appeared in a pamphlet published in the so-called German Democratic Republic with the following commentary:

"The fascist beast lay in its death throes and the allies in the anti-Hitler coalition rejoiced that victory over the common enemy was in sight. Who could have guessed at that time that the Anglo-American imperialists, in alliance with the West German trust and bank bosses, would shortly afterwards stage the cold war against the east?"

Who could have guessed it? Those who planned the "Cold War" as a tactic for the redivision of the world in the post-war period. Stalin knew it, Truman knew it, Churchill knew it, and even Herr Ulbricht who plays dumb and asks the question knew it.

(Continued from Page 3)

of all responsibility for them. On the other hand, the Vietnam problem is used to create the impression that no satisfactory solution of the crisis can be achieved without Peking's participation. Some people in the United States have begun to contemplate a deal with China. In April, 1966, the Senate Democratic majority leader, Mansfield, suggested settling the conflict by direct negotiations between the United States, China, the DRV and South Vietnamese representatives. In June, 1966, Mansfield proposed a meeting between Dean Rusk and Chen Yi to discuss the question of peace in Vietnam. It is highly revealing that these proposals coincided with Peking's statements to the effect that the conflict could not be resolved on the basis of the Geneva Agreements, which were signed by many states, the USSR included. Thus, *Jenmin Jihpao* wrote in July, 1966: "The Geneva Agreements were long ago torn to shreds by the devil's claws of American imperialism. In view of this, how can one speak of 'resolving' the Vietnam question on the basis of these agreements?" The fact, however, is that both the DRV Government and the leaders of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front constantly emphasize the great significance of the Geneva Agreements. But Peking could not care less about the opinion of the Vietnamese themselves.

"With the escalation of the war in Vietnam, the Chinese leaders began more openly to renege on their 'firm' promise to guarantee North Vietnam's security. The August 6, 1964 Declaration of the Chinese Government, unequivocally states: 'Any encroachment on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is at the same time an encroachment on China.' *Jenmin Jihpao* wrote on the same date: 'Should American imperialism encroach at any time on the territory, territorial waters or air space of the DRV, the Chinese people will be unswervingly true to their promise to render most resolute support to the just war of the Vietnamese people against U.S. aggressors.'

"Such statements are forthcoming to this day. But what do they actually mean? The Chinese leaders, who persistently reject common action with other socialist countries, are, in effect, stabbing the Vietnamese people in the back. They imply that the U.S. aggressors may pursue their war against the Vietnamese as long as they please, and that China will not interfere unless her own territory is attacked. Early in 1965, Mao Tse-tung told Edgar Snow that 'Chinese armies would not engage in war outside their own territory' and that 'the Chinese would fight only if the Americans attacked them.' The same idea was voiced by Chen Yi, on September 29, 1965, and Chou En-lai, in April, 1966. In September, 1966, U.S. Defense

Secretary McNamara, who naturally spoke on behalf of his country's ruling circles, hastened to reassure the Chinese leadership that 'U.S. limited aims in Vietnam constitute no threat to it (i.e. China) whatsoever.'

"The Vietnamese problem is now the centre of world developments. Vietnam is the scene of a direct confrontation between the contemporary progressive forces, socialism and the national-liberation movement, on the one hand, and its most reactionary force, U.S. imperialism, on the other. The attitude to the struggle of the heroic people of Vietnam, to the unity of revolutionary forces in defending Vietnam from aggression, is today the most crucial test of the truly internationalist position of countries, parties, movements and organizations forming the anti-imperialist front. The Mao-led Chinese leadership has not stood this test." (*World Socialist System and National Liberation Movement.*)

In a speech made during a session of the Supreme Soviet on July 12, 1969 Andrei Gromyko "fiercely attacked" Soviet imperialism's two other partners in the "Entente." He was equally "forceful in condemning" "great power" China as he was "critical" of "super-power" U.S.A.

In regards to the U.S. Gromyko stated:

"Military groupings are not our device. The big states of the

West, our former allies in the war, began establishing them...

"Animosity towards socialism, striving for expansion, took the upper hand in the West instead of a sober approach to the estimate of the situation in the world.

"The establishment of the Warsaw Treaty Organization was our reply to such policy and action of the countries of the West and, above all, to the formation of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc...

"The growing might of the Warsaw Treaty Organization serves the cause of peace and security in Europe. But let all those concerned know that this organization will never allow anybody to encroach on the security of its members, on the gains of socialism in these countries."

And referring to "Mao's China" he added:

"Not even our most rabid enemies ever used such unseemly ways and in such a scope as the Chinese leaders do now. The Chinese leaders are striving to slander the activity of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, their peace-loving foreign policy. Peking often makes allegations that the Soviet Union, by fighting for peace, against imperialist aggression, is making a deal with imperialism..."

"Leaders of the PRC are reviling our policy and our program of the construction of communist society. They are actu-

ally merging forces with those who from the very start of the existence of the Soviet state tried to fight it...

"It is not imperialism but the socialist countries and above all the Soviet Union the strongest anti-imperialist bulwark in the world, that are now regarded as the main enemy of China.

"China's foreign policy broke with proletarian internationalism and lost its class socialist content. Therefore it is not surprising that the great-power, anti-Leninist line of the PRC merges with those who all the time have been trying to undermine the unity of the socialist states, to break up the anti-imperialist front, that the PRC merges with rabid imperialist reaction."

After listening to these "two sides" of the "Socialist Cold War" tirades the first impulse of any honest but naive or politically immature individual would be to declare "both bastards are right" and to conclude that the only rational thing to do would be to declare "a plague on both your houses."

But for a politically conscious person, for a real Marxist-Leninist, the proposition is much more difficult and complex.

There are not "two sides," at all, involved in the projections of the revisionists of the Right and the "Center." There is only one side—the side of the "Entente" interests, the side of the counter-revolution.

Section 1

"Cold War" Thaw Main Immediate Tactic Of Imperialism

We, too, and not too long ago either, fell into the subjective trap of characterizing the Soviet and Chinese revisionists as "traitors to the working class." But, that's wrong. That stage of traitors and renegades was passed decades ago during the period following Lenin's death. Today they are something different. They are leaders of imperialist "great powers" playing the exact social role that the Kennedys, Johnsons, Nixons, Rockefeller, McNamaras, Rogers, etc., play in the U.S.A.

If this basic distinction is not grasped clearly, the prevailing revisionist illusions about a possible return to Socialism in the Soviet Union and to revolutionary struggle in China without a previous proletarian upheaval, most certainly will prevent the world working class from mounting a massive counter-offensive.

Who ever heard anyone calling Churchill, Roosevelt, or Truman traitors?

Each and every one of them was a criminal imperialist, but no one can accuse them of being traitors to their class.

Neither should Khrushchev, Stalin, or Brezhnev, Mao Tse-tung or Chen Yi be conceived as being traitors to their relative imperialist states. The truth is that they have done yeoman service for their reactionary, predatory, criminal, ruling classes. Why then refer to them as traitors to a class which they exploit and oppress on a world scale?

The gimmick of mutually "downgrading" the economic and political strength of the other members of the "Entente" triarchy, as we have often explained, is yet another expression of the "Cold War."

Thus, since the end of the Second World War and behind the "Marxist-Leninist" forecasts of "the impending collapse of imperialism," American finance capital has spread its economic and political tentacles all over the world.

And behind the slogans of "Socialist inefficiency" and "lack of know-how," the American imperialists together with their European partners, have facilitated and conditioned the accelerated spread of Soviet and Chinese imperialisms in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

At one time this type of "Cold War" propaganda blared forth the "failure of the big leap forward and its catastrophic impact on China."

Another time it was the "disastrous balance of payments and monetary crisis in the U.S."

At present, "Cold War" propaganda is concentrating on a so-called "economic stagnation" sian which is specifically directed at the United States' and the Soviet Union's economic power.

During a "Luncheon Conference" held at Brussels last January (1970) with Clyde H. Farnsworth, European economic correspondent of the New York Times acting as "host" and attended by J. Robert Schoetzel, American ambassador to the European Economic Community, Jean Francois Deniau, commissioner of external affairs of the European Economic Community, John Davis, former director general of the Confederation of British Industry, Louis Camu, chairman of the Banque de Bruxelles, Edward B. Seaton, European director for Monsanto Co., John D. Philiphorn, representative of Chase Manhattan

Overseas, the British representative (John Davis) recited a whole series of arguments purporting to prove that American corporate capital had reached the end of its economic rope in Europe.

Following is what Mr. Davis stated at the Brussels conference:

"I think that on the question of protectionism one of the things which is more and more evident is that the United States has passed through a period when, by applying its own genius in productivity, it could compete despite its labor costs. It is now moving more and more into areas where its ability to compete is restricted to those industries which are at the pinnacle of technological advance.

"Its labor costs are beating it in the conventional industries. We haven't had any mention at all of textiles, but in fact the one undertaking President Nixon gave at the time before the election was to the textile industry in the United States, and this is an industry which occupies something like four million people and where in fact it is being beaten by the outside world. That's true of textiles now; it's perhaps even true of steel now.

"The whole concept of a voluntary program of restraint of exports is a non-tariff barrier. Even in the steel industry the United States is going to be beaten and is being beaten now by the outside world in competitive terms.

"The ability of America to compete in the outside world in almost any industry, because of its productive genius, is disappearing. And I think that this is a fundamental problem for the United States to face." (*New*

York Times, January 16, 1970)

It appears that the British, as well as other third rate European partners of the "Entente" Powers have been handed the task of acting as "professional wailers" for both American and Soviet "economic wakes." Recently, that organ of British imperialist propaganda, *The Economist*, has begun to conduct a propaganda campaign precisely on the subject of "serious economic crises" in both the Soviet Union and the U.S.A.

The American press has been quick to pick up *The Economist's* "alarum" angle and has spread it far and wide.

Hence the *Christian Science Monitor* of March 24, 1970 started to toll the bells announcing the knell of Soviet imperialist power when it editorialized thusly:

"If *The Economist* is right, then, something is terribly wrong in the Soviet Union. For Britain's (and perhaps the world's) foremost and most authoritative economic magazine has printed figures which, if correct, must be terrifying to those who have the Soviet Union in hand. These figures show that between 1967 and 1969, the yearly growth rate per man in industry sank from 6.6 percent to 4.4 (it had already sunk to 5.0 in 1968). Thus the percentage growth in man-hour efficiency was more than one-third lower last year than it had been two years previously."

Then, in order to add credibility to *The Economist's* "obituary note" on Soviet economy, the *Christian Science Monitor* editorial continues:

"Earlier this year these columns quoted a most interesting prediction from the well-known French journalist and political thinker, Jacques Servan-Schreiber. He said that the 'real contest' between the United States and Europe would eventually turn out to be over 'which of the two will be able to supply effective industrial aid to Russia when the time comes,' since the latter remains 'notably vulnerable both in the economic and social fields'.

"The continued revelations as to the Soviet Union's bad showing in both industry and agriculture lend increasing weight to the Servan-Schreiber thesis" (*Christian Science Monitor*, March 24, 1970)

As a matter of fact, the *Christian Science Monitor* had already begun the "crepehanging" rites in preparation for the "passing away" of Soviet imperialist economic power when in another editorial written almost a year ago it stated:

"Meanwhile, and to the surprise of many, there are growing indications that the Soviet Union may, within a few years, be heading into a petroleum shortage. Some experts believe that Russia, heretofore considered well-off where oil production was concerned, may even become an oil-importer during the 1970's. This occurs, embarrassingly, at a time when the Western world's oil output and wealth are growing prodigiously, and is clearly one explanation of Moscow's strong interest in the oil spouting Middle East." (*Christian Science Monitor*, June 18, 1969)

After this apocalyptic pressage every anti-imperialist as well as every "anti-communist" should be getting ready to enjoy the funeral and burial of the predatory regime of Brezhnev, Kosygin & Co.

"But wait — don't be too hasty," warns the *New York Times*, "Soviet imperialism's economic power is not quite dead — it is just badly hurt!"

"...important as are current Soviet economic woes, they should be seen in perspective, however. Moscow still controls vast resources and its productive apparatus is far from mired in stagnation. A reminder of this reality is provided by the extraordinarily ambitious program announced last week to develop the extremely rich oil and gas resources of Western Siberia. The billions of rubles required for that effort dwarf Western oil companies' projected spending on Alaska's North Slope." (*New York Times*, January 19, 1970)

As for the American "econo-

(Continued on Page 5)

(Continued from Page 4)

mic crisis" the same New York Times editorial explains:

"Tight money has brought the nation's economic growth to a halt. In the final quarter of 1969, Gross National Product increased by \$10.3 billion — but the entire gain was due to inflation. ...

"What is needed now is a broad program that will bring wage demands back closer in line with reasonable expectations of productivity growth; that will restrain the use of monopoly power by either labor or business; that will end Government anticompetitive policies that boost prices for wages, and misallocate resources. At the same time, the Administration should focus more attention on efforts to increase productivity, which is both a powerful anti-inflationary force and a source of real economic growth." (Ibid.)

It is quite interesting to observe that the content of the statement made by John Davis at the Brussels "luncheon conference" was an "open secret" first "divulged" by the American propagandists themselves.

For instance, the U.S. News & World Report of December 2, 1968 carried an article entitled "Europe Losing Lure for U.S. Firms" and which read in part:

"Money being poured into new factories and enterprises — in Europe and in America — is undergoing important shifts.

"U.S. executives suddenly are cutting back on the amount of new funds they are investing in European plants.

"European firms, in contrast, are showing rising interest in building plants in the U.S. to tap the world's richest market.

"What explains these investment trends? Why are American firms changing their minds? What's it like to do business in Europe now?

"The fervor of American business for setting up ventures in Western Europe is fading.

"For the first time in 10 years, American firms are cutting back on funds being poured into European plants.

"About 100 million dollars less will be invested in Europe this year than last — a reversal of a trend that had seen such investments climbing by 330 million dollars annually since 1958. Talks with executives on the scene indicate even sharper reductions may be coming in 1969.

"At the same time, European companies are discovering America as an attractive place to build factories. Money flowing from abroad into the U.S. — up to 80 per cent this year — has pushed foreign ownership of plants on U.S. soil to nearly 10 billion dollars, as the chart on page 45 shows." (U.S. News & World Report, December 2, 1968)

The chart referred to above is the following:

"GROWING FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF U.S. FACTORIES

"Direct investment by foreigners in U.S. plants at beginning of 1968 —

United Kingdom	\$3.2 billion
Canada	2.6 billion
Netherlands	1.5 billion
Switzerland	1.1 billion
West Germany	.3 billion
France	.3 billion
Sweden	.2 billion
Belgium	.2 billion
Latin America	.2 billion
Italy	.1 billion
Japan	.1 billion
All other	.1 billion
Total:	\$9.9 billion

(Ibid.)

We will go into this particular subject of "foreign" investments in the U.S. later on in this report; for the present let us proceed by quoting from the same U.S. News & World Report article and find out what are the true perspectives of Amer-

ican finance capital in the European commodity and money markets:

"The great majority of U.S. firms, however, are sticking it out. Profits, although squeezed right now, generally are higher than those made by their European competitors.

"'Chalk it up to more efficient management,' says a London-based management consultant. He adds: 'The trouble with many European companies is that they are run by family members who are more interested in salting away profits in a Swiss bank account than they are in building a modern business.'

"Many American executives talk about the future of Europe in glowing terms. The rubber industry is said to be growing in Europe at twice the rate of growth in the U.S. The big reason is that Europe is taking to wheels — though the ratio of autos to population still lags far behind America's. One tire-company official predicts: 'Europe now has 62 million cars. By 1977 it will have 113 million. That is a lot of tires.'

"The marketing chief for a consumer-goods firm in Brussels has this to say:

"Per capita, Europe has only a fraction of what Americans already have of practically any item you can name. The market potential is huge." (Ibid.)

If American imperialism is really sick it is absolutely unaware of its own malady. Maybe it's a case of self-delusion! Who knows? But the fact is that its own outlook on the possibilities for their continued mastery of the whole world together with its "Socialist" partners remains not just hopefully but **decidedly** confident.

On April last the Bureau of Labor Statistics, reflecting the cocky outlook of the American ruling class, published a ten-year prognosis of American economy which, as reported by the U.S. News & World Report, stated:

"A trillion plus. ... between 1969 and 1980, the economy is expected to grow 59 per cent in 'real' terms to 1.4 trillion dollars, after taking out the anticipated effects of inflation. That indicates an average growth of 4.3 per cent a year in this new decade — more than the gains being nailed down in 1969 and 1970." (U.S. News & World Report, April 27, 1970)

Obviously, there is a discrepancy between the "Cold War"-ish predictions of "economic cataclysms" and political Armageddon with the confident outlook of the future put on display by each of the three imperialist political entities forming the "Entente" triarchy.

In the present world and in the historical conditions created

by the worldwide victory of the counter-revolution, neither the United States or China has any reason to fear the present, nor the immediate future.

They are not, as imperialist powers, at odds with each other.

They are living through a particular historical period and a specific moment of the class struggle that permits them to share the colonial and semi-colonial world amongst the triarchy, the second echelon of imperialist marauders such as Britain, France, Belgium, etc., and their tenth rate partners, the national bourgeoisie of the colonies.

Hence, the "Open Door" policy is the economic expression of that predatory unity.

The imperialist states under the economic and political hegemony of the "Entente" know that at present there is lots of room for economic expansion in the colonial areas of the world. Hence, neo-colonialism with its main economic feature — the direct exploitation of the colonial working class through the medium of a truncated industrialization, has become the pivotal ingredient of present history.

The imperialists know that it is only and only in the colonial areas of the world that possibilities for capital expansion remain.

Therefore, better than anyone

else are they aware of the fact that stabilization of capitalism depends, in the absolute sense, on the exploitation of the colonial workers and peasants.

The apologists and ideologists of the imperialist states speak glibly about the "expansion" of their home market. But that is a dream, that can be realized only by multiplying a thousandfold the extraction of surplus value from the proletarian masses of the so-called "under-developed" nations of the world.

For all of these reasons the number one hegemon in the "Entente" triarchy, namely the United States of America, has enunciated a policy of "live and let live" and of slicing the colonial pie according to the economic, political and military power that each of the imperialist states can muster.

This period of inter-imperialist "peace" and "cooperation" will last as long as the limits of industrial expansion in the neo-colonies permit, and no longer. The moment that the economic saturation point of that expansionism is reached, the imperialist love-fest and political idyll will be over. When that economic saturation point is reached, the "Open Door" policy will turn into its very opposite, into an imperialist free-for-all and door-slamming over their particular spheres of influence.

Imperialist wars and proletarian revolutions will again be on the agenda of history. As Lenin put it nearly sixty years ago:

"Therefore, in the realities of the capitalist system, ... inter-imperialist or ultra-imperialist alliances, no matter what form they may assume, whether of one imperialist coalition against another, or of a general alliance embracing all the imperialist powers, are inevitably nothing more than a 'truce' in periods between wars. Peaceful alliances prepare the ground for wars, and in their turn grow out of wars; the one is the condition for the other, giving rise to alternating forms of peaceful and non-peaceful struggle out of one and the same basis of imperialist connections and the relations between world economics and world politics. ..." (Lenin, Imperialism The Highest Stage of Capitalism, p. 119)

"Cold War" rhetoric and demagoguery will be around for some time in the foreseeable future as a convenient smoke-screen for the "Entente's" still unfinished drive for world expansion. However, as the task of redividing the world among the imperialist marauders approaches its completion, the need to coordinate their predatory plans more freely forces the "Entente" triarchy to assume more open, united and cohesive relations. Political and ideological rationales which attempt to explain that accelerated process of "unity" between the three-imperialist states constituting the "Entente" triarchy exist by the tens and even by the hundreds.

Among those rationales there is the so-called "convergence" canard simultaneously projected from "East and West."

Referring to this particular ideological burp of the revisionists and the liberals Time magazine stated in a recent issue:

"The only choice is either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course." — Lenin

"Should Lenin be taken at his word? Some Western political theorists and even a few Russians think not, and in defense of their belief they have propagated what has become known as the convergence theory. In essence, the theory proposes that capitalism and

(Continued on Page 6)

Political Illusion and Historical Reality!

"'Dark Ages' whose creeping shadows begins already to haunt the imagination of current thinkers, will yet be defeated . . ." (Fascism and Social Revolution, R. Palme Dutt)



The hammer and sickle, the symbol of working class revolution, "waving" over the German Reichstag on May 2, 1945.

Of all political illusions this has been the most deadly and harmful to the world working class in its entire history.

For it was not, nor could it be, the working class that had "triumphed over the forces of reaction and fascism" in that predatory, unjust war.

The hammer and sickle over the Reichstag in reality represented the victory of the imperialist "United Nations" powers over their Axis rivals. Yet that partisan victory of one gang of imperialist cut-throats over another was palmed-off by the ideologists and propagandists of the newly arisen "Entente" as a "great victory for the working class and the peoples of the world."

But the fact remains that such a deliberate distortion of the social and political character of the Second World War became imperative and indispensable to the task of shifting tactics based on an imperialist war policy to those of an imperialist peace.

(Continued from Page 5)

Communism — driven by the irresistible scientific and technological forces that control modern industrial states — will eventually coalesce into a new form of society, blending the personal freedom and profit motive of Western democracies with the Communist system's government control of the economy.

"Convergence prophets argue that the theory has universal application, but contend that it applies particularly to the United States and Russia. Despite their manifest differences both nations are post-industrial powers grappling with the problems of advanced technology. According to the convergence theory, Moscow and Washington should meet some day at the omega point somewhere on the outskirts of Belgrade, the capital of a nation that has — so far, successfully — introduced elements of capitalism into a doctrinally Marxist society.

"... The definitions of 'bourgeois' and 'socialist' ideologies have changed over the years — and no doubt will continue to change — but in the long run Lenin may well prove to be right.

"The future is always problematical, but the weight of evidence suggests that Communist and non-Communist societies will continue to develop on separate but parallel tracks. Fortunately, though, basic differences no longer imply the inevitability of a cataclysmic showdown. The pragmatics of survival may well be the one respect in which the U.S. and Soviet Russia are really meeting. That may be a more helpful and hopeful prospect than the euphoric vision of convergence." (Time Magazine, January 12, 1970)

This summary of the "theories" of the Andrei Sakharovs and Pyotr Kapitzahs in the Soviet Union and of the John Kenneth Galbraiths and George F Kennans in the U.S. conveniently serves as the introduction to the more practical suggestion of "pragmatics of survival" (meaning recognition of common inter-imperialist interests) which Time Magazine stresses.

But whichever demagogic rationale is used, the end result is the same — a call for "more unity among the great powers as a means of guaranteeing world peace and security."

Even that dyed-in-the-wool American imperialist organ of "public opinion" — the Wall Street Journal — detects some "socialist" trends in American society and in fact approves of them.

Referring to the impact of "inflation" on capital goods outlays and the present inadequacy of those outlays, the Wall Street Journal stated:

"Those requirements for capital, after all, are not fantasies dreamed up by profit-hungry capitalists. They reflect the needs, present and prospective, of the whole population — for products, jobs and income.

"One way or another those needs are going to be met. If the private economy cannot generate enough savings to do the job, the Government in one way or another will try to do it. And if that sounds like socialism, that's exactly what it is." (Wall Street Journal, June 9, 1970)

After this, Communism, eh! Last January, Joseph Fromm, the Senior European editor of U.S. News & World Report put in simple and quite explicit terms this "new" trend towards the "unity" of the so-called "great powers of the Entente."

Joseph Fromm's opinions were contained in an "interview" by

the staff of the "U.S. News":

"Q Do you get the feeling that the world next year is going to be a little safer than it has been in the past?"

"A Yes. I think that the 1970s should be safer than the years since World War II and that the United States can expect to face fewer problems and dangers around the world. We are moving into an era of change in our relationships both with our adversaries and our main allies. And the changes, as I see them taking shape, should make the world a more comfortable place for the United States. . . .

"Q Are you saying that the U.S. and Russia are developing a better understanding of their mutual interests?"

"A Exactly — that's one reason for the changing relationship. In recent years, there has been a growing awareness that, as superpowers, the U.S. and Russia have certain parallel interests that are equal to the interests they share with their allies — and in some cases even transcend in importance these alliance interests. . . .

"The Middle East negotiations offer another example of this kind of tacit understanding about crisis management. I don't see much hope that the U.S. and Russia can find a settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict, but both are acutely aware of the danger of being dragged into a confrontation by their client states (our emphasis) in the Middle East. And I think there now is better understanding of how they would behave if another major round of fighting broke out between Israel and the Arabs.

"There is some evidence to indicate that the Russians are working to deter the Arabs from precipitating a major war. This certainly is the view that I found among diplomats in Israel not long ago.

"The Russians are walking a tightrope: doing their utmost to avoid a war but doing nothing that would jeopardize their influence in the Arab world. At the same time, the U.S. is unwilling to impose terms on Israel that might jeopardize the security of that country.

"But at least both America and Russia are fully aware of the dangers. Both are intent on preventing another major round of fighting which might drag them into a confrontation. If fighting nonetheless does erupt, I would expect the two superpowers to move, in the United Nations and elsewhere, to end it quickly and without the kind of panicky situation that erupted when the 1967 Arab-Israeli war broke out. . . .

"For the past two years the Russians have been pouring military and economic aid into Nigeria to support the Federal Government. Several years ago this would have produced almost automatically a panic stricken American reaction in the form of massive intervention, but on this occasion the U.S. has played it cool, on the theory that its vital interests aren't really jeopardized. . . .

"Q How does this new understanding between the U.S. and Russia manifest itself in Vietnam? Why aren't the Russians doing more to help us out of that war?"

"A On balance, I suspect that Soviet leaders might prefer to see this war wound up. But as they see it, the net advantage that they could gain by helping the United States wind it up is appreciably less than the net disadvantage they would suffer by applying a military embargo or taking other action to force Communist North Vietnam into a settlement against its will.

"Q As you look ahead, how do you assess the American-Chinese relationship?"

"A Well, our relationship with China also is beginning to undergo a change which could be very important in the years just ahead. You see, instead of the bipolar world we've known in the past decade or two—a world of only two great powers—we are moving into a much more complex situation. A triangular relationship between the U. S., Russia and China is just beginning to emerge. . . .

"I would expect Japan to pursue a flexible policy toward the three powers—China, Russia and the U.S. The Japanese, I believe, will seek to establish close and productive relations with all three. . . .

"Q The sum of almost everything you've said is that the whole era we've known since the end of World War II is ending and that we're entering a new stage in world affairs. Is that it?"

"A That's precisely what I'm saying. I've been abroad as a foreign correspondent for this magazine for almost a quarter of a century. During that period, we've witnessed incredible changes in the world order, and these changes have involved great chaos and dangers.

"We've seen the collapse of two global empires—the British and French. We've seen the emergence of scores of new nations in Africa and Asia. There's been the rise of Communist Russia as a world power and the take-over of China by the Communists — with the temporary prospect of a great new Sino-Soviet power bloc.

"We've seen Western Europe rebuilt as a prosperous and secure non-Communist area. And we have seen the United States for nearly 25 years play the role of the world's only real superpower. It's been a period when the United States has had to face great dangers and assume great burdens around the world.

"Now, with a new world order pretty well established [our emphasis] we are moving into a new era. And, as I see it, there's a reasonable chance that in the decade ahead we will be less preoccupied with foreign problems, foreign dangers and burdens abroad." (U.S. News & World Report, January 5, 1970)

Extending their wholehearted approval to the "unity" tack of the "Entente triarchs" the editors of the Christian Science Monitor commented on the purpose of Nixon's political junket last summer as follows:

"The single greatest international issue in the decades ahead will be the working out of the triangular balance of relationship between Americans, Russians, and Chinese. This is what long-term foreign-policy planners in Washington, Moscow, and Peking are almost certainly giving simultaneous priority to. And it is this issue that gives a thread of rational continuity to the waypoints on President Nixon's current round-the-world trip, from the moment he lands at his first major stop in Manila until he takes off from the last, Bucharest. . . .

"... Mr. Nixon has a number of reasons for deciding to end his tour in Romania—not the least being that President Ceausescu invited him. But one of them is probably to tell Asians and the Russians that the United States intends to keep its options open and play a three-way super-power game in the years ahead, not just a two-way one with the Russians." (Christian Science Monitor, July 25, 1969)

And in a more recent editorial the Christian Science Monitor re-emphasized the benefits of a policy of "triangular unity" for the U.S. imperialists:

"The United States is, of course, still at the top of the world superpower league. And being there, the two other contenders in the league—the Soviet Union and China—have a common interest in trying to cut the American lead, if not oust the United States from its commanding position altogether. But neither the Russians nor the Chinese want to do this for the other. . . .

"... Each of the powers involved is continental in size. Each comes to the negotiating

table encumbered with a combination of traditional interests and commitments. Each is in fact a juggernaut. And a juggernaut has almost as much difficulty in sharply altering course as a leopard does in changing its spots. Yet this does not make the three sets of talks—in Warsaw, Peking and Vienna—any the less welcome a way to give a keynote to the 1970's." (Christian Science Monitor, January 20, 1970)

Hence the "thaw" in the phony tactic of "Cold War" becomes more evident as the triangular shape of the "Entente" powers forge ahead towards the establishment of total hegemony over the whole world.

Referring to the so-called "Nixon foreign policy," Roscoe Drummond in an article entitled "Where Is U.S. Foreign Policy Headed?" stated last February:

"He [Nixon] is fully aware that the United States cannot and should not be the world's lone policeman, but to step back from the wrong way to keep the peace could create a dangerous vacuum unless new steps are taken to create a new means for the free nations to keep the peace together. . . .

"What we need to understand is that since the United States is cutting back its part in keeping the peace alone, then the United States must lead in plans to keep the peace collectively or the peril of war will be increased, not lessened." (Christian Science Monitor, February 17, 1970)

Assessing American imperialist foreign policy in the light of the "Cambodian incident," Joseph C. Harsch in an article entitled "A Complete Circle" wrote as follows:

"China is talking both to Russians and Americans. China is also talking with the West Germans, although less formally.

"The Russians are talking to Chinese, Americans, and West Germans.

"Americans are talking to Russians, Chinese, and West Germans.

"No one is left out of the circle of conversation. . . .

"Today there are three great powers, and Britain and West Germany.

"France, Italy, and Japan are regional powers concerned only with their relations with their immediate neighbors." (Christian Science Monitor, December 18, 1969)

And still pursuing the same subject, Mr. Harsch in another article entitled "The Peace of Asia," stated:

"Peace, or a relative absence of hostilities, is usually kept anywhere and at any time in history by a relative balance of forces. . . .

"The U.S. is, of course, important in maintaining a balance of forces in Asia which in turn will, more or less, keep the peace.

"But what happens in Cambodia or even in Vietnam is of minor relevance to the balance of forces. . . .

"... The role of the U.S. is to see to it that a balance between Russia and China is sustained." (Christian Science Monitor, May 26, 1970)

Making the "Socialist" inter-imperialist conflict aspect of the "Cold War" the starting premise of American foreign policy of "big power unity," James E. Sheridan in an article reviewing Harrison E. Salisbury's book *War Between Russia and China* stated last November:

"... A Sino-Russian war would be disastrous for the whole world, and Salisbury recommends an imaginative use of American power as the best means of preventing it. . . .

"... the prerequisite to the

The imperialist king is dead—long live the imperialist king!



It was at Potsdam that the "Entente's" blue-print for the redivision of the world was secretly agreed to by the American and Soviet imperialist partners. Winston Churchill, who attended the first sessions of the Potsdam Conference was later withdrawn and Clement Attlee replaced him as representative of British imperialism. Note that Churchill's "political furlough" as Britain's representative lasted until all arrangements had been made for his Fulton, Missouri "Cold War" diatribe in February of 1946.

(Continued on Page 7)

(Continued from Page 6)

effective use of American influence is that the United States establish a viable relationship with China.

"These are reasonable and desirable ends, but the importance of the argument lies not only in its specific prescriptions for America's China policy but also in its underlying assumption. It recognizes that The Bomb has made us all brothers, and the fundamental long-range interests of this nation are advanced when peace and stability are maintained among even those powers that we have long considered our enemies." (Chicago Sun Times, November 30, 1969)

So rapid has the "thawing process" of the "Cold War" developed that even that erstwhile "China Watcher," Professor A. Doak Barnett, has been recon-verted into a staunch defender of "unity" among the "Entente" triarchy.

Reporting at the annual gathering of the "Academy of Political and Social Science" held at Philadelphia on April 11, 1970, the "eminent scholar" joined other American imperialist spokesmen and ideologists in a rally for "unity" among the world powers.

As reported by the New York Times:

"A new array of major powers is emerging in East Asia and will reduce the chances of big-power confrontation there, a prominent political scientist has forecast here.

"A. Doak Barnett, an Asia spe-

cialist now with the Brookings Institution, said the evolving balance in the area between the United States, Japan, the Soviet Union and Communist China was in contrast to the 'bipolar' stance between the Communist and non-Communist powers that brought the threat of major war in the nineteen-fifties.

"For the United States, the new balance in East Asia, Mr. Barnett said, provides an opportunity to 'try to evolve a new approach to East Asia as a whole,' including a disengagement of American combat forces from the area, and 'normalization' of relations with Communist China.

"... By the end of the nineteen-sixties, he went on, the power situation in the area became a 'triangular relationship' between the United States, China and the Soviet Union.

"The Asia expert saw the Soviet Union trying to expand its relations with Japan and other Asian nations; China adopting more flexible policies toward the United States and Japan, and Tokyo seeking improved relations with both Peking and Moscow. For the United States, he felt, the prospects are for efforts to maintain the strategic balance with the Soviet Union, and also for expanding contacts with China." (New York Times, April 12, 1970).

In an article written in commemoration of the 25th Anniversary of the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, C. L. Sulzberger wrote in the New York Times:

"When he learned of Roose-

velt's death, Ambassador Averell Harriman immediately went to see Stalin. I noted, after talking with the Ambassador: "Stalin was clearly moved by Roosevelt's death and worried about its implications. He held Harriman's hand for a perceptible time, saying nothing.

"Then, with Molotov present, they talked. Harriman wished to explain how very important to the American situation and therefore to the international situation this tragedy was. He put it up to Stalin point-blank that Russia must cooperate strongly now..." (New York Times, April 12, 1970).

Sulzberger went on to quote Charles E. Bohlen, Roosevelt's special advisor on Soviet affairs, on the political significance of the Yalta agreement:

"He [Roosevelt] had considered Yalta the test of the ability of the three powers to resolve their differences and to work toward the common purpose, namely, keeping the peace of the world." (Ibid.)

Referring to the open secret of a general agreement on the distribution of spheres of influence in Europe and particularly dealing with the eastern European "share" allotted to the Soviet imperialists, Sulzberger continued to quote Bohlen as follows:

"... Such an agreement was not made in any form, shape or manner. The declaration on liberated Europe is the exact antithesis of any spheres of influence agreement in Europe, since it provides for the participation of all three major al-

lies in any of these matters dealing with occupied countries." (Ibid.)

We think Mr. Bohlen "doth protest too much!" Not only was there a secret agreement to re-divide Eastern Europe but the whole colonial and semi-colonial world, as we are observing today.

In the same issue of the New York Times in an editorial titled "The Responsive Roosevelt," the editorialist gave the historical background of the so-called "policy" of "big power unity" which today is being presented as a mere coincidence in history — as a "policy" that began with the Johnson and Nixon administrations.

But the editorial clearly discloses the genesis of the present day "Entente" triarchy when it states:

"A quarter of a century ago today Franklin D. Roosevelt died, and with his death the Age of Roosevelt ended for America and the world. . . .

"In retrospect, if allowed but one word to describe President Roosevelt's four terms of office, it would be responsive. Although unable to move easily about the nation because of his crippling infirmity, Roosevelt was somehow able to grasp the mood and desires of the country; and he both led and tugged the branches of the Federal Government in response to the people's needs.

"His keen instinct sensed the feelings of the common man who may have been silent but was not forgotten. And so without waiting for a revolution by the

one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-fed, President Roosevelt started one. The Hyde Park patriot who betrayed his class [sic] played a New Deal that caused fundamental changes in the economy. New agencies were created to help farmers, workers and industry break out of traditional bonds and establish new relationships within a virtually new structure of American government.

"Western civilization was threatened at the same time by the most barbaric tyranny in history. Now President Roosevelt had to combat the forces of isolationism which tried to stop the United States from helping its traditional allies in Europe. The voices of Franklin Roosevelt and of Winston Churchill kindled hope in the darkness of war. The alliance with the Soviet Union, which turned to ashes in the cold war after Roosevelt's death, helped to forge victory.

"President Roosevelt's foreign policy raised the dreams of men everywhere. The four Freedoms he enunciated — freedom of speech and of religion, freedom from want and from fear — responded to the hopes of mankind. The great coalition of the United Nations in wartime was his legacy to the U.N. imperfect instrument of peace, includes most of the old and new nations of the world. Unlike the League of Nations after the First World War, it survives today — a living and vital tribute to the vision of Franklin D. Roosevelt." (New York Times, April 12, 1970).