

Open Letter
of the Revolutionary
Communist Party
of Chile
to the
Communist Party
of China

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE

**Open Letter of the
Revolutionary Communist Party
of Chile to the
Communist Party of China**

**NORMAN BETHUNE INSTITUTE
TORONTO, 1978**

Publisher's Note

This *Open Letter of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile to the Communist Party of China* was initially published in Spanish in Issue No. 93, December 1977 of *El Pueblo*, Official Organ of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile, and was subsequently published in French by Ediciones marxista-leninistas. The present English text has been translated from the French and Spanish editions.

This digital edition by
© Digital Reprints
2004

Published by:
THE NORMAN BETHUNE INSTITUTE
Printed by:
PEOPLE'S CANADA PUBLISHING HOUSE
Distributed by:
NATIONAL PUBLICATIONS CENTRE
Distributors of Progressive Books & Periodicals
Box 727, Adelaide Station, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
NBI-62

Open Letter of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile to the Communist Party of China

The Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile (RCP) established political relations with the Communist Party of China (CPC) thirteen years ago, when it was still only a Marxist-Leninist group named "Spartacus". The first meeting between this political group and the CPC took place in 1964 between the leaders of "Spartacus" and Comrade Mao Tsetung himself, who encouraged and supported their plans to build a genuine communist party, and towards this end gave them valuable advice. Among this advice: "Do not mechanically copy the experience of China or of another country; struggle against any tailist tendency and use your own heads, applying Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions of your country." We have always striven to remain loyal to these teachings of Comrade Mao, and this Open Letter is an expression of this. At the beginning of 1966, at a Constituent Congress attended by all the existing Marxist-Leninist parties in Latin America — a Congress whose organizing core was the "Spartacus" group — the, Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile was established. The RCP continued to maintain and develop political relations with the CPC, with the Party of Labour of Albania and with the rest of the Marxist-Leninist movement, insofar as we had the chance of meeting with the representatives of each country.

Those who made up the "Spartacus" group in 1963, and later the RCP in 1966, had already, several years before the beginning of the public polemic between the CPC and the Soviet leaders and their disciples, taken up the struggle against the revisionist line imposed by Khrushchov at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, within the old "Communist" Party of Chile. The "Spartacus" group, for its part, established political relations with the CPC about one year after it

came into being as a group independent of the old “C”P of Chile. The political relations between first “Spartacus” and then the RCP, and the Communist Party of China, were born of an identical understanding of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and in their common defence against present-day revisionism. In response to Khrushchov’s revisionist line, under the personal guidance and direction of Comrade Mao, the Communist Party of China elaborated its *Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement* (better known by the name of the *25-Point Letter*) as well as the nine comments replying to the Open Letter that the CC of the CPSU sent to the CPC, on whose basic points we were in complete agreement. This coincidence of points of view was the basis of our party-to-party relations.

Otherwise, in the 1960’s, the years in which we established our political relations — at the very height of the ideological struggle against modern revisionism, and afterwards, during the Proletarian Cultural Revolution — China consistently practiced a revolutionary international policy against the revisionists. This was the era in China during which one could attend large mass meetings of support for the anti-imperialist struggles of the world’s peoples or numerous artistic performances which reflected these struggles, and during which one found propaganda for these struggles on your radio and in your magazines and periodicals. This was the era when Chinese publications reproduced material from the Marxist-Leninist parties regarding their own countries, in which the marionettes of imperialism, the fascists, the racists and the reactionaries like Ne Win, Mobutu and others, were denounced as such, and the traitors to Marxism such as Tito were exposed.

Subsequently, during the 1970’s, coinciding with the “rehabilitation” of people like Teng Hsiao-ping and others who were condemned by the Cultural Revolution, a profound change took place in the international policy of China, which led to many disagreements and contradictions between our parties. Then, in April 1974, Teng Hsiao-ping made his famous speech to the United Nations in which he set out an international line absolutely opposed to the Marxist-Leninist line which the CPC and Comrade Mao had upheld in opposition to Khrushchov and his disciples, and identical, in essence, with that of the latter. At our first meeting with the CPC following the speech of Teng Hsiao-ping, in August 1974, we made a severe criticism of his opportunist international line. Without

a reply to our arguments, the only response we were given was to be told, with the greatest cynicism, that "this is the international line of Chairman Mao". At the beginning of 1975, and after having informed the leadership of our Party of the refusal of the CPC to discuss the change in its international line, we firmly renewed our criticism of Teng Hsiao-ping's international line; in particular, we showed that this line leads to a reactionary policy, beginning from the attitude of official Chinese circles towards the fascist Chilean Junta. This was the last contact between our two parties.

On this occasion, we did not mention (as several fraternal parties have falsely been told) the diplomatic relations between China and the fascists that govern Chile. On the other hand, we did manifest our deep disagreement with the callousness and lack of solidarity of those responsible for leading China's international policy, in accord with the international line of Teng Hsiao-ping, in face of the tragedy that our people have undergone from the time of the fascist coup d'etat, a tragedy which has moved and angered the broadest sections of the progressive and democratic people of the entire world. In fact, the only statement where a position is taken, if one can call it that, on what took place in Chile, is contained in the condolences sent by former Prime Minister Chou En-lai to the widow of ex-President Allende, in which he expresses his "sorrow and indignation" at his death, without passing any judgement on his murderers and without mentioning the tens of thousands of workers who were massacred, tortured and imprisoned by the fascist military. News items on various aspects of the repression in Chile appeared only during the month of the coup d'etat and were reported without any commentary or opinion. Moreover, as if to underscore the decision not to take a stand on the atrocities perpetrated by the fascist Junta, several condemnations of it were reproduced, but always condemnations made by others. Later, even news regarding acts of repression was passed over in silence and the Chinese publications restricted themselves to noting, with increasing tardiness, some of the effects of the economic crisis affecting Chile. We are pointing out all of this to show the contrast with what appeared throughout the world press regarding the denunciation of the atrocities of fascism in Chile. And we pointed out, moreover, that the representatives of China at the United Nations and in other international bodies left the sessions without voting when the resolutions condemning Pinochet and his henchmen were presented. We showed how this attitude of the

official Chinese circles was warmly hailed by the functionaries of the Chilean fascist regime, such as the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who in January 1975, maintained that "People's China supports Chile in international meetings", without being contradicted either by word or by deed.

At the present time, we can bring even more serious accusations concerning your relations with the bloody Chilean fascist regime: you have granted credits to the Junta; none other than the Chinese ambassador had himself photographed in the process of handing over gifts to the dictator Pinochet in August of this year, and made statements to the effect that "the relations between the two countries have always been at a high level" and that China intended to strengthen and broaden them. Finally, this same ambassador topped off his pro-fascist activities on his departure from Chile in mid-October, declaring that he was leaving with "a very good impression of Chile and of the Chief of State". Is it not an insult to the Chilean people to eulogize the butcher who has subjected them to massacres, tortures, and to superexploitation? Is this not open sabotage of the revolutionary role which China has played for the world's peoples?

During our last meeting, at the beginning of 1975, when the collaboration with the fascist Junta was not as scandalous as it later became, we had already pointed out the profound harm that the policy of those in China who were implementing Teng Hsiao-ping's line was causing to the anti-fascist and anti-imperialist struggle of our people. We pointed out the harm that this policy was causing to the revolutionary brotherhood between the Chilean people and the Chinese people, as well as to the prestige of the Chinese revolution in Latin America and in the rest of the world. Finally, we pointed out the difficulties that this opportunist policy was leading to for our own Party in its struggle to mobilize the masses of the people against the dictatorship and to denounce the treacherous policy of revisionism and of social-imperialism, which opened the road to fascism and which, today, contribute to maintaining it in power. Naturally, the masses of the Chilean people, knowing of our former political relations with the CPC, ask us for an explanation of your attitude of friendship and cooperation with its hangmen and torturers, an attitude which we cannot explain from a revolutionary point of view and which we are not inclined to justify, because it is profoundly opposed to our resolutely anti-fascist policy and to the very principles of Marxist-Leninist international policy.

As an example of the support which we would have liked to receive from China, we pointed out that which we had received from the majority of Marxist-Leninist parties and from Socialist Albania, through publications, meetings or other forms of solidarity in support of the anti-fascist resistance, condemning the crimes of the dictatorship and exposing the revisionist theses such as the “peaceful road” and others, which made possible the establishment of fascism in Chile and which today hinder its overthrow.

Finally, we requested a genuine discussion of our differences concerning the international line of Teng Hsiao-ping, for during the previous visit, none of our criticisms had been replied to. We were given only the right to a speech in which this opportunist line was reaffirmed, and we were deprived of the right to ask questions on what we had just heard, being told that “you will be able to do so at our next meeting”.

Already at that time our Party found itself confronted with the alternative of publicly and openly denouncing the international line and policy of Teng Hsiao-ping and his followers which is profoundly opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought and which is particularly harmful for the anti-fascist and anti-imperialist struggle of our people. The militants of our Party, our allies and broad sections of the masses were demanding more and more insistently that we take a position on this question. The reason we did not do so then, at the beginning of 1975, following our last meeting with the CPC, was that precisely beginning with that year we could see encouraging signs in China regarding the development of the class struggle, which made us entertain serious hopes that rectification would be made. At the beginning of 1975 was published Chairman Mao's call to “strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat” and to struggle against the survivals in China of bourgeois right, as well as his warning of the fact that as long as this continued to exist, “if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system.” From the time of these directives of Chairman Mao and under his leadership — from the end of 1975 to September 1976, the date of his death — a broad and sustained mobilization of the masses was developed to criticize and struggle against what was called “the right-deviationist wind” whipped up by Teng Hsiao-ping to liquidate the gains of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Moreover, in April 1976, at the demand of Chairman Mao and the masses of the people, the CC of

the CPC unanimously removed Teng Hsiao-ping from all his positions inside and outside the Party, as a result of his role as the instigator of the counter-revolutionary incidents at Tien an Men Square. This resolution, as your publications explained, was approved by meetings in which “several hundreds of millions of persons” participated. Thus it was completely justifiable to be optimistic and to nourish the hope that the international line of Comrade Mao would be re-established, a line that was in effect at the height of the ideological struggle against revisionism and during the Cultural Revolution. These favourable conditions for the struggle in China, as well as the necessity to redouble efforts to clarify this problem to the whole of the Marxist-Leninist movement, where some agents of Teng Hsiao-ping were attempting to sow confusion, led us to develop the struggle against this new revisionist trend gradually, prior to arriving at the point of making a public criticism of it and a rupture with it. This is what we did through various documents of the RCP, through positions contained in joint statements made with fraternal parties, through our speeches in international meetings and bilateral discussions.

Finally, the tragic events following the death of Comrade Mao—the imprisonment of those who distinguished themselves in the Cultural Revolution and fought at his side against the chieftains of revisionism in China; the shameful “rehabilitation” of individuals condemned by the Cultural Revolution and of some, such as Teng Hsiao-ping, condemned as a repeat offender; the brutal repression against the sections of the masses and the cadres who were determined to defend the victories of the Cultural Revolution and other gains — left no doubt that a counter-revolutionary coup d’etat had been perpetrated in China. In these conditions, we consider it our duty to denounce and publicly combat those who have usurped power. In this way, we are responding to the appeal made by Comrade Mao in 1965, when he declared: “If China’s leadership is usurped by revisionists in the future, the Marxist-Leninists of all countries should resolutely expose and fight them and help the working class and the masses of China to combat such revisionism.”

In particular, as far as the international policy and line of the Marxist-Leninist movement is concerned, we have the right to have our say. No party, no matter what its importance for the revolutionary movement, can claim the right to impose its international line on the other parties, or even less to change a

Marxist-Leninist line into a revisionist line and demand that all should follow it in this opportunist turn. Problems such as defining the main enemy of the world's peoples, characterizing the united front with which it must be opposed, establishing the course to follow in face of the danger of war, or the norms for the unity of the Marxist-Leninists and the role of the vanguard, concern the whole of the international communist movement. In the *25-Point Letter* written under the guidance of Comrade Mao, we can read: "If it is accepted that there are no 'superiors' and 'subordinates' in relations among fraternal parties, then it is impermissible to impose the programme, resolutions and line of one's own party on other fraternal parties as the 'common programme' of the international communist movement" (p. 47) As far as our Party is concerned, the pressure exerted by the opportunist group that temporarily controls the CPC, such as: Refusal to have discussion with or even to receive parties that do not share its point of view; slanders against them; efforts to split them and supplant them by promoting opportunist groups, etc. . . . , will not make us give up our positions and will not prevent us from denouncing an international line which we consider reactionary. Neither will it prevent us — when we consider that the moment is ripe, and no matter what the consequences — from exposing the reactionary and anti-Marxist nature of those who are attempting to impose this line and to use it as a guide in their activity.

What is the substance of the revisionist international line of Teng Hsiao-ping and his accomplices, who fraudulently tried to pass it off as the "international line of Chairman Mao"? It is nothing other than a rehash — almost point for point — of the revisionist international line of Khrushchov and his successors, a line launched by them to prevent the peoples from rising against colonialism and neo-colonialism and to thus create the conditions to replace traditional imperialism as the exploiters and oppressors of these peoples. It is the line which the USSR has implemented with the aim of helping it become a social-imperialist superpower and to contend for hegemony with U.S. imperialism. This line was forcefully combatted by Comrade Mao, Comrade Enver, and other Marxist-Leninists of China, Albania and other countries, especially during the struggle against modern revisionism. As far as China is concerned, the documents that we mentioned at the beginning of this Open Letter — the *25-Point Letter* and the nine comments on the Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU to the CPC prepared under

the leadership of Mao Tsetung—were written to denounce this reactionary international policy of Khrushchov and his successors. These documents represent the “international line of Mao Tsetung”, as do the concepts contained in his well-known works and not the falsifications with which Teng Hsiao-ping and his clique would like to supplant them.

As we have pointed out, Teng Hsiao-ping, on the other hand, put together his anti-Marxist positions in his speech to the United Nations in April 1974 and in several other writings. In them he begins by denying colonial and neo-colonial political oppression, as Khrushchov had done before him, in identical terms. He states: “The numerous developing countries have long suffered from colonialist and imperialist oppression and exploitation. They **have won political independence**, yet all of them still face the historic task of clearing out the **remnant** forces of colonialism, developing the national economy and consolidating national independence.” In another point he says: “We maintain that the **safeguarding** of political independence is the first prerequisite for a Third World country to develop its economy. In achieving political independence, the people of a country have only taken the first step, and they must proceed to **consolidate this independence**, for there still exist **remnant** forces of colonialism at home and there is still the **danger** of subversion and aggression by imperialism and hegemonism. The **consolidation** of political independence is necessarily a process of repeated struggles. In the final analysis, political independence and economic independence are inseparable. Without political independence, it is impossible to achieve economic independence; without economic independence, a country’s independence is **incomplete** and **insecure**.” For this faithful disciple of Liu Shao-chi and Khrushchov, therefore, the countries that are referred to as “developing” (masking the political dependence which prevents or distorts their development), “have been” victims of oppression in the past. Today, they “have won political independence” and it is only necessary for them to eliminate the “remnant” forms of colonialism. For him, it is simply a question of “safeguarding” and of “consolidating” this independence, which he takes as having been won, against the “remnant” forces of colonialism or against the “danger” of imperialist aggression or subversion. For its part, economic independence must be attained so that the political independence already won can be “complete” and “secure”.

What, on the other hand, are we told by Comrade Mao and those who together with him drafted the comment criticizing the Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU entitled *Apologists of Neo-Colonialism*? In this document it is stated: "There is a whole group of countries which have declared their independence. But many of these countries have not completely shaken off imperialist and colonial control and enslavement and remain objects of imperialist plunder and aggression as well as arenas of contention between the old and new colonialists. In some, the old colonialists have changed into neo-colonialists and retain their colonial rule through their trained agents." (pp. 3-4) And further on: "The facts are clear. After World War II the imperialists have certainly not given up colonialism, but have merely adopted a new form, neo-colonialism. An important characteristic of such neo-colonialism is that the imperialists have been forced to change their old style of direct colonial rule in some areas and to adopt a new style of colonial rule and exploitation by relying on the agents they have selected and trained. The imperialists headed by the United States enslave or control the colonial countries and countries which have already declared their independence. . . . When they are unable to continue their rule over these countries by "peaceful" means, they engineer military coups d'état, carry out subversion or even resort to direct armed intervention and aggression." "This neo-colonialism," it concludes, "is a more pernicious and sinister form of colonialism". (pp. 4-5) This is a reply which is in accordance with the real ideas of Mao Tsetung on the so-called "political independence" which, according to the revisionist theses of Teng Hsiao-ping, the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have attained.

In another part of his speech to the United Nations, Teng Hsiao-ping states: "Since numerous Third World countries and people were able to **achieve political independence** through protracted struggle, certainly they will also be able, on this basis, to bring about through sustained struggle a thorough change in the **international economic relations** which are based on inequality, control and exploitation and thus create essential conditions for the **independent** development of their national economy by strengthening their unity and allying themselves with other countries subjected to superpower bullying as well as with the people of the whole world, including the people of the United States and the Soviet Union." For this loyal disciple of Khrushchov,

therefore, the question is not one of fighting to win genuine political independence by breaking the chains of colonialism and of neo-colonialism. It consists merely of improving “the international economic relations based on inequality” and, in this way, to be able to achieve the “independent development of their national economy”. An affirmation of this kind amounts to saying to the workers and the masses under the yoke of capitalism, “you are ‘free’ in the capitalist society, and to solve your problems, it is sufficient to demand better wages from your bosses”. Clearly, the statement of Teng Hsiao-ping quoted above is not addressed to peoples of the world who are politically and economically oppressed by colonialism and neo-colonialism, but aims instead at sharpening some contradictions between the lackeys of the superpowers and their masters, in order to gain some allies among them and build his own hegemony. What is said about this “original” method of Teng Hsiao-ping’s to “confront” imperialism, by the authors of the above-cited comment *Apologists of Neo-Colonialism?* It states: “The leaders of the CPSU have also created the theory that the national liberation movement has entered upon a ‘new stage’ having economic tasks as its core. Their argument is that, whereas ‘formerly, the struggle was carried on mainly in the political sphere’, today the economic question has become the ‘central task’ and ‘the basic link in the further development of the revolution’.” (p. 6) As we can see, on this front also Teng Hsiao-ping has drawn his inspiration not from Mao Tsetung but, as is generally the case for him, from his Soviet masters in opportunism and revisionism. The comment carries on to criticize these conceptions: “The national liberation movement has entered a new stage. But this is by no means the kind of ‘new stage’ described by the leadership of the CPSU. In the new stage, the level of political consciousness of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples has risen higher than ever and the revolutionary movement is surging forward with unprecedented intensity. They urgently demand the thorough elimination of the forces of imperialism and its lackeys in their own countries and strive for complete political and economic independence. The primary and most urgent task facing these countries is still the further development of the struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys. This struggle is still being waged fiercely in the political, economic, military, cultural, ideological and other spheres. And the struggles in all these spheres still find their most concentrated expression in

political struggle, which often unavoidably develops into armed struggle when the imperialists resort to direct or indirect armed suppression. It is important for the newly independent countries to develop their independent economy. But this task must never be separated from the struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys.” (pp. 6-7) And the comment, *Apologists of Neo-Colonialism?* concludes: “According to this theory of theirs” (and of their disciple Teng Hsiao-ping, we might add) “the fight against imperialism, old and new colonialism and their lackeys is, of course, no longer necessary, for colonialism is disappearing and economic development has become the central task of the national liberation movement. Does it not follow that the national liberation movement can be done away with altogether?” (p. 7) Teng Hsiao-ping — faithful parrot of the anti-Marxist theories of Khrushchov and his successors — should answer this question.

The efforts of Teng Hsiao-ping to abolish the task of the national liberation movement do not restrict themselves, however, to the economism which he proposes as a method for confronting imperialism and neo-colonialism. These economist affirmations, which he made use of in China as a pretext to oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat arise from the same, equally economist, concept which he uses to present the nature of neo-colonialism. Does Teng Hsiao-ping see neo-colonialism as “a more pernicious and sinister form of colonialism”, as a form of political domination by imperialism, “relying on the agents they have selected and trained”, such as Pinochet in Chile? In no way. In his speech to the UN, he stated: “The imperialists, and particularly the superpowers, **have adopted neo-colonialist methods** to continue and intensify their exploitation and plunder of the developing countries. **They export capital** to the developing countries and build there a ‘state within a state’ by means of such international monopoly organizations as ‘transnational corporations’ to carry out economic plunder and **political interference**.” Thus for Teng Hsiao-ping, neo-colonialism is not a “pernicious and sinister” form of colonialism, of the political and economic domination of imperialism, but rather just a “method” of exploitation and plunder as well as just a system of political “interference”. For him it is not a form of state domination exercised by imperialism and its agents (for example, the fascist military throughout almost all of Latin America and the pseudo-socialist bureaucracy in Eastern Europe) but rather a kind of “state within a state”, a result of the export of

the capital of the “transnational corporations”. Consequently, the true politically independent (according to Teng Hsiao-ping) state can liberate itself from such neo-colonialist “methods” by taking economic measures against the “transnationals” and thus eliminate their “political interference” and their “economic plunder”.

The essence of Teng Hsiao-ping’s reasoning, in opposition to the national liberation movement, derives from his desire to detach the bourgeois sectors which are lackeys of the superpowers from their imperialist masters, to ally himself with them and develop his own zone of influence. All of this by opposing that the people should throw out the imperialists and overthrow their lackeys on the basis of a genuine revolutionary-national liberation movement with a socialist perspective. We must not forget what Comrade Mao pointed out as early as the Eighth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee in 1959, in reference to opportunists like Teng Hsiao-ping, that they never were proletarian revolutionaries, but simply bourgeois or petty-bourgeois democrats who came into the ranks of the proletarian revolutionaries. They never were Marxist-Leninists, but fellow-travellers of the Party. Later on, referring to the same question, during the struggle against the “right-deviationist wind” whipped up by Teng Hsiao-ping against the Cultural Revolution, Comrade Mao pointed out before his death: “After the democratic revolution, the workers and the poor and lower-middle peasants did not stand still; they want revolution. On the other hand, a number of Party members do not want to go forward; some have even moved backward and opposed the revolution. Why? Because they have become high officials. They want to protect the interests of their caste.” If their plans for China are to make the revolution go back to its bourgeois stage and to oppose socialism, is it any wonder that they want to reach agreements with the bourgeois forces of what they call the “third world” or the “second world” and that they oppose genuine national liberation under proletarian leadership and with a socialist perspective? Their international policy is nothing but a projection of “the interests of their caste”, which Comrade Mao Tsetung denounced and fought, on the international level.

One of the greatest mystifications concocted by Teng Hsiao-ping in order to oppose the revolutionary national liberation movement and to unite with the bourgeoisie of the countries subjected to colonialism and neo-colonialism (including the sections of the

bourgeoisie that are lackeys of one of the superpowers), is his attempt to present the “third world countries” as the motive force of history. The Marxists, Comrade Mao among them, have often spoken of oppressed “nations”. This term refers to the inhabitants of a **country** united by a common origin, with common language and traditions, that is, basically the people of a country. The concept of country, on the other hand, only refers to the geographical and territorial limits within which, in general, a nation is situated. For the bourgeoisie, the representatives of those who live in a country are the ruling sectors which control the state apparatus and in particular the government of a country. For the Marxist-Leninists, the genuine representatives of those who inhabit a country are the people, whose genuine expression is the proletariat and its vanguard party, the Marxist-Leninist party. The Marxists have always spoken of the people as the motive force of history, both in the era of slavery as well as in the era of feudalism, and in the era of capitalism, considering that in this, the last mode of production based on the exploitation of man by man, the proletariat is the authentic representative of the people’s interests. Teng Hsiao-ping, on the other hand, treats us to the following innovation: the **countries** of the “third world” are the motive force of history. And this is not some translation error caused by the complexity of the Chinese language. He and those who support him or those who provided the inspiration for his opportunist thinking chose this designation of “countries” with care. By speaking of “countries” they left themselves a margin of ambiguity necessary to have it believed that they were interested in the fate of the peoples of these countries while in fact coming to an understanding with their governments, with the ruling bourgeois sectors. It was in this way that Teng Hsiao-ping stated in his speech to the United Nations that the “developing” **countries** constitute: “a revolutionary motive force propelling the wheel of world history and are the main force combatting colonialism, imperialism, and particularly the superpowers.” At the United Nations, the location chosen by Teng Hsiao-ping for his revisionist speech, the countries are “represented” by their governments, which in general are opposed to their peoples and in the service, with a few rare exceptions, of one or the other superpower. Without any doubt, it is to these governments that Teng Hsiao-ping is referring when he speaks of “countries” and in no way to their peoples. What we are saying, that for Teng, “countries” mean their governments, follows from the

entire context of his speech at the UN, from numerous subsequent speeches that we are aware of, as well as the propaganda of the Chinese publications which is inspired by his ideas. For example, in his speech to the UN, he cites as proof of the anti-imperialist struggle of the **countries** of the "third world": "the 10th Assembly of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, the 4th Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries, the Arab Summit Conference and the Islamic Summit Conference." Clearly, those who participate in all these "summit" conferences are the governments, the bourgeois, and often semi-feudal ruling sectors in these countries, and not their peoples. Further on in his speech, Teng Hsiao-ping himself makes a distinction with struggles that genuinely represent a struggle of the peoples when he says: "The armed struggles and mass movements carried out by the peoples of Mozambique, Angola, Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Azania against Portuguese colonial rule and white racism in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are surging ahead vigorously." In another passage of the speech, he says: "We hold that in both political and economic relations **countries** should base themselves on the Five Principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence." And to illustrate what he said earlier and to show how, for him, "country" is synonymous with "state", he immediately adds: "We are opposed to the establishment of hegemony and spheres of influence by any **country** in any part of the world in violation of these principles."* On another occasion, receiving Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany, Teng Hsiao-ping expressed himself in the following manner: "Chancellor Schmidt has come to China on the third anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two countries." Without any doubt, such relations "between countries" are relations with the reactionary government of West Germany and not with its people.

The articles in Chinese publications written to support Teng Hsiao-ping's line do not leave any doubt that "country" is

* *Translator's note:* The English translation of Teng Hsiao-ping's speech uses the word **country** in both of the last two passages quoted, whereas the French (and presumably the Spanish) translation employs the word **state** (Etat) in the previous quote, referring to political and economic relations between states (entre Etats).

considered as synonymous with “state”. Thus for example, in *Peking Review* No. 44 in November 1974, we can read: “The situation in which the superpowers controlled the United Nations has been changed. Third world **countries** now form the overwhelming majority of the UN member states, thus changing the composition of this world organization.” Thus, for Teng Hsiao-ping and his clique, “countries” means: Pinochet, Banzer, Videla and other members of the fascist military in Latin America who send representatives of their governments to the United Nations. In *Peking Review* No. 43, October 1974, we read: “In effect, the results of the general debate have turned out to be the exposure and repudiation of the two superpowers by the Third World **countries.**” In another article, it is stated: “China has established economic and technical relations with more than 50 countries providing them with aid to the best of her ability.” We can be certain that the portion of the “aid” and cooperation provided to the Pinochet government has nothing in common with the interests of the Chilean people.

But there is more. Not only does Teng Hsiao-ping consider that the “countries” of what he calls the “third world”, i.e. their governments, constitute “a revolutionary motive force propelling the wheel of world history”, but he also considers that the vanguard of the peoples in the struggle for their liberation is these governments established by the ruling classes which exploit the people—which often are fascist and act as lackeys of one or the other superpower, and not the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties. In the same speech given at the reception for Helmut Schmidt, he states: “The unity and struggle of the third world countries have ushered in a new stage in the struggle of the people of the world against colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism.” Khrushchov himself did not dare to formulate such a gross anti-Marxist outrage! In this sentence which will go down in history—the history of revisionism — he makes a clear distinction between “countries” and “people” — in order to place the latter under the hegemony of their governments, and he presents this as a “new stage” in the struggle against “colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism”. Indeed Comrade Mao was correct when he said, concerning Teng Hsiao-ping: “He makes no distinction between imperialism and Marxism.” Comrade Mao, on the other hand, formulated the exact opposite thesis to that of Teng Hsiao-ping when he stated: “A weak nation can defeat a strong, a small nation can defeat a big. The people of a small country can certainly defeat

aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, take up arms and grasp in their hands the destiny of their country.”

In his calls, Mao Tsetung always addressed himself to the world's people, whom he considered as the motive force of history. In 1958, he pointed out: “If the monopoly capitalist groups of the USA persist in their policy of aggression and war, the day will inevitably arrive when they will be hanged by the world's people. The accomplices of the USA should expect the same fate.” In 1964, in a statement in support of the people of the Congo, he stated: “People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs! People of the world, be courageous, dare to fight, defy difficulties and advance wave upon wave. Then the whole world will belong to the people. Monsters of all kinds shall be destroyed.” Regarding the Yankee aggression in Santo Domingo, Comrade Mao pointed out: “The U.S. armed intervention in the Dominican Republic has aroused a new wave of opposition to U.S. imperialism among the people of Latin America and the world. . . The people in the socialist camp should unite, the people of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America should unite . . . and form the broadest united front to oppose the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war and to defend world peace.” The slogan for the formation of this front is: unity with all the popular and patriotic forces to throw out imperialism following a harsh and protracted war. He also made other statements in the same tone against racial discrimination in the United States (1963), against the U.S. aggression in South Viet Nam (1963), in support of the people of Panama (1964), in support of the black Americans (1968). In 1969, he stated: “Imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers. . . The revisionists are also paper tigers. . . The Soviet revisionists and the U.S. imperialists are at the crossroads and the people of the world cannot leave them unpunished for the numerous crimes they have committed. The people of all the countries of the world have risen up, a new era of opposition to U.S. imperialism and to Soviet social-imperialism has begun.”

The *25-Point Letter*, for its part, states: “U.S. imperialism is pressing its policies of aggression and war all over the world, but the outcome is bound to be the opposite of that intended — it will only be to hasten the awakening of the people in all countries and to hasten their revolutions. The U.S. imperialists have thus placed themselves in opposition to the people of the whole world and have become encircled by them. The international proletariat must and

can unite all the forces that can be united, make use of the internal contradictions in the enemy camp and establish the broadest united front against the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys. The realistic and correct course is to entrust the fate of the people and of mankind to the unity and struggle of the world proletariat and to the unity and struggle of the people in all countries.” (p. 12) A little further on, passing judgement in advance on the revisionist line of Teng Hsiao-ping, the document states: “The attitude taken towards the revolutionary struggles of the people in the Asian, African and Latin American countries is an important criterion for differentiating those who want revolution from those who do not.” (p. 15)

As far as the path that all the countries which are colonized or subjected to neo-colonialism must follow to liberate themselves, there exist numerous writings of Comrade Mao which totally contradict the anti-Marxist affirmations of Teng Hsiao-ping. National liberation is the fruit of a revolution in the subjugated country, a revolution aimed at overthrowing the forces — both feudal and bourgeois — which serve as props for the imperialist domination and which, themselves, in their capacity as big exploiters of the people, also constitute a target of the people’s democratic and anti-imperialist revolution. National liberation also implies the decision to confront through a people’s liberation war the attempts of imperialism to maintain its domination through force of arms. At the present time, such a liberation struggle cannot achieve its objectives under the leadership of the bourgeoisie, even of those sections of it which are anti-imperialist. But even less so can it achieve them under the leadership of the sections of the bourgeoisie which are pro-imperialist, collaborators or lackeys of imperialism, which are what we find in the governments of a large part of the countries said to be in the “third world”, sections which for Teng Hsiao-ping constitute the “motive force of history”. The People’s Democratic Revolution which makes national liberation possible cannot lead to an independence under the domination of the bourgeoisie, for the weakness of the bourgeoisie in these countries which are colonized or subjugated by neo-colonialism leads it inevitably to tie itself to imperialism and submit to it and, in our times, to one or the other superpower.

As early as 1939-1940, in his works entitled *The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party* and *On New Democracy*, Comrade Mao broadly developed his position on the People’s Democratic Revolution. He states: “Imperialism and the

feudal landlord class being the chief enemies of the Chinese revolution at this stage, what are the present tasks of the revolution? Unquestionably, the main tasks are to strike at these two enemies, to carry out a national revolution to overthrow foreign imperialist oppression and a democratic revolution to overthrow feudal landlord oppression, the primary and foremost task being the national revolution to overthrow imperialism." And he adds: "These two great tasks are interrelated. Unless imperialist rule is overthrown, the rule of the feudal landlord class cannot be terminated, because imperialism is its main support. Conversely, unless help is given to the peasants in their struggle to overthrow the feudal landlord class, it will be impossible to build powerful revolutionary contingents to overthrow imperialist rule, because the feudal landlord class is the main social base of imperialist rule in China and the peasantry is the main force in the Chinese revolution."

Regarding the necessity for proletarian leadership in the revolution, at no matter what stage, Comrade Mao has said: "In this era, any revolution in a colony or semi-colony that is directed against imperialism, i.e. against the international bourgeoisie or international capitalism, no longer comes within the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, but within the new category. It is no longer part of the old bourgeois, or capitalist, world revolution, but is part of the new world revolution, the proletarian-socialist world revolution. . . it is no longer a revolution of the old type **led by the bourgeoisie** with the aim of establishing a capitalist society and a state under bourgeois dictatorship. It belongs to the new type of revolution **led by the proletariat** with the aim, in the first stage, of establishing a new-democratic society and a state under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes." (pp. 7-8). And he adds: "Such a revolution attacks imperialism at its very roots, and is therefore not tolerated but opposed by imperialism. However, it is favoured by socialism and supported by the land of socialism and the socialist international proletariat." (p. 8). Elsewhere, in his work *On the People's Democratic Dictatorship*, he states: "The people's democratic dictatorship needs the leadership of the working class. For it is only the working class that is most far-sighted, most selfless and most thoroughly revolutionary. The entire history of revolution proves that without the leadership of the working class revolution fails and that with the leadership of the working class revolution triumphs." More recently, in 1964, in

the *25-Point Letter* drafted under his guidance, he reproaches the Soviet revisionists for claiming (as does Teng Hsiao-ping) that “the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism can be resolved without revolution by the oppressed nations.” (p. 7). At another point in the document, it is stated: “As the internal social contradictions and the international class struggle sharpen, the bourgeoisie, and particularly the big bourgeoisie. . . increasingly tend to become retainers of imperialism and to pursue anti-popular, anti-Communist and counter-revolutionary policies.” (pp. 17-18). And further on: “In the revolutionary struggle it supports progressive nationalism and opposes reactionary nationalism. It must always draw a clear line of demarcation between itself and bourgeois nationalism, to which it must never fall captive.” (p. 17). Then, stressing the necessity of proletarian hegemony, he adds: “If the proletariat becomes the tail of the landlords and bourgeoisie in the revolution, no real or thorough victory in the national democratic revolution is possible, and even if victory of a kind is gained, it will be impossible to consolidate it.” (pp. 17-18). For its part, the pamphlet *Apologists of Neo-Colonialism?* states: “Another idea often propagated by the leaders of the CPSU is that a country can build socialism under no matter what leadership, including even that of a reactionary nationalist like Nehru. This is still further removed from the idea of proletarian leadership.”

Teng Hsiao-ping, on the other hand, takes the political independence of the countries he includes in his “third world” as already won. In so doing, he denies the necessity of carrying out in each country a revolution that leads to freeing it from colonialism and neo-colonialism. For him, the only thing that remains is to eliminate the “remnants” of imperialist interference, on the basis of measures aimed at consolidating economic independence. The “motive force” of this process, for Teng Hsiao-ping, would be the bourgeois or semi-feudal governments of his “third world”, which include fascists, reactionaries and lackeys of imperialism. What Teng Hsiao-ping and his clique want in fact is to hold back the genuine movement for revolutionary national liberation in a socialist perspective in order to find, in the purest bourgeois nationalist style, equally bourgeois allies (and even semi-feudal ones) for their revisionist caste which wants to take control of China, restore capitalism there, and transform China into a new superpower. In their efforts to establish their sphere of influence and hegemony in the world, they simply want, in the countries

under the baton of imperialism or social-imperialism, to detach the bourgeois sectors obedient to one or the other superpower from their masters, in order to offer themselves as an ally in place of the two superpowers. In order to do this, they encourage them to put forward a number of economic demands. The main enemy of this strategy and the principal obstacle to it, more so than the two rival superpowers, are the peoples of the world and their revolutionary advance guard under Marxist-Leninist proletarian leadership, who are aiming at liberating themselves from **all** oppression, exploitation and hegemony and at advancing towards socialism, which Teng Hsiao-ping is attempting to eradicate from his own country. Seeking to eliminate this danger, Teng Hsiao-ping denies the peoples who are colonized or subjugated by neo-colonialism their role — under proletarian leadership — as the motive force of their liberation and attempts to attribute this role to the ruling sectors with which he is coming to an understanding through diplomatic relations and with which he gets together at the UN and in the other international bodies.

What can these reactionary theories spun by Teng Hsiao-ping and his accomplices, with the aim of winning bourgeois allies in the colonial, neo-colonial or advanced capitalist countries and to contend with the two superpowers for hegemony, have in common with the revolutionary international line of Comrade Mao? To try and pass off one thing for another is to believe that the entire world mixes up black cats and white cats.

What we have just analyzed does not exhaust the reactionary theses which Teng Hsiao-ping and the “capitalist roaders” that he presently represents are presenting as an international line. Revealing in advance his sinister plans for the restoration of capitalism in China, he persists in obliterating its character and its role as a socialist society and the internationalist duties which flow from it. “China”, he says “is a socialist country, and a developing country as well. China belongs to the Third World.” And elsewhere, speaking in the plural about China and the other countries belonging to his “third world”, he says: “The developing countries have great potentials for developing their economy independently. As long as a country makes unremitting efforts in the light of its own specific features and conditions and advances along the road of independence and self-reliance, it is fully possible for it to attain gradually a high level of development never reached by previous generations in the modernization of industry.” After giving various

pieces of economic advice, he concludes by saying that in this way they can “prepare the conditions for eliminating as quickly as possible the state of poverty and backwardness”.

Thus we see that Teng Hsiao-ping, after affirming, as if to exonerate himself, that China is still socialist, likens it completely to the countries of the “third world” which are in one way or another under the domination of the superpowers. In fact, in a later formulation, he completely eliminates the significance of the socialist revolution carried out by the Chinese people at the price of their blood, as he eliminates all differences between socialist China and the colonial and neo-colonial countries, to which he attributes the capacity to “develop” and to end their state of “poverty” and “backwardness”, without carrying out revolution to liberate themselves from imperialism and without advancing towards the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat as in China. Conclusion: for Teng Hsiao-ping, the People’s Democratic Revolution, the Socialist Revolution, the Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, have no significance, for the other “developing” countries to which he likens China, can obtain the same results without making revolution. Besides denying the significance of these revolutions which have taken place in China, he also proposes as a “development” programme for the colonial and neo-colonial countries, the theory of “bourgeois development”, a well-known old hoax long propagated by imperialism and its agents to convince the peoples that, without making revolution and simply through working harder — i.e. through letting themselves be more intensely exploited — they will eliminate “poverty and backwardness”.

In his shameful refusal to acknowledge the clear difference which exists between a socialist state and a state under the domination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, in seeking some kind of similarity based on the degree of economic development, Teng Hsiao-ping exhibits his contempt for and opposition to socialism, for which he was a target of struggle during the Cultural Revolution. For this pseudo-Marxist, it is not the question of state power, the nature of the state, the relations of production, which characterize a society, but simply its degree of economic development. So that, if China’s accelerated pace of development continues, according to the economist logic of Teng Hsiao-ping, it would rapidly become part of the “second world” and, very soon, it would become a superpower and join the “first world”, for the measure he uses to

classify countries is their degree of economic development. For Teng Hsiao-ping, China does not constitute a socialist model towards which, under proletarian leadership, the oppressed nations are converging, a model radically different from the system of colonial and neo-colonial oppression and exploitation under which they now exist. Being interested in allying himself not with the proletariat or the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, but rather with the ruling sectors which have established themselves in government, he persists in ignoring China's role as a socialist model, as well as the basic differences between socialism and colonialism. In doing so, he is simply slandering socialism, renouncing the vanguard role and responsibility that must be borne by the proletariat in power and belittling the role of proletarian politics and proletarian ideology. In sum, the same thing that he persisted, and continues to persist, in doing inside China — making use of economist arguments to oppose the Cultural Revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The first aspect of his betrayal of Marxism, for which the *25-Point Letter* denounces Khrushchov and his disciples, is: “blot(ing) out the class content of the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps and fail(ing) to see this contradiction as one between states under the dictatorship of the proletariat and states under the dictatorship of the monopoly capitalists.” (p. 7) Teng Hsiao-ping goes further — not only does he attempt to blot out “the class content of the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps” but he tries to blot out the socialist camp itself. In his speech to the UN, he states: “As a result of the emergence of social-imperialism, the socialist camp which existed for a time after World War II is no longer in existence.” At a time when there only existed one socialist country, the USSR, Lenin maintained: “There are now two worlds; the old world of capitalism . . . and the rising new world, which is still very weak, but which will grow, for it is invincible”, referring to socialism.

What did Comrade Mao think about the role of a socialist regime? In his book *On New Democracy*, referring to the only existing socialist country — the USSR before the revisionist betrayal — he stated: “the first imperialist world war and the first victorious socialist revolution, the October Revolution, have changed the whole course of world history and ushered in a new era. It is an era in which the world capitalist front has collapsed in one part of the globe (one-sixth of the world) and has fully revealed its decadence

everywhere else, in which the remaining capitalist parts cannot survive without relying more than ever on the colonies and semi-colonies, and in which the proletariat of the capitalist countries is steadily freeing itself from the social-imperialist influence of the social-democratic parties and has proclaimed its support for the liberation movement in the colonies and the semi-colonies. In this era, any revolution in a colony or semi-colony that is directed against imperialism, i.e. against the international bourgeoisie or international capitalism, no longer comes within the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, but within the new category. It is no longer part of the old bourgeois, or capitalist, world revolution, but is part of the new world revolution, the proletarian-socialist revolution. Such revolutionary colonies and semi-colonies can no longer be regarded as allies of the counter-revolutionary front of world capitalism; they have become allies of the revolutionary front of world socialism.” (p.7). And in 1939, in an interview with a correspondent of the newspaper New China, he stated: “Outside the capitalist world there is a world of light, the socialist Soviet Union.” Can we compare this grandiose vision of socialism of Comrade Mao — at a time when there only existed one socialist country — with the shabby attempts of Teng Hsiao-ping to liken China to the countries oppressed by imperialism and to cease to recognize the existence of a socialist world? Isn’t the attitude of Teng Hsiao-ping a foreshadowing of what he wants to accomplish in China — to liquidate the socialist system and restore capitalism — for which he was combatted by Mao Tsetung and the Marxist-Leninists? Does this not mean denying the role which the national liberation movement in the colonies and semi-colonies plays as an integral part of the socialist revolution, by persisting in trying to make it revert to the stage of the “old bourgeois revolution”? Making a farsighted analysis of positions like those of Teng Hsiao-ping, Comrade Mao noted: “The revisionists deny the difference between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line.”

This entire revisionist strategy of Teng Hsiao-ping which we have analyzed is synthesized in the theory of “three worlds”. This theory is the quintessence of the opportunist and chauvinist line of Teng Hsiao-ping. In this theory, the existence of the socialist world is simply passed over in silence, confirming what we have demonstrated, namely that for Teng Hsiao-ping and his supporters,

socialism is nothing more than a word, without any importance. The theory of “three worlds” grants the existence of only a “first world” which is equivalent to the two superpowers, a “second world” which groups a series of developed capitalist countries, and the “third world”, in which it includes China, whose basic characteristic is not that they are nations oppressed and exploited by imperialism but that they are “developing”. According to the theory of “three worlds”, it is possible and necessary to unite **all** the forces of the “second” and the “third” world against the “first”, i.e. against the superpowers. As many Marxist-Leninist parties have already demonstrated, this theory is absolutely one-sided, mechanical, economist, completely lacking in class analysis and anti-Marxist. It is nothing other than a new version decked out in modern dress of the old bourgeois theory which speaks of “developed” and “underdeveloped” or “developing” countries, which, by putting forward that they are already “developing”, tries to sow the illusion that it is possible to “develop” without needing to make revolution to shake off the colonial or neo-colonial yoke. The only “novelty” of the theory of “three worlds” by comparison with the bourgeois formulations that it copies, is that it recognizes the existence of two “superdeveloped” nations, which it classifies as the “first world”.

The theory of “three worlds” divides and groups the nations solely on the basis of their stage of economic development, taking no account of the character of the ruling political regime and omitting all class analysis — the most important thing for genuine Marxist-Leninists — which is applicable to all nations. By this mechanical, one-sided and false classification, an attempt is made to ignore the fact that within the colonial countries, and even more within those dominated by neo-colonialism, there are forces which are in the service of the two superpowers’ domination; forces which, as a rule, hold power and govern in these countries of the alleged “third world”. In the developed capitalist nations, it ignores the reactionary role of the monopoly sections of the bourgeoisie, which are allied with and closely linked to U.S. imperialism, are often imperialists themselves, and, in any case, are the mortal enemies of the proletarian revolution which is on the agenda in these countries.

In this absurd opportunist theory that Teng Hsiao-ping is promoting as an international strategy of “struggle” against the superpowers — in reality against one of them — these monopoly bourgeois sectors are considered as “allies”.

Concerning the lackeys of the superpowers who govern in a large portion of the countries said to be part of the "third world", Teng Hsiao-ping not only considers them as allies, but as nothing less than the revolutionary motive force propelling the wheel of world history.

The revisionist and anti-Marxist nature of this theory of "three worlds", which the falsifiers who concocted it have the audacity to attribute to Mao Tsetung, has been so frequently demonstrated that it is not necessary to dwell upon it. What it is interesting to clarify is that through this opportunist theory, Teng Hsiao-ping and his reactionary crew are coming forward to hold back the people's democratic and national liberation revolution in the countries of the so-called "third world", to hold back the socialist revolution in the "second world" and, in exchange for certain economic and other pledges by China, to create their own sphere of influence and hegemony.

This is what is behind their interest in linking up with the bourgeois forces of the capitalist countries and especially of Asia, Africa and Latin America, in pushing them to progressively break off their economic ties with the superpowers.

In fact, all the propaganda of Chinese publications presently and for some time now has been geared to promote and support economic measures adopted by these bourgeois sectors through their governments and other institutions that they control which have the appearance of being "independent", especially if they are taken in opposition to Soviet social-imperialism. The struggles of the peoples are almost entirely passed over in silence.

What is more, by wanting to present Soviet social-imperialism as "the most dangerous" and "the most warlike" superpower, by arguing that it has arrived on the scene late in the division of the world and that it is "obliged to dispute every inch of ground with the United States", Teng Hsiao-ping and his clique are in fact accepting the U.S. domination and in many respects are supporting and strengthening it. It is quite a curious "logic" that these opportunists present. As there exists the "imminent" danger of a world war launched by the Soviets and of the extension of their domination, we must support, they say, the reactionary governments and sections that oppose them even though they may be big exploiters and instruments of the domination (not potential but real and present) of U.S. imperialism.

Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen economic and military

pacts such as the Common Market and NATO, instruments of the domination of Yankee imperialism and of the monopolies of each country, on condition that they oppose the danger of expansion of social-imperialism. In sum, let us accept and strengthen the present domination and exploitation of our peoples by U.S. imperialism and the reactionary forces of each country, give up thoughts of liberation and revolution, to avoid the danger of possible domination by Soviet social-imperialism. Let us allow the tiger to destroy our house to prevent the wolf from coming in through the window.

Teng Hsiao-ping and his clique felt themselves to be under attack and were indignant at the joint declaration of the Marxist-Leninist parties of Latin America because, in reference to the superpowers, it says that it would be a grave mistake to ally oneself with one of them to combat the other. If this statement is correct, why such indignation and so much effort exerted to prevent this declaration from being made public?

This opposition is due to the fact that the policy of Teng Hsiao-ping — to strengthen the instruments of domination of Yankee imperialism and to discourage the liberation struggle of the revolutionaries in the U.S. sphere of influence — objectively amounts to that: to supporting one superpower under the pretext of combating the other.

There have been efforts to justify this collaboration with American imperialism by distorting the correct formula regarding the utilization of the contradictions among the enemies. On this subject, the 25-Point Letter states clearly the limits for the utilization of the contradictions among the enemies: "The proletarian party must lead the masses in waging struggles against the enemies, and it must know how to utilize the contradictions among those enemies. But the purpose of using these contradictions is to make it easier to attain the goal of the people's revolutionary struggles and not to liquidate these struggles." We ask: this condescending attitude, this support which Teng Hsiao-ping and his group give to the pro-U.S. dictatorships in Latin America, on grounds of their opposition to Soviet imperialism, does it have as its purpose "to make it easier to attain the goal of the people's revolutionary struggles"? Obviously not. Perhaps the fundamental task of the Latin American people is not precisely the overthrowing of these fascist dictatorships imposed by U.S. imperialism, the destruction of a very concrete and real rule by this

superpower. As far as Western Europe is concerned, some "leaders" like Jurquet in France, Vilar in Portugal and some other opportunists have called to strengthen the bourgeois armies, to ally with the monopolist bourgeoisies, have held mass meetings jointly with fascist groups because they were "anti-social-imperialists", and have offered their support for NATO and the European Common Market. When the Chinese officials who are followers of Teng Hsiao-ping meet with these European "leaders", are they supporting the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in Europe? Can we think of a more grotesque distortion of the proletarian policies than abandoning revolution and proclaiming alliances with the monopolies and the superpowers which exploit the people, using as pretext the eventual danger of a rule and subjugation by the other superpower?

The most shameless and scandalous side of all this is that Teng Hsiao-ping and his followers pretend to promote this pragmatist, chauvinist and hegemonist atrocity they are using as foreign policy for China, to the rank of "Marxist-Leninist strategy", while striving to bribe and blackmail other Marxist-Leninist organizations to support this policy against the interests of their respective peoples. It is easy to understand why West Germany's Chancellor Schmidt, representative of the big bourgeoisie, has declared, to keep Teng happy, and of course to arrive at some business agreements: "The Alliance of the Atlantic between North America and Europe is still the unvariable basis for the existence of the Federal German Republic", and that: "We are satisfied by the fact that your government has made a positive evaluation of these efforts of the European Community." It is grotesque that people who call themselves Marxist-Leninists throw away the revolutionary aims and tasks in their countries to become mere public relations agents of the chauvinist and opportunist policy of a China controlled by those who wish to restore capitalism in that country. The *25-Point Letter* defines the role of the revolutionaries in the advanced capitalist countries: "In the capitalist countries which U.S. imperialism controls or is trying to control, the working class and the people should direct their attacks mainly against U.S. imperialism, but also against their own monopoly capitalists and other reactionary forces who are betraying the national interests" and adds: "While actively leading immediate struggles, communists in the capitalist countries should link them with the struggle for long-range and general interests, educate the masses in a Marxist-

Leninist revolutionary spirit, ceaselessly raise their political consciousness and undertake the historical task of the proletarian revolution. If they fail to do so, if they regard the immediate movement as everything, determine their conduct from case to case, adapt themselves to the events of the day and sacrifice the basic interests of the proletariat, that is out-and-out social democracy.”

They have also tried to present the anti-Marxist strategy of the “three worlds” as an application of the conception of Comrade Mao of a united front against the main enemies. Nevertheless, the united front programme of Mao Tsetung, based on the real class contradictions and conceived always under proletarian leadership, cannot be mistaken for the absurd and reactionary caricature that Teng Hsiao-ping is offering for sale. In Teng’s “united front” the proletariat and the people of the “third world” must subordinate themselves to U.S. imperialism’s running dogs; in the “second world”, they must subordinate themselves to the capitalist monopolies and to the economic and military organizations controlled by U.S. imperialism, to “combat” the danger represented by Soviet social-imperialism. How can such a “front” develop itself while curbing the revolution of national liberation in the countries under colonialist and neo-colonialist rule or the proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries? In Apologists of Neo-Colonialism? it is said: “The wrong line of the leaders of the, CPSU completely abandons the task of fighting imperialism and colonialism and opposes wars of national liberation; this means it wants the proletariat and the Communist Parties of the oppressed nations and countries to roll up their patriotic banner of opposing imperialism and struggling for national independence and surrender it to others. In that case, how could one even talk about an anti-imperialist united front or of proletarian leadership?” The same could be said for the advanced capitalist countries. The national liberation revolution has as necessary targets the semi-feudal and the pro-imperialist bourgeois groups; the proletarian revolution has as necessary targets the bourgeoisie, and the monopolist bourgeoisie in particular. There cannot be a Marxist-oriented world united front that does not take as its base the class contradictions of each country, and still less, which opposes the basic revolutionary tasks in each country.

While following their chauvinist and hegemonist goals, Teng Hsiao-ping and his group are also completely distorting the ideas of

Lenin and Mao Tsetung on war and peace, on peaceful co-existence, on non-intervention and others. Under statements more subtle and deceiving than those of the leadership of the CPSU they hide the same purposes. The leadership of the CPSU is striving to frighten the people with the threat of nuclear war in order to restrain revolution in the capitalist countries and national liberation in the colonies and semi-colonies, as a means of penetrating them and exercising their hegemony in order to, once in power, prevent the resistance of the proletariat and people. Since most of the world is still under the rule of U.S. imperialism, with the internal support of the bourgeois and reactionary forces, could we not say that Khrushchov's attitude of opposing revolution by invoking the danger of a nuclear world war is the same as Teng's policy of sabotaging revolution and national liberation, and consolidating the oppressive mechanisms of U.S. imperialism and the reactionaries of each country, by screaming about the "imminence" of the Soviet invasion? The only difference is that while the social-imperialists found **one** superpower in their way to expansion and hegemonism, and because of that they preached "peaceful co-existence" and fear of atomic war, Teng Hsiao-ping and his group have found **two** superpowers, and so, along with curbing the peoples' struggles they have supported the imperialist tiger against the social-imperialist wolf.

Actually, after striving to spread panic, announcing the "imminence" of the war, it is not to the people that Teng and his group have appealed to prevent it, but to imperialism and its allies, calling for the reinforcement of their armaments, of their military blocs and other types of pacts. Nevertheless, as is well known, the increase in military power of imperialism and its bourgeois allies is chiefly aimed and primarily used against the peoples they suppress and exploit. Hence, by promoting the armaments race of one superpower and its allies and stimulating some pseudo-Marxist groups to praise such policies, Teng and his opportunist and chauvinist clique are in fact reinforcing the chains of oppression and exploitation. To encourage the arming of one of the contending imperialist blocs has never been the role of a socialist state or of the proletariat in power; instead, they must mobilize the proletariat and the people to tie the hands of the aggressors and to prevent the danger of war by carrying the revolution forward. The main concern of the Marxist-Leninists, — either in striving to prevent the menace of war, inherent to the existence of capitalism, or in par-

icipating in it if it breaks out, turning it to the benefit of the people — is that of carrying revolution forward. In the event of a war between the superpowers, it is not for the Marxist-Leninists to push the people to either side, but to transform this imperialist war, as Lenin did, into a revolutionary civil war to conquer power. Comrade Mao, in the article *Leninism or Social-Imperialism?*, published on April 22, 1970, said in this respect: “With regard to the question of world war, there are but two possibilities: One is that the war will give rise to revolution and the other is that revolution will prevent the war.” And he continues: “People of the world, unite and oppose the war of aggression launched by any imperialism or social-imperialism, especially one in which atom bombs are used as weapons! If such a war breaks out, the people of the world should use revolutionary war to eliminate the war of aggression, and preparations should be made right now!” Also reflecting Comrade Mao’s opinion, the *25-Point Letter* says: “The people of the world universally demand the prevention of a new world war. And it is possible to prevent a new world war. The question then is, what is the way to secure world peace? According to the Leninist viewpoint, world peace can be won only by the struggles of the people in all countries and not by begging the imperialists for it. World peace can only be effectively defended by relying on the development of the forces of the socialist camp, on the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people of all countries, on the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations and on the struggles of all peace-loving people and countries. Such is the Leninist policy. Any policy to the contrary definitely will not lead to world peace but will only encourage the ambitions of the imperialists and increase the danger of world war.”

As for the policy of using the danger of world war as blackmail, calling it “inevitable” and “imminent”, Teng is not the first to do it in China. Chiang Kai-shek used it with similar purposes. In the *Comment on the Open Letter of the CC of the CPUS*,* No. 5 “Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace”, it is stressed that: “The Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries gave this (the danger of world war) great publicity in order to intimidate the Chinese people. Frightened by such blackmail, some comrades became faint-hearted in the face of the armed attacks launched by the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries with U.S. imperialist support and dared not firmly oppose the counter-revolutionary war with a revolutionary war. Comrade Mao Tsetung held different views. He

* *Transcriber’s note*: “CPUS” is undoubtedly a misprint and should read CPSU.

pointed out that a new world war could be prevented provided resolute and effective struggles were waged against world reaction.”

This same “Comment”, while criticizing the bellicose blackmail of the Soviet leadership, makes some remarks which fit perfectly some of Teng Hsiao-ping’s statements: “They use nuclear blackmail to intimidate the people of the socialist countries and forbid them to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, thus helping U.S. imperialism to isolate the socialist camp and suppress peoples’ revolutions. They use nuclear blackmail to intimidate the oppressed peoples and nations and to prohibit them from making revolution, and they collaborate with U.S. imperialism in stamping out the ‘sparks’ of revolution, thus enabling it freely to carry on its policies of aggression and war in the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the socialist camp. They also intimidate the allies of the United States and forbid them to struggle against the control it has imposed on them, thus helping U.S. imperialism to enslave these countries and consolidate its position. By this line of action, the leaders of the CPSU have altogether relinquished the struggle against the imperialist policies of aggression and war. This line of action denies the united front against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys and in defence of world peace. It tries to impose the greatest isolation not on the arch enemy of world peace but on the peace forces. It means the liquidation of the fighting task of defending world peace. This is a line that serves the ‘global strategy’ of U.S. imperialism. It is not the road to world peace but the road leading to greater danger of war and to war itself.” Is this not a faithful advance picture of the blackmail raised by Chinese revisionists today and of the services they render to U.S. imperialism?

Teng is as faithful a follower of Khrushchov’s policy of war blackmail as he is of his policy of “peaceful coexistence”. In those places where he aims to establish his hegemony and to press for the breaking up of the links between the superpowers and the bourgeoisie, he imposes “peaceful coexistence” and the “non-interference in the internal affairs” of other countries as basic lines in China’s foreign policy. If some country breaks diplomatic relations with Taiwan in order to establish them instead with China, then the government of that country can be sure that no matter what crimes and atrocities it perpetrates against the people, no criticism or denunciation will come from the mouths of those who

control China's foreign policy; still less need they fear that these bureaucrats will offer support to the struggles of the people they are suppressing. To those who apply Teng's international policy it does not matter whether the governments with whom they maintain relations are fascists, illegitimate, imposed on the people through ruthless intervention, or puppets of imperialism. Through the opening of diplomatic relations with China, those countries have bought the right to do what they like with impunity as far as the Chinese foreign policy officials are concerned. Dictators like Mobutu, who in the Chinese publications previous to the rise of Teng's policies, was depicted as a "running dog of imperialism", "national traitor to the Congo", "slaughterer of the people", "Lumumba's murderer", "U.S. imperialist lackey", etc., became, overnight, personalities worthy of high praise and beyond any criticism. And this sort of diplomatic deal does not force only the government of China to praise or be silent, but also the Communist Party and the Chinese mass organizations. Meanwhile, the political forces, the mass media and many groups and individuals in the capitalist countries, whether they have or do not have relations with China, freely state all sorts of opinions on China's internal affairs and make tendentious interpretations of the events of that country, of course in order to serve their own purposes.

In brief, Teng Hsiao-ping and his group have established, at least towards the U.S. imperialist camp, the line of "peaceful co-existence" and "non-interference", instead of proletarian internationalism, as China's foreign policy. Is this the foreign policy advocated by Comrade Mao? Or is it the policy put forth by Lenin in the USSR? Comrade Mao himself gives the answer, through the "Comment on the Open Letter of the CC of the CPSU No. 6 *Peaceful Coexistence, Two Diametrically Opposed Policies*": "Lenin advanced the policy of peaceful coexistence as a policy to be pursued by the proletariat in power towards countries with different social systems. He never made it the sum total of a socialist country's foreign policy. Time and again Lenin made it clear that the fundamental principle of this foreign policy was proletarian internationalism. He said: 'Soviet Russia considers it her greatest pride to help the workers of the whole world in their difficult struggle for the overthrow of capitalism.'"

Where did Teng and his cronies obtain their policy of liquidation of proletarian internationalism in the name of "peaceful co-existence" and "non-interference"? As has become usual for him,

he learned it from his schoolmaster Khrushchov. In the "Comment" quoted above it is said: "The leaders of the CPSU maintain that peaceful coexistence is the overriding and supreme principle for solving contemporary social problems. They assert that it is 'the categorical imperative of modern times' and 'the imperious demand of the epoch.' They say that 'peaceful coexistence alone is the best and the sole acceptable way to solve the vitally important problems confronting society' and that the principle of peaceful coexistence should be made the 'basic law of life of the whole of modern society'."

Making the analysis of Khrushchov's policy, the "Comment" adds: "Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence was directed against the imperialist policies of aggression and war, whereas Khrushchov's peaceful coexistence caters to imperialism and abets the imperialist policies of aggression and war." It is worth while to ask: Is it not exactly what Teng and his group are doing when they favour the reinforcement of the military pacts, economic pacts and other tools of domination of U.S. imperialism and its big bourgeois allies? Is this not what they are doing when they quietly accept U.S. imperialism's open intervention in imposing fascist military dictatorships in Latin America and other areas without exposing and condemning this bullying and without giving any support to the people's resistance against these dictatorships? Have we not seen how it is these dictatorships, products of this intervention, which are receiving support from Teng and Company? Is this not the false "peaceful coexistence" of Khrushchov which "caters to imperialism, and abets the imperialist policies of aggression and war"?

Further, "Comment" No. 6 continues: "Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence is based on the standpoint of international class struggle, whereas Khrushchov's peaceful coexistence strives to replace international class struggle with international class collaboration. Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence proceeds from the historical mission of the international proletariat and therefore requires the socialist countries to give firm support to the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations while pursuing this policy, whereas Khrushchov's peaceful coexistence seeks to replace the proletarian world revolution with pacifism and thus renounces proletarian internationalism. Khrushchov has changed the policy of peaceful coexistence into one of class capitulation."

We ask: Is not what the Marxist-Leninists of the CPC led by Comrade Mao exposed in Khrushchov's foreign policy precisely what Teng and his group are applying today? Teng, in his "Address to the UN" speaks of "peaceful coexistence" as the unique form of relations between states, saying that: "We are opposed to the establishment of hegemony and spheres of influence by any country in any part of the world in violation of these principles." Not only does he not mention proletarian internationalism as the basic international policy of China, but he does not even act according to his own rule, since he quietly accepts and often approves the intervention of the Americans or their allies, as he recently did on the shipping of French armaments to Zaire. He kept complete silence on the shameless intervention of the CIA in the military coup d'état in Chile, a fact that was eventually acknowledged by the CIA itself, and which became the subject of an investigation by a Committee of the U.S. Senate — of course, only after it had been widely denounced by democratic world opinion.

Moreover, to attribute the quality of "motive force of history" to the bourgeois representatives of the "third world" countries and to favour alliances with them is nothing but to oppose the uprising of the people against the bourgeoisie and to oppose revolutionary leadership of the liberation struggle. Is it not similar to what they propose for the "second world" countries when they call for the strengthening of the armies and economic and military pacts used by U.S. imperialism and the monopolies of the various countries to keep their rule over their respective countries? Are they not giving up priority to "coexistence" and diplomatic relations while ignoring their proletarian internationalist duties, in order to gain a sphere of influence and world hegemony of their own?

The "Comment" No. 6 which we are quoting continues: "The imperialists push on with their plans of aggression and war not only against the socialist countries but throughout the world. They try to suppress the revolutionary movements of the oppressed peoples and nations. In these circumstances, the socialist countries, together with the people of all other countries, must resolutely combat the imperialist policies of aggression and war and wage a tit-for-tat struggle against imperialism. This class struggle inevitably goes on, now in an acute and now in a relaxed form." It concludes: "We hold that the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries must embody the fundamental principle of their foreign

policy and comprise the fundamental content of this policy. What is this fundamental principle? It is proletarian internationalism. Lenin said, 'Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed peoples against any and all the imperialists — such is the external policy of the proletariat.'" It seems that Teng Hsiao-ping, who in his country insists on ignoring the difference between white and black cats to promote the counter-revolutionaries, in fact does make a sharp difference between the superpowers . . . only he ends up favouring U.S. imperialism and its lackeys, with whom he is anxious to coexist peacefully, forgetting proletarian internationalism completely.

The aspects analyzed of Teng's policy statements and practice show beyond doubt that he and his group put forward an international line completely divorced from the international line of Mao Tsetung and the Marxist-Leninists. On the contrary, it is an almost word for word modernized rehash of the opportunist, chauvinist and reactionary international line of Khrushchov and his successors. Teng and those who have "rehabilitated" him against the last will of Comrade Mao and against the people's will could argue that this foreign policy was already applied during the life of Comrade Mao and hence, that it was "his policy". Nevertheless, this argument cannot be accepted by anyone who knows the complexity of Chinese political life, the power that the revisionist forces have had there and the extreme harshness of the class struggles which have occurred in this country. In China dwell almost one fourth of mankind and the CPC itself has more than thirty million militants. One of the notable aspects of the complex process of struggle between the two lines in China, the proletarian and the bourgeois lines, has been the existence of what has been designated by the name of "independent kingdoms", that is to say, strongholds in certain domains in which the revisionist line has held sway for long periods. They are precisely the ones referred to by the Cultural Revolution slogan: "Regain that part of power which has been usurped by the capitalist-roaders". Facing these powerful enemies fully backed by imperialism and social-imperialism, the Chinese Marxist-Leninists led by Comrade Mao were not able to obtain victories simultaneously on every front: culture, the Party, production, education, the Armed Forces, foreign policy, etc. That does not mean they did not fight the opportunists on every one of these fronts. In *Peking Review* No. 45 (November 1977), in the long article entitled "Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of

the Three Worlds Is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism” which is nothing but a desperate attempt to disguise Teng’s revisionist claptrap with some nice clothes in order to sell it as Comrade Mao’s work, it is admitted that there has been strong opposition to the line of Teng Hsiao-ping (of course presented as “Mao Tsetung’s line”). It says: “In our own country there are persons who frantically oppose Chairman Mao’s theory of the three worlds. They are none other than Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao, Chiang Ching and Yao Wen-yuan, or the ‘gang of four’. Hoisting a most ‘revolutionary’ banner, they opposed China’s effort to unite with all forces that can be united, and opposed our dealing blows at the most dangerous enemy. They vainly tried to sabotage the building of an international united front against hegemonism and disrupt China’s anti-hegemonist struggle, doing Soviet social-imperialism a good turn.” If we keep in mind the falseness of their point of view, we can still tell from this statement that the leaders mentioned, among whom is Mao Tsetung’s wife — leaders who played an important role closely united with Comrade Mao in the ideological struggle during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and in the struggle against Teng’s efforts to destroy the achievements of this revolution — also fought against the international line of Teng and his cronies.

In addition, throughout this letter we have shown the principles of the Marxist-Leninist international policies of Comrade Mao, completely opposed to the revisionist conceptions promoted in this matter (as in many others), by Teng Hsiao-ping. We have done it through quoting either the works of Comrade Mao published before his death or documents from the public controversy against modern revisionism, universally accepted as written under the personal command and supervision of Comrade Mao.

In his works and in the writings of the polemic, Comrade Mao holds that: the imperialist colonial political rule continues under the form of neo-colonialism through its lackeys; that national liberation is achieved through the class struggle inside the country subjugated by imperialism, by a revolution against this imperialism and internal forces which support its rule; that this revolution of national liberation can be successful only if led by the proletariat and not by the bourgeoisie; that no liberation can be achieved through simple measures of economic independence put forward by the bourgeoisie; that the motive force of history is the class struggle, expressed in our time by the people of the world led by

the proletariat and their vanguard parties; that the proletariat in the advanced capitalist countries must defeat the local monopolist bourgeoisie to conquer power and build socialism, as well as to fight the superpowers; that “the view which blots out the class content of the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps and fails to see this contradiction as one between states under the dictatorship of the proletariat and states under the dictatorship of the monopoly capitalists” is unacceptable; that the existence of the socialist states has changed the character and the perspective of the national liberation movement, which under proletarian leadership marches towards socialism and not to capitalist “development” under bourgeois dictatorship; that the socialist states must practice proletarian internationalism as the core of their foreign policy, and never submit to peaceful coexistence, less to chauvinism or hegemonism; that it is possible to prevent a new world war through the people’s struggle and carrying revolution through to the end; that it is necessary to strongly fight both the American imperialist and the Soviet social-imperialist superpowers, opposing them with the united front of the people of the world led by the proletariat.

On the contrary, Teng Hsiao-ping holds that colonial political rule has basically disappeared and that there are only “remnant” forms of colonialism; that it is possible to “safeguard” and “consolidate” the independence through some changes in the “international economic relations”; that national liberation will be achieved through the actions of the countries of the “third world”, basically accepting as such the bourgeois governments, lackeys of imperialism and oppressors of the people; that these bourgeois forces which control the governments of the countries of the “third world” are not only the leading force of national liberation but also the “motive force propelling the wheel of world history”; that the proletariat of the capitalist advanced countries of the so-called “second world” must ally with the monopolist bourgeoisies and strengthen the military pacts and other tools of U.S. imperialist and bourgeois monopolist rules, under the pretext that an attack from social-imperialism is “imminent”; that the socialist camp does not exist and that China, in spite of being socialist, belongs to the “third world”, which is basically made up by countries subjected to colonial or neo-colonial rule under the U.S. or the social-imperialists; that the countries of the “third world”, “like” China, can bring about economic development to end their “situation of

poverty and backwardness” without carrying out the national liberation revolution or the socialist revolution; that China’s foreign policy is fundamentally one of peaceful coexistence and not a policy based on proletarian internationalism; that a Third World War is inevitable and imminent, and that the allies of the U.S. imperialism must improve their armaments, armies and military pacts to confront social-imperialism, thus restraining the class struggle. All these concepts — revisionist to the core — have been either formulated by Teng Hsiao-ping himself and his cronies or can be clearly drawn from the propaganda in support of their line, as well as from the concrete development of the Chinese foreign policy controlled by them.

Now, it is necessary to ask: those who say that Teng and his mentors or followers are faithfully applying the international policy of Comrade Mao, do they expect us to believe that Comrade Mao changed the principles of his international lines, drifting 180 degrees overnight, without making any written statement and only secretly whispering these changes in the ear of Teng and others of his filthy kind? And what is even more serious, do they want us to believe that Comrade Mao publicly refuted the revisionist international line of Khrushchov and of the Chinese “Khrushchovs” like Teng Hsiao-ping, while putting secretly into practice a revisionist and anti-Marxist line? They will never make our Party believe that. What we do know is that due to the boundless prestige that the political statements of Comrade Mao have gained and the affection and admiration felt towards him by the Chinese people and the people of the world, his enemies have had to “raise the red flag” of his thoughts and pretend that they are the faithful interpreters of his ideas, when in fact they are opposing them and trying to destroy them. Is this not what Lin Piao did in his “independent kingdom” built inside the People’s Liberation Army, while Comrade Mao actually had deep political and ideological differences with him? Is this not what Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping and other inveterate revisionists had done before Lin Piao in their “independent kingdoms”, infiltrating the Party, the state apparatus, the cultural front and other fronts, until they were overthrown by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution? The fact that this has been a protracted struggle (even now when the revisionists have taken the offensive through a coup d’etat), and that the unmasking of these traitors and their first defeat in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution took a long time to achieve, does not mean that

Comrade Mao agreed with them or that he did not oppose them. Certainly not. Mao Tsetung himself exposed on many occasions the fact that his enemies abused and misused his name, and even used some isolated quotations from his works to oppose him and destroy the essence of his thought. In a letter addressed to his wife, Comrade Chiang Ching, on July 8, 1966, Comrade Mao expressed his deep discontent for the way Lin Piao was using his writings, saying that: "After my death, when the right will try to seize power . . . the rightists will try to use these words of mine always in trying to raise their black flag, but that will not bring joy to them". He also said to Edgar Snow: "Of those who shout 'Long Live Mao Tsetung!', a third are sincere, a nother third follows the majority and the rest finally are just hypocrites". We are certain that Teng Hsiao-ping and his accomplices are among the last third, that of the hypocrites.

The "rehabilitation" of Teng Hsiao-ping soon after the death of Comrade Mao and the decisive role that he played in the international relations of China every time he succeeded in creeping into power, changing the course of the correct international policy applied during the upheaval of the international polemic against revisionism and of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, clearly show that in spite of their struggle, Comrade Mao and the Marxist-Leninists of the CPC did not succeed in launching a decisive blow against the "independent kingdom" ruling Chinese foreign policy, so as to finally crush it. What we do not doubt is that Mao Tsetung and the Marxist-Leninists in the CPC would never have entrusted the task of interpreting and completely revising the foreign policy of China to a man like Teng Hsiao-ping, one of the main targets of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, exposed and condemned as a recidivist a short time before Comrade Mao's death, for his activities as a conspirator and enemy of the achievements of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

Since we are familiar with the basically revisionist and reactionary international policy of Teng and his group, our Party cannot accept the widely publicized story which says that Teng Hsiao-ping and those who follow him through complicity or fear, today represent the ideas of Comrade Mao and the will of the Chinese people. For us it is clear that unfortunately the forecast made by Comrade Mao has come true, and that after his death the "rightists have seized power", raising their "black flag" of counter-revolution. What you have carried out is a rightist coup d'etat, promoting a great number

of military officers who were dismissed by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution; removing more than half of the members of the CPC Central Committee during the last Congress; and ruthlessly repressing the Party militants, Marxist-Leninist cadres and masses who have opposed your usurpation of power.

When he launched the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution Comrade Mao said: "Those representatives of the bourgeoisie who have sneaked into the Party, the government, the army and various spheres of culture are a bunch of counter-revolutionary revisionists. Once conditions are ripe, they will seize political power and turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie". Well Teng Hsiao-ping was one of the most important leaders of this "bunch of counter-revolutionary revisionists" and because of that, he was dismissed by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Moreover, Mao Tsetung said of people like Teng: "They are faithful lackeys of the bourgeoisie and the imperialists, they cling to the bourgeois ideology of the oppression and exploitation of the proletariat and to the capitalist system, and they oppose Marxist-Leninist ideology and the socialist system . . . Their struggle against us is one of life and death, and there is no question of equality. Therefore, our struggle against them, too, can be nothing but a life-and-death struggle."

Later, Teng Hsiao-ping simulated repentance from his revisionist positions and during a pretended self-criticism he promised solemnly: "never to reverse the correct verdicts", that is to say, the principles and achievements of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Thus, he and his bunch played the "repentant ones", in order to gradually infiltrate and seize key positions in the Party, the state and the armed forces. Teng Hsiao-ping was seen at a public function for the first time after the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in April 1973, at a banquet; some time later, he regained his former post as Vice Premier; in August that same year, he was re-elected to the Central Committee of the CPC; in 1974, he infiltrated the Politburo and was given the responsibility of re-organizing the armed forces, becoming at the same time a member of the People's Congress; in April 1974, he made public his revisionist thesis on international policies at the United Nations. In January 1975, during the Second Plenum of the Tenth Central Committee, he became Vice Chairman of the Party. That same month, during a Fourth National People's Congress (NPC) session, in which Comrade Mao was not present, he managed to get named

senior Vice-Premier of the State Council and Chief of Staff of the People's Liberation Army (PLA), assuming in fact all the responsibilities of Premier, because of the illness of Premier Chou En-lai. By that time, he felt strong enough to begin his offensive against the achievements of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, in spite of his promises to accept the "correct verdicts". To attack these achievements he wrote the policy papers *On the General Programme for All Work of the Whole Party and the Whole Nation; Outline Report on the Work of the Academy of Sciences; and Certain Questions on Accelerating the Development of Industry*. All these papers and his revisionist activities deeply opposed to the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution were strongly refuted by Comrade Mao, as well as by the Marxist-Leninists in the CPC and the popular masses. The core of Teng's offensive was to oppose the development of the class struggle of the Chinese proletariat against the bourgeoisie and the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To succeed, he did not hesitate to modify Mao Tsetung's own directives, saying that: "The directives of Chairman Mao on the study of theory to prevent and stop revisionism, on unity and stability, and on the development of national economy constitute the general programme for all work of the Party, the army and the nation. To speed up industrial development it is necessary to thoroughly follow this programme." Comrade Mao immediately refuted this revisionist course by saying: "What 'taking the three directives as the key link'? Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it." Referring directly to Teng's behaviour he said: "He has sworn a thousand times to change and never reverse the correct verdicts; this cannot be trusted." And further he said: "With the socialist revolution, they themselves come under fire. At the time of the cooperative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois right, they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet you don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party — those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road." And he added: "This person"—Teng Hsiao-ping — "does not grasp class struggle; he has never referred to this link. Still his theme of 'white cat, black cat', making no distinction between imperialism and Marxism". "He does not understand Marxism-Leninism, he represents the capitalist class."

Can there be any doubt that Comrade Mao was firmly leading the struggle against the new “right deviationist wind” raised by Teng and his cronies?

At the beginning of 1975, Mao Tsetung, at the head of the CPC, launched a big campaign to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and to restrain the remnants of “bourgeois right” in China. He said then: “Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? It is essential to make this question clear. Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation.” “Our country still practices a commodity system; the wage system is unequal, too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. These can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. So if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system.” These and other directives of Comrade Mao led to a vast mass mobilization of study of the characteristics of the dictatorship of the proletariat, through the analysis of the basic Marxist writings, and of elimination of the remnants of bourgeois right in China. In opposition to this movement of class struggle against the bourgeoisie and against bourgeois right, Teng Hsiao-ping led a frantic campaign at the head of the most intransigent “capitalist roaders”.

Desperate in face of the successful advance of the class struggle they finally plotted and launched the counter-revolutionary incident at Tien An Men Square. In the aftermath of this incident, which occurred in April 1976, the CC of the CPC met and, on the proposal of Comrade Mao, unanimously resolved to “dismiss Teng Hsiao-ping from all posts both inside and outside the Party”, because “the Political Bureau of the Central Committee holds that the nature of the Teng Hsiao-ping problem has turned into one of antagonistic contradiction”, as it is expressed in the public statement. According to Chinese publications, “hundreds of millions of soldiers and civilians” celebrated and approved this decision. During the meeting held at Tien An Men Square, member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the CPC, First Secretary of the Peking Municipal Committee and Chairman of the city’s Revolutionary Committee, Wu Teh, said: “In the past few days, while we were studying our great leader Chairman Mao’s instructions, counterattacking the right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts and grasping revolution and promoting production, a handful of bad elements, out of ulterior motives,

made use of the Ching Ming Festival to deliberately create a political incident, directing their spearhead at Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee in a vain attempt to change the general orientation of the struggle to criticize the unrepentant capitalist-roader Teng Hsiao-ping's revisionist line and beat back the right deviationist attempt. We must see clearly the reactionary nature of this political incident, expose the schemes and intrigues of the bad elements, heighten our revolutionary vigilance and avoid being taken in. Revolutionary masses and cadres of the municipality must take class struggle as the key link, act immediately, and by concrete action defend Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and the great capital of our socialist motherland, deal resolute blows at counter-revolutionary sabotage and further strengthen and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and develop the excellent situation. Let us rally around the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao and win still greater victories!"

Hua Kuo-feng, at Comrade Mao's funeral, said: "Representing the aspirations and interests of the working class and the poor and lower-middle peasants to continue the revolution, Chairman Mao himself initiated and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which smashed the schemes of Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping for restoration, criticized their counter-revolutionary revisionist line and enabled us to seize back the portion of leading power in the Party and state they had usurped, thus ensuring China's victorious advance along the Marxist-Leninist road."

A few months after the death of Comrade Mao, transgressing all his decisions which they pretend to respect, during the Third Plenary Session of the Tenth CC of the CPC, they rejected the previous unanimous resolution of the CC ousting Teng from all posts, and have restored him to all his former functions and high positions. At the same time, the closest cadres of Comrade Mao in his struggle against Teng and his bunch have been slandered, suppressed and "expelled once and for all from the Party".

Later on, through the Communiqué of the 11th Congress of the CPC, they attempt to make people believe that the "resolutions" imposed there, such as the repression against the closest comrades of Mao Tsetung; the "rehabilitation" of Teng Hsiao-ping and the decision of proclaiming the end of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, were taken following the "directives and decisions" of Comrade Mao. They even say that these repressive decisions, or as they say "the smashing of the 'gang of four'" marks the

“triumphant conclusion of our first Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which lasted eleven years.” Really, your cynicism and cowardice know no limits! You insult Comrade Mao after his death and mock him, his ideas and both his earlier and latest instructions against the revisionists, particularly against Teng Hsiao-ping. You really believe that the Marxist-Leninists who have known the latest directives and decisions of Comrade Mao, among them the decision to dismiss Teng, are imbeciles or so servile that we will bow to you and accept such a monstrous fraud. It happens now that those who were described by Comrade Mao as a “bunch of counter-revolutionary revisionists”, “faithful lackeys of the bourgeoisie and the imperialists”, “opponents of Marxist-Leninist ideology and the socialist system”, and elements engaged in a “life-or-death struggle” against the Marxists, today are presented (like Teng and those who follow him from reactionary convictions or from fear), as the “successors of Chairman Mao and good students and followers of his line”, having carried the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution through to a “triumphant conclusion” after his death, when in fact they always frantically opposed it. You really have a good chance to outdo Khrushchov and his successors, who call themselves followers of Lenin! Not even the columnists of the bourgeois mass media believe your lies, and have described your actions as “the defeat of the thought of Mao Tsetung” and “the smashing of the Cultural Revolution”, facts which, of course, fill them with joy.

The struggle and victory of the Chinese people against imperialism and feudalism, the Socialist Revolution and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, all led by Marxism-Leninism applied to the concrete conditions of China and by the creative development of this theory achieved by Comrade Mao, constitute a heritage for all peoples of the world, and particularly, for the Marxist-Leninists. We will not permit the revisionists who have temporarily usurped the leadership of the glorious CPC and the Chinese state, to sully, distort and destroy this heritage.

Particularly for the present era, in which broad sections of the masses all over the world are disconcerted about the events which occur in the pseudo-socialist countries, where revisionists like you have already restored capitalism, and under the circumstances in which the reactionary forces are profiting from this situation to attack Marxism and genuine socialism, insisting on presenting those states as “socialist”, we think the defence of the struggle that

Comrade Mao and the Chinese Marxist-Leninists carried on at the head of the masses to achieve the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is of the highest importance. This constituted a glorious effort to consolidate and develop an authentic socialist system for almost one-fourth of mankind; to put the proletarian policy effectively in command; to carry on the class struggle under the socialist system, to break with bourgeois ideology, habits and customs in the superstructure and with the remnants of bourgeois right, to mobilize the broadest masses to take the state affairs in their hands and to demolish the "independent kingdoms" where the revisionist bureaucrats were entrenched. As the tragic events after Comrade Mao's death show, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution could not accomplish all of its objectives. Nevertheless, our Party thinks that the correctness of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has become confirmed today more than ever, now that the sinister, reactionary and anti-Marxist nature of the enemies it exposed and combated has been openly demonstrated. And their nature will become even more evident as they expose themselves through their actions.

Our organization, the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile, is ready to make its modest contribution to the struggle for the defence of socialism in China, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the immortal achievements of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and of the thought of Mao Tsetung, against the revisionists who temporarily control power in China.

We believe that the present struggle against the Chinese revisionists and their followers constitutes a new stage of the already long struggle of Marxism-Leninism against the revisionists who distort it. The Chinese Marxist-Leninists, with Comrade Mao at their head, have taught us in the document *The Leaders of the CPSU Are the Greatest Splitters of Our Times* that: "To fight for Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism is to work for the unity of the international communist movement. Persevering in principle and upholding unity are inextricably bound together", and draw three conclusions: "First, it demonstrates that like everything else, the international working class movement tends to divide itself into two. Secondly, the history of the international communist movement demonstrates that in every period the struggle between the defenders of unity and the creators of splits is in essence one between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism and revisionism, between the upholders of Marxism and the traitors to Marxism.

Thirdly, the history of the international communist movement demonstrates that proletarian unity has been consolidated and has developed through struggle against opportunism, revisionism and splittism. The struggle for unity is inseparably connected with the struggle for principle." On this matter, Lenin said: "Without struggle it is not possible to clarify and without clarifying it is not possible to go forward with success, it is not possible to achieve a solid unity. Those who are struggling today are in no way destroying unity. Unity has already ceased to exist, it is broken in all its aspects . . . Open and direct struggle is one of the necessary conditions to restore unity."

We hope that this struggle will really clarify matters and that it will enable us to deeply comprehend the origins of modern revisionism, so as to be able to attack it more effectively.

In face of this new revisionist current, our Central Committee has unanimously resolved, expressing the opinion of all our militants, to break the party-to-party relations with the revisionist clique which by means of a coup d'etat has usurped power and the leadership of the Communist Party of China after the death of Comrade Mao, and to combat this clique publicly.

We do not break our links either with the Chinese people or with the glorious Communist Party of China, but with those who, against the will of the Party and of Comrade Mao, and using counter-revolutionary violence and intrigues, have temporarily usurped power in China.

We are certain that the joy of this clique will not last for long. We have full confidence in the words written by Comrade Mao to his wife, Comrade Chiang Ching, in 1966, when he forecast your future: "In China, since the overthrow of the emperor in 1911, no reactionary has been able to stay in power long . . . If the rightists stage an anti-communist coup d'etat in China, I am sure they will know no peace either and their rule will most probably be short-lived because it will not be tolerated by the revolutionaries, who represent the interests of the people making up more than 90 percent of the population." "Conclusion: the perspectives are luminous, but the road is full of twists and turns. These two formulations are still valid."

Central Committee of the
Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile

Santiago, Chile, November 1977

Price: 65 ¢

Published by:

THE NORMAN BETHUNE INSTITUTE

Printed by:

PEOPLE'S CANADA PUBLISHING HOUSE

Distributed by:

NATIONAL PUBLICATIONS CENTRE

Distributors of Progressive Books & Periodicals

Box 727, Adelaide Station, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

NBI-62