



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

Vol V - Nos 3-4

Price 10 Cents

March-April, 1963

# Polarization and The Struggle for Marxist-Leninist Unity

Part 2

## CUBAN REVOLUTION EXPOSES REVISIONISM

In their attempt to undermine the revolutionary struggles in Latin America by "threatening" last October-November to invade Cuba, the U.S. imperialists had to openly depend on the services of Khrushchev and the other revisionists thereby exposing them to the world as traitors of the socialist as well as the national colonial revolutions. Thus it's around the Cuban revolution that true revolutionaries are tested and revisionists exposed.

The Cuban Revolution signifies first, a breach in the solid front of U.S. imperialism in its own front yard and historic stamping grounds — Latin America. It marks the beginning of the dialectical and historical process of transforming the colonial and semi-colonial oppressed nations and peoples of Latin America from a reserve of strength for U.S. imperialism into a reserve of strength for the proletarian revolution.

Second, the Cuban Revolution demonstrates the indissoluble link between the national-colonial question and the proletarian revolution. It is the proof of the fact that in the present epoch only the proletariat armed with Marxism-Leninism can lead the oppressed peoples to national liberation. The national bourgeoisie can not successfully lead the anti-imperialist struggle. It is living proof of the correctness of the Leninist principle of the uninterrupted revolution, with no "skipping over" of stages, and no "stopping short."

Third, it is perhaps the clearest demonstration of the correctness of the concept that imperialists and all reactionaries are paper tigers.

It is within the context of the preceding that we gauge the attitudes of various forces in relation to the profound revolution of the Cuban people. Support for the Cuban Revolution calls for more than general praises, and more than trade agreements.

How do the revisionists, and those they influence, "aid" the Cuban Revolution? According to the Reporter of Dec. 6, 1962 we learn that "Back in 1960, Nehru had a talk with Castro in New York at the United Nations and tried to point out the dangers to Cuba and the world of too radical a position."

As the Reporter itself says, this is nothing new for "neutrals" of the Nehru brand. Nor does it surprise us when Yugoslav revisionists offer similar "advice". The following is from an article in Peking Review of Dec. 7, 1962, analyzing a pamphlet of the Yugoslav revisionists.

## TITO'S ADVICE TO CUBA

"The Tito group openly opposes the Cuban Revolutionary Government's confiscation of U. S. monopoly enterprises. It goes so far as to say that in taking this step Cuba 'is not tactical enough, and in too much of a hurry to take certain measures without considering U.S. reactions at all.' It has even repeated word for word the shopworn slander of the U.S. ruling circles that Cuba violated 'representative democracy,' falsely accusing the Cuban Revolutionary Government of failing to 'establish the new state by way of elections from below,' and alleging that 'all decisions are made by the most limited

government circles,' and that Cuba 'has not yet tackled the question of democracy as advocated and required by socialism.' . . . But, in the eyes of the Yugoslav modern revisionists, the Cuban revolution is a pretty mess. The Tito group has gone so far as to libel the just struggle of the Cuban people to defend their revolution, uphold their independence and sovereignty and resist U.S. imperialist aggression as an expression of 'one-sidedness in foreign policy,' 'not tactical enough,' 'itself aggravating relations with the United States' and turning Cuba into a 'cold war front.' They ask the Cuban people, pretending to quote others: 'Is it necessary for Cuba to adopt such a policy? Can they embark on some other road soon?' 'Why must it "answer back with attack" as Castro has done?'"

## KHRUSHCHEV'S ADVICE TO CUBA

Khrushchev, also, has "advice" for the Cuban Revolution. In a speech last June 4th to Cubans studying in the USSR, he declared (as quoted in the Reporter of Jan. 17, 1963)

"Khrushchev advised the Cubans that it would take more than heroism and arms to overcome these difficulties. The road was 'long and not easy.' He promised to continue sending 'arms and other things' to Cuba, but he stressed that the construction of socialism and communism demanded 'a high degree of consciousness, intelligence, and a great deal of work.'"

Thus Khrushchev, in borrowing a page from the imperialists, chauvinistically inferred that Cubans were irresponsible, lazy and lacked intelligence. Furthermore, continued the article:

"He recalled that Lenin had solved the Soviet crisis by introducing in 1921 the New Economic Policy, which had 'made concessions to capitalist elements within the country for the ultimate strengthening of the interests of socialism in the country.'

Lenin, he added, had also offered concessions to foreign capitalists. Some members of the Bolshevik party could not understand the necessity for the NEP and had thrown away their party cards, but he, Khrushchev, had marched with the Party."

What sophistry — to compare weak, struggling Russia of 1921 with Cuba today, part of the Socialist Camp! However, Cuba is not taking Bukharinite Khrushchev's advice; it is not marching backwards to capitalism, but striding forward to socialism and communism.

That Khrushchev was advising the Cuban Revolution to accommodate to imperialist pressure was so obvious that the Reporter was forced to conclude that:

"It is fairly clear from this and other indications that the Soviet leaders were counseling

the Cubans to take it easy, to make some concessions to the Cuban middle class, and even per-

(Continued on page 2)

May First is the traditional rallying day of the international working class, a focal point in the struggle for the unity of the class. May Day 1963 is of particular significance in this respect for today the most decisive struggle for working class unity is being waged against the splitting, divisive attacks of world-wide revisionism.

## NEW REVOLUTIONARY CENTER

Today the struggle for unity takes the precise form of sharp adherence to the Marxist Leninist these laid down in the 12 Party Statement (1957) and the 81 Party Declaration (1960), and a resolute break with the false unity of revisionism. Or to place this in terms of what is concretely taking place in the world today, real unity of the working class can only be achieved by rallying around the new revolutionary center of the struggle for Marxism-Leninism, the Communist Party of China, and away from the counter-revolutionary, revisionist Khrushchev-Tito cabal.

This process of polarization now taking place throughout the whole Communist movement must be grasped and understood by all workers, communists and non-communists alike, if this May Day is to be one of revolutionary reaffirmation and one which mobilizes the working class to resolutely struggle against the ever mounting attacks of U.S. imperialism. The struggle against revisionism is not one of debate of abstract theories, or even one of leadership and tactics of concern only to communist parties, but a basic struggle to remove from the working class movement the best agents that imperialism has today.

The Chinese comrades (Peking Review No. 49, 1962) very correctly state that "The counter-revolutionary stand of the mod-

ern revisionists is as incompatible with the revolutionary stand of the world's people as fire is with water." This was clearly

demonstrated by the complicity of Nikita Khrushchev in the hoax of the Cuban crisis.

Here we saw Nikita Khrushchev completely discard his pose as a Marxist-Leninist and in the role of great power chauvinist, gave to imperialist John F. Kennedy the right to violate the national sovereignty of Cuba and thereby head-off the revolutionary upsurge sweeping throughout Latin America.

## WORKING CLASS UNITY DEVELOPING

This monstrous crime was prevented by the heroic Cuban people under the leadership of Fidel Castro just as they had stopped the attempted invasion of the Kennedy agents at the Bay of Pigs one year earlier. And the Cuban revolution remains as the beacon of the exploited, oppressed, toiling masses of the Americans, not because of Khrushchev as the revisionists claim, but in spite of him. The attempt by the revisionists to use the Cuban revolution to stop the revolution in Latin America continues, but it has also brought forward its opposite. The emergence of real Marxist-Leninist parties in Santo Domingo and Brazil, the rising struggles of the working class and peasants throughout Latin America, is the rapidly developing picture of working class unity which we greet on this May Day.

## THE MOST BRIBED WORKING CLASS

It is also the same struggle for unity which the working class-

boasted in the N.Y. Times of the United States must finally grasp. Our working class, living in the seat of world reaction, is beyond a doubt the most bribed working class in the world. The vicious slavery and later oppression of the Negro people, the expropriation of the Western lands and extermination of the Indians, the rape of Latin America, filled the coffers of rising American imperialism, enabling it to let some of its booty trickle down among the ranks of the workers. Thus the "refutation" of Marx seen in the "high standard" of living enjoyed by the U.S. worker, high wages, schools, homes, and more democracy, in reality represented the sharing in the brutal oppression of the Negro sharecropper, the Cuban and Puerto Rican cane-cutter, the Bolivian tin miner, etc. The U.S. working class could and did accept these bribes behind the rationale of white and national chauvinism. The "labor leaders" reflected this — Green, Murray, Meany, Reuther, Hoffa, etc. The Communist Party U.S.A. also aided in adopting this rationale by its prattle of democratic traditions and national heritage. From this it was but a short step to the openly revisionist theme of the decade of the sixties and benevolent imperialism solving the problems of unemployment, Negro oppression, and rising squeeze on living standard of American workers.

## COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY ROLE OF CPUSA

The revisionist Communist Party U.S.A., moving in perfect rhythm to the baton of Nikita Khrushchev, supports fully his counter-revolutionary efforts in Latin America and add their own. They talk about threat of invasion of Cuba fostered by the "ultra-right", and bemoan the "reactionaries" who oppose their idol, JFK; the Latin American dictators, and Ross Barnett. They also boldly attack those "dogmatists", the Chinese, Albanians,

(Continued on page 2)

# More On Nehru's Philosophy In the Light of The Sino-Indian Boundary Question

(This is the second installment of an article which appeared in the "Peking Review", No. 44 of November 2, 1962.)

Everybody knows that before India attained independence, Indian society was colonial and feudal. The task facing the Indian people then was to carry out a national and democratic revolution against imperialism and feudalism. The great Indian people waged a prolonged and heroic

struggle for the complete overthrow of the colonial rule of British imperialism in India and for the genuine independence and liberation of their homeland. After World War II, the national-liberation movements carried on by the people of the Asian and African countries rose to unprecedented heights and the anti-British struggle of the Indian people forged ahead. The Chinese people always deeply sympathized with and highly esteemed the Indian people in their national-liberation struggle.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INDIAN BOURGEOISIE

The Indian bourgeoisie has a blood relationship with the British bourgeoisie and the Indian landlord class. But in its own class interests, it participated in the Indian people's anti-British movement in varying degrees at

different stages. However, as determined by its economic position, it had from the very beginning a strong tendency towards compromise in the anti-British movement. In the national-independence struggle, the Indian bourgeoisie, on the one hand, carried on the non-co-operation movement against British colonial rule and, on the other hand, used the slogan of "non-violence" to paralyze the people's struggle and restrain their revolutionary movement.

In his *Autobiography* Nehru himself shows this characteristic of the Indian bourgeoisie. He writes that the Indian national movement "has been not a change of the social order, but political independence. . . It is absurd to say that the leaders betray the masses because they do not

(Continued on page 6)

# May Day 1963

(Continued from page 1) and POC. The Communist Party of China has just called them followers of John F. Kennedy and "prettifiers of imperialism." The position of POC has always been one of exposing and routing these agents of Wall Street with phoney "Marxist" badges. The path of unity, the path of revolutionary struggle which the American working class must take is in the direction of the Marxist-Leninist center in the United States. And today that center is the POC.

For the reality is that in spite of the rosy predictions of the imperialists and the revisionists, the sixties have produced, not prosperity but continued crisis. Even John Kennedy is forced to label unemployment as chief problem for the United States. Recent government figures (which underestimate the problem) show that 4.9 million are jobless on a seasonally adjusted figure of 6.1 per cent of the labor force. But its full impact is more clearly seen in the figure of one out of every five being unemployed some time during the year. And to the dismay of those who believe in the regenerative powers of capitalism (Gus Hall, Khrushchev, etc.), despite "recoveries" from recessions, since 1953 the number of unemployed has never gone below 4.2 per cent. And while automation is eliminating 1.5 million jobs a year, there

has only been a 17 per cent increase in jobs since World War II or 18 years. This is compounded by the fact that in the same 18 years the labor force increased by 21 per cent (Newsweek April 1)

### THE LION'S SHARE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

The lion's share of this burden of unemployment and repression is passed on to the Negro and Puerto Rican workers. Negroes constitute fully 40 per cent of the unemployed in Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Washington and other major cities. This rising and persistent unemployment is not due to lack of training or unskilled workers unable to adjust as some would have us believe. Of 11 men who took electronics courses under the Manpower, Development and Training Act, only two found employment. One graduate of the program was unable to put his skills to work in either Pennsylvania, New York or New Jersey. The problem is one of decadent imperialism unable to meet the needs of the people, the question today is one of the working class girding itself to come to grips with its imperialist - bourgeois masters.

Certainly the question of a revolutionary situation brewing in the U.S.A. is posing again the question of rallying the class for a revolutionary line of struggle.

but this is no simple task and many obstacles must be forcefully met. The enervating strangling effect of reformism and opportunism must be broken if the working class is to move ahead. This means, in particular, a struggle to drive white chauvinism out of the working class. This is vital to unleash the revolutionary potential of the entire working class. Negro and Puerto Rican workers who, due to national oppression are the most exploited workers, and with the factor of oppression added to the factor of exploitation, are the catalyst of revolution in the United States. This is the real self interest of the working class, advancing the proletarian revolution.

This developing situation is taking place in the absence of a real communist party, but in a situation where the revisionist CPUSA has been blocked by the real international communist center, at a time when our POC is maturing and marching forward, at a time when we have glorious example of the Cuban Revolution.

Under today's circumstances, the fight for unity which is being seen in the process of polarization on a world scale, the chance for a leap forward in the U.S.A. is indeed a reality. We join with all the true Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, who on this May Day echo Karl Marx's historic call, "Workers of the world, unite" behind Marxism-Leninism's triumphant banner.

### Revolution.

To all these revisionist demagogues who are hollering loud about the Chinese Communists "demobilizing" the anti-imperialist struggle by insisting that all imperialists are paper tigers, let us remind them of the Chinese comrades position on atomic bombs way back in 1945.

Referring to the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings Mao Tse-tung stated on August 13, 1945:

"Can atom bombs decide wars? No, they can't. Atom bombs could not make Japan surrender. Without the struggles waged by the people, atom bombs by themselves would be of no avail. If atom bombs could decide the war, then why was it necessary to ask the Soviet Union to send its troops? Why didn't Japan surrender when the two bombs were dropped on her and why did she surrender as soon as the Soviet Union sent troops? Some of our comrades, too, believe that the atom bomb is all-powerful; that is a big mistake. . . The theory that 'weapons decide everything,' the purely military viewpoint, a bureaucratic style of work divorced from the masses, individualist thinking, and the like — all these are bourgeois influences in our ranks." (quoted in "Communist China's Strategy in the Nuclear Era" by Alice L. Hsieh)

A year later, in an interview with Anna Louise Strong, Mao Tse-tung asserted:

### "THE PEOPLE WILL ANNIHILATE THE BOMB" — MAO

"Its great bursting over Hiroshima destroyed it. For, the people of the whole world turned against it. . . The birth of the atomic bomb was the beginning of the end of the American imperialists. For they began to rely on the bomb and not on the people. . . The basic question is the consciousness of the people. It is not explosives or oil-fields or atom bombs but the man who handles them. . . In the end the bomb will not annihilate the people. The people will annihilate the bomb." (Ibid)

The revolutionary movement during that period went from victory to victory. Imperialism did not dare use the A-bomb because it knew that doing so would have spelled its doom.

Today when the socialist sector is stronger than the imperialists militarily, politically, and economically, when the national liberation movements have acquired unprecedented depth and scope, when imperialism is torn by sharpening internal contradictions, it is precisely at this time that the revisionists cringe from the fear of nuclear war, and join the imperialists in spreading the "total annihilation" hysteria. At the same time, China, Albania, Korea, Vietnam and Cuba without any nuclear striking force, do not cringe in the face of atomic weapons of the imperialists. True Marxist-Leninists do not fall victim to nuclear blackmail, nor do they kneel in fear of imperialists atomic threat. As the Chinese comrades have stated:

"With regard to the question of how to cope with nuclear weapons, the Chinese Communists have always advocated a complete ban on nuclear weapons which are highly destructive, and have always opposed the imperialists' criminal policy of nuclear war. They have always held that with the socialist camp enjoying great superiority, it is possible to reach an agreement on the banning of nuclear weapons through negotiations and through continuously exposing U.S. imperialism and struggling against it. But no Marxist-Leninist or revolutionary people have ever become paralyzed with fear by the nuclear weapons in the hands of imperialism and given up their struggle against imperialism and its lackeys.

"Even more absurd is the allegation that 'a world without war' can be achieved through peaceful coexistence. In the present situation, it is possible to prevent imperialism from launching a new world war if all the peace-loving forces of the world unite into a broad international anti-imperialist united front and fight together. But it is one thing to prevent a world war and another to eliminate all wars. Imperialism and the reactionaries are the source of war. In conditions where imperialism and reactionaries still exist, wars of one kind or another may occur. The history of the 17 postwar years shows that local wars of one kind or another have never ceased. Oppressed nations and oppressed people are bound to rise in revolution. When imperialism and the reactionaries employ armed force to suppress revolution, it is inevitable that civil wars and national-liberation wars will occur. Marxist-Leninists have always maintained that only after the imperialist system has been overthrown and only after all systems of oppression of man by man and of exploitation of man by man have been abolished, and not before, will it be possible to eliminate all wars and to reach 'a world without war.'"

(Peking Review No. 1, 1963)

### THE FAILURE OF ATOMIC BLACKMAIL

The imperialists have always resorted to the tactics of trying to frighten the world with their technological superiority and "strength." During the years from 1945 to 1949 the U.S. had a monopoly on nuclear weapons. Every time the imperialists faced a crisis, their spokesmen rattled the bomb as the "decisive weapon." We need only mention Truman's threat to use atomic bombs in the Korean war in his speech of Nov. 30, 1950; also Dulles' threat of atomic attacks against China during the climax of the war in Indo China in 1954.

Had the Soviet leadership in 1945 fallen victim to atomic blackmail, the revolution in Eastern Europe could not have been accomplished. Had the Chinese Communists become paralyzed by the fear of "atomic extinction" they would have never been able to accomplish the great Chinese

all peace-loving forces."

It then goes on to say, "But should the imperialists merely start war, the peoples will sweep capitalism out of existence and bury it."

The revisionists counterpose this formulation of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties, and using as the justification for their distortion the bugaboo of nuclear annihilation, speak of "avoiding war at all costs." Thus Khrushchev asks: "Would socialism win by a thermonuclear war? No. You cannot build socialism in an atomic-infested territory." (Phila. Bulletin Jan. 16, 1963)

### "PEACE" IS THE STRATEGIC AIM OF THE REVISIONISTS

This distortion takes the struggle for peace out of the realm of the revolutionary struggle, and elevates it to the level of the strategic aim of the revisionists. This was revealed by John Gunther in his book *Inside Russia Today*. "Khrushchev, however, insists that, at present, coexistence is not tactical in Soviet foreign policy, but 'fundamental.'" The consequences of this policy was exposed in the *Vanguard* of Feb.-March 1962 which stated that " . . . the fight for peace as the main, immediate task has been surreptitiously converted into 'peace' as the strategic aim, by the revisionists. When Socialism is the strategic aim in Communist strategy and tactics, in the advanced capitalist nations, then the strategic allies of the working class are the peasantry and the oppressed nations and peoples fighting for their freedom. But, when 'peace' becomes the strategic aim, then the imperialists themselves logically become the 'strategic allies.'"

The revisionist's distortion of the question of war and peace is expressed further in the deliberate attempt to put all wars in one negative category and also lump together world wars and limited wars. The Chinese comrades treat this subject in the following manner.

# Polarization

(Continued from page 1) **happens to start mending their economic fences with the United States."**

### CAN THE IMPERIALISTS BE STOPPED IN THEIR DRIVE FOR A WORLD WAR?

Marxist-Leninists have always regarded war as an attempt to achieve political ends through military means. In a world of antagonistic classes, war represents one form of class struggle; it is the carrying out of class aims.

As the 81 Party Statement points out:

"War is a constant companion of capitalism. The system of exploitation of man by man and the system of extermination of man by man are two aspects of the capitalist system."

Marxist-Leninists have always made a distinction between just and unjust wars. An unjust war is a war of the imperialists to enslave new peoples, hold back the revolutionary forces of the proletariat and national liberation movements, destroy the socialist lands, and extend imperialist domination over the world. A just war is a war of the working class or oppressed peoples to overthrow capitalist or imperialist rule, to end the domination of imperialism, for the defense of a socialist state against imperialist aggression. Marxist-Leninists regard it as their duty to oppose unjust wars, and to support and render every possible aid to just wars.

Because of the existence of a socialist sector of the world and strong world-wide national liberation movements, there exists the possibility of preventing the imperialists from starting a new world war.

The 81 Party Statement says, "The time has come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a world war can be curbed. World war can be prevented by the joint efforts of the world socialist camp, the international working class, the national liberation movement, all the countries opposing war and

.....

**Vanguard**  
 Box 137  
 Planetarium Station  
 New York City  
 Box 996 - Chicago 90, Illinois

---

Box 6604 Cleveland 1, Ohio

---

Box 8442, Philadelphia, Pa.

Published by the Provisional Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.

Subscription — \$1.00 per year.

.....

"We Marxist-Leninist are no believers in the theory that weapons or nuclear weapons mean everything. We never believe that nuclear weapons can decide the destiny of mankind. We are convinced that the masses of people decide the course of history. We are implacably opposed to the imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. We also hold that there is no need whatsoever for socialist countries to use nuclear weapons as chips in gambling or as a means of intimidation. To do this would really be committing the error of adventurism. If one has blind faith in nuclear weapons, fails to recognize or trust the strength of the masses of people and becomes scared out of one's wits by imperialist nuclear blackmail, one may possibly jump from one extreme to the other and commit the error of capitulationism." (Pekin Review No. 5, 1963)

The revisionists do not share the courageous outlook of the Marxist-Leninists. According to Khrushchev the most important thing is to keep alive. Evidently he has forgotten Lenin's precept that Communists must learn to live like communists — and die like communists.

### "WITHOUT LIBERTY, WE DO NOT WANT LIFE" — CASTRO

Contrast the attitude of the cowardly revisionists with the words of Fidel Castro full of Bolshevik courage:

"When Mr. Kennedy threatened to use us as a nuclear target trying to intimidate us, what happened? . . . The people answered 'Fatherland or death!' We can die, not because we do not value life, not because we don't see the shining future to which we have a right with our labor, but because the lives of all of us are indissolubly linked with the idea and that future. . . without liberty, without dignity, we do not want life."

(Speech of Jan. 2, 1963)

However, not only do the revisionists cringe before imperialist atomic blackmail, they go further and join in it themselves. As we stated at the 5th POC Conference:

"Note the two-faced revisionist-imperialist farce involving on the one hand the terrorizing of the world by the American imperialists and Nikita and company, through atomic explosions.

"In the process of developing their atomic power the American imperialists and Nikita and his cohorts take turns at exploding atomic retarders. When one is exploding atom bombs the other holds back while his 'antagonist' finishes all the tests. Then the other 'antagonist' goes through the same shenanigans, while the other dutifully and patiently awaits his next turn at bat.

"But, this tragic farce does not end there. Both the American imperialists and their revisionist partners, Khrushchev and company, declare that an atomic war would mean 'the destruction of the whole world' and for this reason, the world better remain

(Continued on page 3)

# Polarization

(Continued from page 2)  
 as is. Whatever changes must be made should be carried out in a 'peaceful' and 'evolutionary' way. Therefore, the producing classes in the capitalist nations better renounce all struggles for the elimination of capitalist exploitation. At the same time, the colonial peoples should give up their struggles for national freedom and limit their national ambitions to a reformist arrangement 'mutually convenient' to both the oppressed and the oppressor nation.

"Now the relation between this atomic blackmail and peaceful co-existence a-la-Khrushchev, becomes quite clear."  
 After collaborating to intimidate the world's population by exchanging threats to bomb each other's allies, Khrushchev and Kennedy are now collaborating at the Geneva talks on banning nuclear tests. All their "disagreements" are just fancy foot-work to make it easier to put across their common aim: securing to themselves of nuclear superiority, and specifically, impeding China from acquiring nuclear weapons. They hope to turn world opinion to discredit China as a "violinist" of the agreements if and when she tests her first A-bomb — notwithstanding the fact that China was not invited to participate in any talks. It is interesting to note that the Kennedy-Khrushchev plan is being held up, due to their inability to whip into line De Gaulle and French imperialism, which is carrying out its own policies in contradiction to the United States.

## HOW TO PREVENT NUCLEAR WAR

What are the facts on the prevention of nuclear war? As stated in Peking Review No. 1, 1963:

"We hold that in order to mobilize the masses of the people against nuclear war and nuclear weapons it is necessary to inform them of the enormous destructiveness of these weapons. It would be patently wrong to under-estimate this destructiveness. However, U.S. imperialism is doing its utmost to disseminate dread of nuclear weapons in pursuit of its policy of nuclear blackmail. In these circumstances, while Communists should point out the destructiveness of nuclear weapons, they should counter the U.S. imperialist propaganda of nuclear terror by stressing the possibility of outlawing them and preventing nuclear war; they should try and transmute the people's desire for peace into righteous indignation at the imperialist policy of nuclear threats and lead the people to struggle against the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war. In no circumstances must Communists act as a voluntary propagandist for the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. We hold that the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail must be thoroughly exposed and that all peace-loving countries and people must be mobilized on the most extensive scale to wage an unrelenting fight against every move made by the U.S. imperialists in their plans for aggression and war. We are deeply convinced that, by relying on the united struggle of all forces defending peace, it is possible to frustrate the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. This is the correct and effective policy for achieving a ban on nuclear weapons and preventing a nuclear war."

That is the only position for a Marxist-Leninist to take: to be opposed to nuclear war, to fight against it, but never to be afraid of it. In this context we can also quote Armando Hart, minister of education in Cuba, when he stated that the Cuban people

were ready for the "sacrifices that nuclear war entails" in order to "crush Yankee imperialism definitely." (Reporter Jan 17, 1963)

## THE ATOMIC BOMB IS A PAPER TIGER

The revisionists like to cover up their retreat by presenting themselves as "tacticians" seeking to evade war by "artful diplomacy." The fact is, however, that the policies of revisionism lead not to peace but to war. As Comrade Fidel Castro has said: "The way to peace is not the way of sacrificing or infringing upon people's rights, because that is precisely the way leading to war."

In Korea, the U.S. imperialists were handed the first defeat of their history. In Indo-China, the people routed the forces of French colonialism backed by the U.S. In Laos, and now in Vietnam the peoples are beating the hell out of American imperialism. The Cuban people have fought the American imperialists to a standstill. Why, then, didn't the imperialists resort to nuclear weapons in any of these cases?

The answer is that they knew that a nuclear attack in any of these cases would have released revolutionary energies of counter-attack a thousand times greater than their nuclear weapons and which would have eliminated imperialism from the face of the earth.

Yet the revisionists continue to advocate surrender to imperialist attacks under the guise of avoiding a nuclear war trap. They lecture the Chinese comrades for allowing themselves "to become a party to armed conflict (with India) . . . (during) the Cuban crisis. . . when that crisis brought the world to the brink of thermonuclear war." (Worker Jan. 13, 1963)

Contrary to the fears of the revisionists the victorious resistance of China to the attacks of India, not only put an end to these imperialist-inspired attacks against China, but did not initiate a thermonuclear war, the revisionist prophets of doom notwithstanding. Yet they continue to boast that their retreat in the Caribbean "preserved" the peace of the world.

## KHRUSHCHEV'S CONGO "VICTORY"

Khrushchev claims the Congo as a "victory." Here is what he said at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU:

"After long and painful trials a government which declared itself to be the successor to the Patrice Lumumba Government was set up in the Congo."  
 The murder of patriotic leaders, the subjugation of the Congolese people by U.S. imperialism, etc. are mere "details" not even worthy of mention.

In sharp contrast we have Castro's discussion with U Thant when he was in Havana last Oct. 30th trying to convince Castro to accept UN inspection. U Thant boasted that many small nations had "benefited" from UN "assistance." And Castro interjected:

— "In the case of the Congo too? . . ." U Thant replied: "And in the case of Somalia."

But Castro persisted:

— "In the case of the Congo, I understand that they solicited help from the UN."

And U Thant answered:

— "In the Congo, the petition was made by the Government of the Congo." And Castro shot back:

— "The government in the Congo which solicited help is now buried!" (From stenographic notes printed in Obra Revolucionaria no. 32)

In the Vanguard of Oct-Nov. 1962, we stated:

"It is a clear commentary on the role and treachery that Nikita Khrushchev and his revisionists have played that in a recent article appearing in *Le Progress*, which reflects the views of the government of Cyrille Adoula, dealt with the Cuban 'crisis' as follows:

"The free world should unite without hesitation against this new Soviet aggression. Remember the lesson of Hitler: The price one may be called on to pay tomorrow may be a thousand times greater than the cost of firmness today." (N.Y. Times, Oct. 25, 1962)

"Could anyone conceive of Patrice Lumumba referring to the imperialist cut-throats as 'the free world'? Only revisionist Khrushchev and Co. could distort the facts in such a way."

If Khrushchev and the other revisionists have their way, they would impose similar "victories" on Cuba, Vietnam, and other areas. In Cuba it was only the Marxist-Leninist policy of the revolutionary leadership together with the solidarity of the People's Republic of China and Latin America that prevented Khrushchev from scoring another "victory" of the kind registered in the Congo.

In Southeast Asia, also, Khrushchev and the revisionists have been disappointed. There the people did not accept the imperialist solution and continued beating the hell out of the U.S. imperialists. There will be no "Congo" solution in Southeast Asia, nor in Cuba, and that's for sure!

## BLOW-FOR-BLOW FIGHT AGAINST U.S. IMPERIALISM

How do Marxist-Leninists fight for peace? In an article in *Peking Review* of December 21, 1962 we learn that:

"The Chinese Communist Party has always maintained that in order to preserve world peace, realize peaceful coexistence and ease international tension, it is necessary, first of all, to oppose resolutely the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war and to mobilize the masses of people to wage a blow-for-blow struggle against U.S. imperialism."

The revisionists do not like this blow-for-blow policy of the Marxist-Leninists. They say:

"The editorialists of the *Peking Review* emphasize that the alternative policy that should have been followed is one of 'blow-for-blow,' and which charges 'surrender,' and 'Munich' has only one meaning in the actual circumstances of the time: that the quarantine and threat of bombing should have been met head on — in short a policy leading to thermonuclear war." (Worker Jan. 13, 1963)

But if the revolutionary forces do not give blow-for-blow, then the imperialists will be encouraged to go forward in their aggressive actions. If the revolutionary forces surrender to the imperialist atomic blackmail on one question, what is to stop the imperialists from using it on all questions? One cannot fight against imperialism for world peace on one's knees; it is necessary to stand up and give blow-for-blow.

If the Korean and Chinese people had been afraid of world war and allowed the United States to go ahead with its plans to destroy the Korean People's Democratic Republic, wouldn't this have strengthened imperialist war preparations? If the Vietnamese people had not performed the great historic feat of ousting French colonialism and U.S. imperialism from their territory, would not the war danger have increased? What of Algeria — should the people there not have fought a seven year war against French colonialism

and its NATO partners for fear of a nuclear war? Should the Cuban people not have expelled the puppet Batista regime from their country on the grounds that it "increased tension" in the Caribbean?

Would the cause of peace have been better served by allowing the continued presence of the odious Batista satrapy in Cuba, or the murderous forces of imperialism in Korea, Indo-China, and Algeria?

As Eugene Debs used to say, "Courage, brothers, peace will come, but only hand in hand with freedom."

## THE MAIN WAR DANGER

The 81 Party Statement forcefully characterizes U.S. imperialism as the main enemy of peace and source of the war danger in the world today. Therefore, it stands to reason that in order to fight for peace it is necessary to expose the war plans of U.S. imperialism. In *Peking Review* of August 17, 1962, it states:

"The broad masses of the people can be rallied and mobilized to wage effective struggles in defence of peace only if the enemy of peace and the source of war threats is identified. If, on the other hand, this fact is concealed and the line of distinction between the enemy and ourselves is blurred or, if only goodwill for peace is expressed without pointing out the aim of the struggle, the peace movement will be weakened and lose its bearings. Such a line is therefore absolutely wrong and most detrimental to the cause of world peace."

Under the influence of revisionism the peace movement in the United States has surrendered all pretense to anti-imperialism and has sunk to the level of bourgeois and social pacifism. At the present stage of the struggle, such pacifism can be helpful only to the imperialists, and not to the struggle for peace. The pacifists merely echo, along with the revisionists, the imperialist nuclear blackmail, thus frightening the peoples away from the peace struggle.

## POCS 1960 LINE ON THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

In September 1960, at the 3rd National Conference of POC we put forth our concept of how the fight for peace should be waged.

"Recent history in Korea, Indo China, Egypt, etc., is absolute proof of the possibilities for the prevention of a world war. In every one of these cases peace was imposed on the imperialists. They pulled in their horns only, and only when they realized that their war efforts would not rally support abroad or at home. Faced with inevitable military disaster and political bankruptcy and the ending of their system of exploitation they back-watered fast!"

"Some people argue thusly — 'Don't drive the imperialists into a corner, they may start a war out of desperation. They are madmen!'"

"The imperialists are criminal and fiendish, but they are not madmen. But even if they were . . . there is a Spanish saying 'madmen do not eat live coals.' The imperialists are capable of any form of brutality, but one thing you can be sure of — they will never commit suicide. They will always be aware of social and historical reality. They will not make a war that is profitable. They will not dare start a war that means the end of capitalism."

"Does this mean that the war danger is ended? It does not! Imperialism is always seeking for an opportunity to create the conditions for warmongering — such a war must have at least the possibilities of victory for them and must be profitable. If the peace forces relax their vigilance, fail to expose the constant war schemes of the imperialists and allow confusion to

develop among the people, then the fight for peace is endangered."

"We have summarized this attitude by this statement — 'peace has to be shoved down the throats of the imperialists!'"

## THE "DOUBLE STANDARD" SLANDER

To cover-up their shameful betrayal of the Cuban Revolution the revisionists here, taking their cue from Khrushchev, slanderously accuse the CPC of being guilty of a "double standard" in their foreign policy. The *Worker* of January 13, 1963 complains:

"One could say at this point that our Chinese comrades who set an example of flexibility in their heroic struggle for liberation are even today, correctly, not following the adventurous policy in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao that they advocate for others. Why this double standard and approach?"

We'd like to ask these cringing creatures of accommodation to imperialism why they failed to mention Korea in their "list"? We'd like them to tell us who was guilty of cowardice, the Chinese volunteers who continued to sacrifice their lives for the liberation of Korea despite Truman's threat of November 30, 1950 to drop nuclear bombs on China, or Khrushchev when Kennedy "threatened" last October a phony "invasion" of Cuba? Who's guilty of cowardice, the Chinese Communists who fulfilled their internationalist duty in giving unstinted aid during the revolution in Indo-China despite Dulles' threat in 1954 to bomb China with nuclear weapons, or the revisionists who continue to permit the imperialists to continue their occupation of West Berlin?

Furthermore, we'd like to ask the revisionists, who's guilty of "double standards" when imperialist spokesman C. I. Sulzberger boasted in the *N.Y. Times* July 23, 1962, that in the struggle in South East Asia "Moscow has cleverly got itself in the position of seeming to work ideologically for Peiping and pragmatically for us?"

We note that the revisionists mention Taiwan among the areas that China failed (or "feared") to liberate. Recently published material written by an apologist of U.S. imperialism (Alice Hsieh in *Communist China's Strategy in the Nuclear Era*) revealed how Khrushchev sabotaged China's attempt to free Taiwan in 1958. (This fact was also confirmed by Max Frankel in the *Saturday Evening Post* of April 13, 1963)

When the U.S. Navy was sent to the Taiwan Straits with atomic weapons during the Chinese shelling of Quemoy the Chinese government was led to believe that Khrushchev would come to its aid when Pravda asserted on August 31, 1958 that the "Soviet Union will give the CPR the necessary moral and material help in its just struggle." Yet the U.S. imperialists couldn't help but notice, as revealed by Alice Hsieh, that Khrushchev "did not commit the Russians to any specific military response." But when Chou En-lai stated on September 6th that China was "prepared to resume ambassadorial talks with the U.S." then, and only then did Khrushchev make "his deterrent threat — only after the peak danger point in the crisis had been passed, only after the risk that any threat might have to be implemented had been much reduced. In his letter of September 7 to President Eisenhower, Khrushchev accused the United States of resorting to atomic blackmail against China and stated for the first time that 'an attack of the People's Republic of China . . . is an attack on the Soviet Union.' Had Khrushchev's enunciation of the Soviet deterrent posture in relation to China, come before September 6, it might have con-

(Continued on page 4)

# Polarization

(Continued from page 3)  
stituted a dangerous gesture, for it might have been difficult for the Soviet Union to predict the United States reaction to it. Moscow could well have felt that such a threat, issued at the height of the crisis, might cause the United States to miscalculate Soviet intentions and resort to reckless action with unforeseeable consequences. After Chou's proposal to resume political talks, however, the Soviet Union had reason to assume that the United States would evaluate Khrushchev's statement in the framework of reduced tensions." (Ibid)

## KHRUSHCHEV TALKS TOUGH — AFTER DANGER IS OVER

Much as Khrushchev and Gus Hall might falsely accuse the CPC of "double standards", the imperialist bourgeoisie and their apologists nevertheless are actually aware of who are the past-masters of the double standard. Alice Hsieh noticed that:

"As the Taiwan Strait crisis moved more and more into a political phase, with the resumption of ambassadorial talks in Warsaw, Khrushchev became more outspoken in defining the character of the Soviet Union's deterrent posture. In his letter of September 19 to President Eisenhower he said:

"As I had noted in my previous message, some American military leaders are even trying to threaten China with atomic weapons. . .

"I must tell you outright, Mr. President, that atomic blackmail with regard to the People's Republic of China will intimidate neither us nor the People's Republic of China. . .

"We have a treaty of friendship alliance with the great ally, neighbor of our country, a treaty meeting the fundamental interests of the Soviet and Chinese peoples, the interests of peace, and may no one doubt that we shall completely honor our commitments."

The sending of MIG's to the Indian bourgeoisie during their attack on China is an example of how Khrushchev "honors" his commitments. But during the Taiwan Strait crisis, he sent only "moral" support. We must note also that when Khrushchev sent missiles to Cuba, he promptly withdrew them upon "demand". But when the U.S. imperialists sent missiles to Taiwan, Khrushchev didn't demand their removal. As a matter of fact, they're still there!

Now, who's guilty of a double standard foreign policy!!!

The revisionists' hypocrisy and double standards were thoroughly exposed by the Chinese comrades in an incisive manner in the Peking Review no. 10-11, 1963.

"We say to these friends who are acting the hero, it is you, and not we, who really have a 'double standard.' With regard to the U.S. imperialists, one day you call them pirates and the next you say they are concerned for peace. As for revolutionary Cuba, you say that you support her five demands for safeguarding her independence and sovereignty, but on the other hand you try to impose 'international inspection' on her. With regard to the Sino-Indian dispute, you speak of 'fraternal' China and 'friendly India' on the one hand, but on the other you maliciously attack China and support the Indian reactionaries in divers ways. As for Hongkong and Macao, while you ostensibly speak for China, you are actually stabbing her in the back."

## HOW KHRUSHCHEV "DEFENDED" CUBA

Perhaps the most unprincipled attacks of all have been leveled

by the revisionists against the Marxist-Leninists, for their firm stand in relation to the so-called Cuban Crisis. On the one hand we have the arrogant claims of the Kennedy Administration claiming "victory" in Cuba, on the other hand, we see the revisionists indulging in the most extravagant self-congratulations for having "saved the peace" and Cuba from "invasion". Thus the Worker of Jan. 13, 1963 boasts:

"The role of Premier Khrushchev in keeping open the lines of communication and negotiation in the direct moments of the crisis — resulting in the removal of the missiles, the ending of the blockade, and the promise of no invasion of Cuba (notwithstanding the attempts of the Kennedy Administration to renege on the promise) — was a triumph for courage and reason though negotiations and compromise which advanced the peace aspirations of all mankind. World peace was saved; peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition were indicated; and the right of Cuba to determine her own way of life and her own social system was preserved."

A great deal is made of Kennedy's "promise" not to invade Cuba, as if the pledge of imperialist criminals can be accepted at face value. And yet this is what Khrushchev said to the Supreme Soviet regarding this "pledge": "The President declared quite definitely, and this is known to the whole world, that the United States will not attack Cuba and will refrain also its allies from such action." Yet, despite the claim that the "pledge" was made and "known to the whole world" the Christian Science Monitor of Feb. 11, 1963 reports that "Socialist emissary spokesmen here repeat their Premier's promise that Soviet troops will be removed 'in due course'. But they hasten to add that . . . the United States has not given a no-invasion pledge."

Whether the U.S. imperialists made a pledge or not does not really matter. Any pledge by American imperialists is just as unworthy as one by their revisionist servants. But the 26th Street brand of Titoites are trying hard to sell the gullible and the naive renegade trust in Khrushchev and to restore confidence in U.S. imperialism.

It was fortunate, for the future of the revolutionary struggles in Latin America, and in the world that Fidel Castro called Kennedy's bluff. At the time when U Thant was in Cuba to legalize the Khrushchev-Kennedy deal Comrade Castro declared firmly that "the U.S. has no right to invade Cuba and it can't negotiate with a pledge not to commit a misdemeanor, with the mere pledge not to commit a crime. In the face of threat of this danger, we trust more to our decision to defend ourselves than in the word of the government of the U.S." (Obra Revolucionaria no. 32, 1962)

## KHRUSHCHEV'S CUBAN "MUNICH" DEAL

What was the position of the Chinese Communist Party during the Kennedy-Khrushchev deal? "On more than one occasion we have made it clear that we neither called for the establishment of missile bases in Cuba nor obstructed the withdrawal of the so-called 'offensive weapons' from Cuba. We have never considered that it was a Marxist-Leninist attitude to brandish nuclear weapons as a way of settling international disputes. Nor have we ever considered that the avoidance of a thermonuclear war in the Caribbean crisis was a 'Munich'. What we did strongly oppose, still strongly oppose and will strongly oppose in the future is the sacrifice of another

country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. A compromise of this sort can only be regarded as one hundred percent appeasement, a 'Munich' pure and simple. A compromise of this sort has nothing in common with the socialist countries' policy of peaceful co-existence." (Peking Review no. 1, 1963)

This correct exposure of the collaborationist policies of the revisionists so stung the revisionist leadership of the CPUSA that they could only scream with "indignation" and protested that the Chinese comrades didn't know their history. Yet the Chinese weren't the only ones who made this correct comparison. Why didn't the revisionists reveal that the Cuban people and leaders also made this comparison? The Reporter of Dec. 6, 1962 gleefully revealed that when "Khrushchev made it quite clear that Moscow would not go to war to defend Cuba" their correspondent in Havana heard the following: "Over and over again one word recurred in conversations with Cuban leaders on that Saturday: the word was 'Munich'. For the first fear of the Castro revolutionaries was that they would be abandoned just as Czechoslovakia had been abandoned in 1938 and left at the mercy of a relentless enemy." And Comrade Fidel Castro warned U Thant during the latter's "Havana mission" that "The path toward the last world war was paved by the annexation of Austria, the dissolution of Czechoslovakia. . . Cuba is not Austria, nor is it the Congo. We have definite intentions to defend our rights despite all the difficulties, and all the risks." (Obra Revolucionaria no. 32, 1962)

Our position was fully expressed in the Oct-Nov. 1962 Vanguard:

## JFK DOESN'T DARE — INVADE CUBA

"American imperialism cannot and dare not invade Cuba directly until the main line-of support to the Cuban revolution, that is, the support of the Latin American masses, is severed. American imperialism and Nikita Khrushchev and Co. know that if there were a frontal attack against Cuba now, there would immediately develop a general revolutionary upheaval in Latin America. And no American imperialist puppet from Betancourt to Ydigoras Fuentes would be able to stem the ensuing tide of revolutionary struggle.

"The main immediate direction of the present 'crisis' attack is against the Latin American movements as a whole and not against Cuba.

"The American imperialists, with the aid and support of the world revisionists, are trying to use the 'crisis' threat to head-off the rising tide of revolution in Venezuela, Colombia, Brazil, and indeed in the whole of Latin America and the world. Invasion of Cuba is not and cannot be part of the immediate plans of American imperialism."

This analysis is further borne out by the statement of Sec. of Defense McNamara who said on Jan. 30, 1963 that the "emphasis" of U.S. "aid" to Latin America in the coming year "would pass from that of continental defense, to measures securing internal security." (El Diario Jan. 31, 1963)

The revisionists, despite their description of Cuba as a socialist country, continue to regard it merely as a "small" semi-colonial oppressed nation, thus delegating to themselves the responsibility for determining how much "sovereignty" Cuba is entitled to demand without running the risk of antagonizing U.S. imperialism. This concept runs counter to historical facts. Cuba is a socialist state, and therefore pursues a consistent policy of peaceful co-existence. The relations between Cuba and the U.S. have nothing to do — any longer — with the

relations between oppressed and oppressor. Cuba is the Free Territory of America, a Socialist Republic, and therefore comes within the scope of peaceful co-existence.

How does Cuba's foreign policy concretize the policy of peaceful co-existence? Comrade Fidel Castro stated:

## INVADE CUBA AND COMMIT SUICIDE

"We do not want imperialism to commit suicide on our coast. We proclaim with all sincerity our desire to live in peace, (and we hope) good judgment and the most elementary common sense will govern the acts of those who have in their hands the destinies of that country."

"We shall stand firm. We can proclaim serenely that we are disposed to die at our posts, but we don't know if the Government of the United States and the generals of the Pentagon and those Senators who proclaim war against our country are also disposed to die. . .

"We are not sardines! The shark should not mistake us to be, because this time it could well be his last mistake."

Comrade Castro is showing Khrushchev and all the other cowardly revisionists the correct method of carrying out the policy of peaceful co-existence!

Like Lenin, Castro has defied the U.S. imperialists warning them that if they attack Cuba, the Cuban Revolution will blast back, and unlike Khrushchev's "advice" to the national and colonial liberation movements to "take it easy", Castro has urged them to "throw the masses into a struggle." Recently Cuba celebrated a "week of solidarity with the Venezuelan people" and match ed deed to word by offering asylum to the Venezuelan patriots who plucked from under Betancourt's nose the freighter Anzo-

(and) it is a tool of the struggle against imperialism and for building an independent economy." (Ibid)

## NEHRU "EXPOSES" REVISIONIST LINE

This rosy portrait of Nehru painted in New Age and Communist depicting him and the class he represents as "anti-imperialist" busy building an "independent economy" was inadvertently exposed as counterfeit by the Saturday Evening Post of Jan. 19, 1963 which revealed that:

"Although India has increasingly encouraged private foreign investments lately, and in many cases has relaxed its insistence on majority control by Indians, foreigners remain cautious, having invested only a little over \$1,000,000,000 in the country, and the British have put in 80 percent of that. 'Nonetheless,' said the prime minister, 'the U.K. companies are making more profits now than they were under British rule.' Even Mr. Winston Churchill has expressed great satisfaction at this."

It must please revisionists Khrushchev, Dange and Gus Hall very much to learn that Winston Churchill, that arch imperialist, also approves of the "anti-imperialist" and "independent economy building" of Nehru!

Marxist-Leninist theory and historical experience teach us that the national bourgeoisie can play a progressive role for a certain time when it is fighting for control of the domestic market, for the "natural right" of every bourgeois to exploit his own proletariat. But when the working class begin to assume a large share in the anti-imperialist struggle, the national bourgeoisie (especially its wealthier section) invariably joins the compradors and becomes an agent of imperialism, turning against the liberation struggle of its own people.

Is this not what has happened in every struggle for national liberation? Wasn't Chiang Kai-shek, today an international symbol for traitor and imperialist agent, once a member of the anti-imperialist forces? Is this not the experience of the Cuban Revolution? What kind of an "anti-imperialist" force were Prio Sordarras, Tony Varona, Miro Cardona, and others of their stripe, well known representatives of the Cuban national bourgeoisie? They were such "anti-imperialists" that they have fully merged with the traitorous Batista clique, thus degenerating into shameless lickspittles of U.S. imperialism, as befits their class role.

We would like to contrast the revisionist picture of the Nehru government with the analysis of Indonesia made by the Indonesian CP, which states, "It should be noted, however, that the social base of the ultra-reactionary forces — imperialism, feudalism, compradorism, and bureaucratic capitalism — has not yet been abolished." (World Marxist Review August 1961) And this in a country whose government has consistently followed a more progressive policy than Nehru's.

We believe the quotation applies with special emphasis to Indian society. With such a character, it should surprise none that the Nehru government launched its aggressive actions, starting with individual provocations and graduating to massive invasions.

The Chinese government and CP, like true revolutionaries acting in the interests of the Chinese and Indian peoples, repelled the attack, thus earning the bitter hatred of the imperialists, Indian reactionary bourgeoisie comprador elements, and revisionists, all of whom were hoping to use the border dispute to isolate China. They accuse China of adventurism for defending its borders. They would have preferred that China accede to the demands of the Nehru reactionaries and adopt the revisionist policy (Continued on page 5)

## HOW THE REVISIONISTS AID NEHRU

In the India-China border dispute we see another example of how the revisionists distort peaceful co-existence. It is obvious how the U.S. imperialists feel on the subject. The Anti-China chorus has reached new heights of shrill attack. Nor have the imperialists confined themselves to verbal support. A U.S. military mission has landed in India; billions in military and other "aid" have been given to India as a reward for its aggression against the People's Republic of China. The revisionists haven't lagged behind: Soviet MIG planes continue to arrive in India, to kill Chinese workers and peasants.

Lenin once said that the revisionists never invent anything, but simply borrow from the arsenal of the bourgeoisie. So it is with the India-China border question. Witness the following from the Worker of Jan 13:

"Is it any wonder then that people everywhere become concerned when the Chinese government reverses its policy in relation to India and allows itself to become a party to armed conflict. . . And has the armed clash with India benefited China? It has caused the ouster from the Indian government of the friends of China and world peace. It has made Premier Nehru the prisoner of the rightwing, landholding exploiters of the Indian masses."

And here's how the revisionists characterize the Nehru government:

"Indian CP chairman S. A. Dange said (New Age, Indian CP weekly, Dec. 2, 1962): 'Indian capitalism is capitalism, but it is not expansionist and it was born as an anti-imperialist force.'" (National Guardian Jan. 7, 1963) And further:

"In India, a recent issue of the Soviet fortnightly Kommunist said (quoted in Link, Oct. 14, 1962), 'with a strong monopoly bourgeoisie, the state sector also serves the national bourgeoisie

# Polarization

(Continued from page 4)

of "surrender a little now in order to surrender more later."

China refused, peace was imposed, the imperialist-revisionist plotters were handed a crushing defeat, and China was not isolated. On the contrary, public opinion throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America has supported its peace-loving policy, as was demonstrated in the recent Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Conference held in Tanganyika. This is not to the liking of the Indian revisionists, who have published a pamphlet entitled *Forward to the Defense of Motherland Under the Banner of Jawaharlal Nehru*.

## NO PHONEY "UNITY" WITH REVISIONISM

Recently the CP of China and the Khrushchev clique have exchanged letters relating to the possibility of holding bi-lateral meetings in order to overcome the divisions between them. There are those who see in this exchange signs that the split will be healed by a simple agreement to "unite." Those who hold this view confuse the correct tactics of the Chinese comrades with the unprincipled maneuvers of the revisionists. What has happened is that Khrushchev and company have been forced by the revolutionary forces of the world to muffle their vicious attacks on the Marxist-Leninists and instead adopt a more "peaceful, conciliatory" tone. The Chinese are merely continuing their historically tested policy of counterposing two tactics of the revolutionary forces to the two tactics of the enemy. In answer to the revisionist slanders of Marxism-Leninism, the Chinese comrades expose the counter-revolutionary nature of modern revisionism, as they have done in a number of articles and pamphlets, including *Workers of All Countries, Unite, Oppose Our Common Enemy, The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us, Leninism and Modern Revisionism, Let Us Unite on the Basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, Whence the Differences?, A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the USA, A Mirror for Revisionists, and More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us*.

When these damning exposures force the revisionists to resort to "negotiations" in order to gain time and prevent their total isolation, the Chinese comrades adopt the tactic of striving for real negotiations as against the false "negotiations" of the revisionists.

The difference between the two concepts of negotiations was pointed out clearly by the NY Times of April 4, 1963, which stated:

"A comparison of the agendas for the Chinese-Soviet talks as proposed by Moscow and Peking was revealing of how the two parties differ on fundamentals of Communist ideology.

"The first point of the Soviet agenda dealt with questions of a struggle for the strengthening of the Communist system, including the question of defeating the capitalist countries in 'peaceful economic competition.'

"The agenda proposed by the Chinese was headed by the question of strategy and tactics of revolution in the contemporary world."

"The second Soviet point was concerned with 'questions of the struggle for peace, and peaceful coexistence.'

"The parallel Chinese point was 'the question of opposing imperialism and defending world peace.'

"The third point on the Soviet agenda was 'questions of struggle against United States-led im-

perialism.'

"The Chinese agenda proposed the 'question of the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples.'"

Let none be confused; there will be no "unity" between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism.

## POLARIZATION — AND POC'S EXPERIENCE FIGHTING REVISIONISM

In the first part of this article we discussed the question of polarization in the international communist movement. We should like to return to the subject once again, to see if we can shed further light on it based on our experiences fighting revisionism in the United States.

The POC was founded in Aug. 1958 by comrades who had been fighting for a Marxist-Leninist policy for several years within the CPUSA. We have since changed our composition in the process of growth to the point that now by far the majority of our members come, not from the old Party, but directly from the masses of workers without any previous contact with the Left. Despite this, we believe certain of our early history will prove valuable for understanding what is taking place internationally.

Before we organized POC we existed in various cities as "caucuses" (factions) in the old Party. These caucuses passed through several stages of development before reaching the point of the complete organizational break. Without going into the specifics of each point of transition to a new level, the main feature in this process was the breaking with one or another form of opportunism, and particularly, the breaking with conciliationism.

When the inner-Party struggle broke out early in 1956, following the 20th Congress of the CPSU, there were three tendencies in the Party which quickly became crystallized into factions: there were the open Right liquidators — Gates, Schrank, Charney, Healey, Nelson, Schneidermann, Lightfoot, Richmond, etc.; the "Center" — Dennis, Jackson, Stachel; and the "Left" — Foster, Loman, Thompson, Davis. The consistent Left at that time existed as part of the general "Left".

Soon after the 16th Convention of the Party in February 1957 it became clear that the "Left" was not one solid whole, but was divided up into the "Left" of Foster et al, which was prepared to accept "unity" with the liquidators in order to "avoid splitting the Party," as they said, and the consistent Left.

Thus there were again three factions: the Right, the newly-merged center-"Left", and the consistent Left. How this revisionist-conciliationist "unity" operated was depicted in our pamphlet *Our Reply to the Conciliators of Revisionism*, published in Feb. 1958.

"Our record shows that never, but never, have we made any deals, voted for in any way or form or compromised with the Revisionists. The record shows that we fought them consistently right from the beginning.

"Perhaps this is where the exception to our 'tactics' originate.

"As a matter of fact, sometime ago, before the National Convention, all the 'left' was one happy factional caucus fighting against the Revisionists. So we thought. In those days, Evie, Weinstein, E. Cantor, Olga, Torres, and Armando participated in one caucus. But soon enough we were jolted by the horse trading proposals. So we split because of conciliationism and for no other reason.

"From then on we were tagged as the 'ultra-left' — 'leftist and factional' . . .

"In reality what Weinstein and Company do not like about our pamphlet is the fact that besides banging away at Revisionism, it also throws the glare of the searchlight on the problem of conciliationism.

"Real struggle on two fronts, against Right and 'Left' deviations presupposes a struggle against the compromising conciliators. The history of the Communist Parties of the world teach us that the appearance of revisionism brings about the parallel development of conciliationism.

"This is also true of our experience. Conciliationism is a particular, specific form of Right-opportunism."

## THREE GROUPINGS — INTERNATIONALLY

This is exactly what has taken place internationally. The "Left" — conciliators long ago merged with the Center, and so what we witness now are the three groupings: the open Right — Tito, Gomulka; the Center-"Left" — Khrushchev, Gus Hall; and the Left, led by the CP of China.

Later on we stated in *Two Roads* (May 1958)

"Since the beginning of the Party crisis, there has been an interlocking chain of cooperative relationships reaching from Schrank to Gates to Wilkerson to Nelson to Fine to Stein to Stachel to Dennis to Jackson to Davis to Foster to Thompson to Loman. It exists today. And the mere detail of one's being no longer in the Party has not been allowed to interfere seriously with this arrangement. Foster-Davis-Loman meet in the Center-'Left' caucus with Dennis-Stachel-Jackson, and both share support of the Convention and condemnation of the 'ultra-left' in the National Committee with Fine-Stein-Nelson who, in turn, meet with Gates and Schrank to advance various common projects intended to culminate in the eventual public mass withdrawal of the Right from the Party and in the establishment of a new full-blown anti-Marxist-Leninist 'American Socialist' grouping.

"There is not one of the entire Center-'Left' leadership who has enough principle to draw a line which would cut him off from this chain of cooperative connections, the end of which lies in the most openly anti-Party circles.

"And, what is the common denominator which runs from one end of this chain of relationships to the other? — It is the varying degrees of rejection of Marxism-Leninism. But they draw a dead-end bead on the Marxist-Leninist 'ultra-left' as they call it, with phrases about wiping out factionalism, expulsions, etc."

Is this not what occurs on an international scale? There was a time when Khrushchev, Hall & Co. went through the motions of criticizing Tito, in order better to attack Marxism-Leninism. That time is past; what we are witnessing today is the full merging of the center-"Left" and the Right, exactly as has occurred in the CPUSA.

The "anti-revisionist" Togliatti recently stated:

"This amply justifies the stand which we and others have taken towards the Yugoslav comrades, hence correcting the resolution of 1960 which is wrong on this point." (quoted in Peking Review no. 5, 1963)

## ANTI-STALINISM IS ANTI-MARKSIST

And at the recent German Party Congress, the Chinese delegate was booed while reading from the portion of the 81 Party Statement that condemns Yugoslav revisionism!

On the other side of the coin, there is another unity which has reached an advanced stage: that is the unity between the revisionist-conciliationist and the real ultra-"left" — the Trotskyites. "Anti-Stalinism" is the rallying cry of this new unity. In theory and practice, "anti-Stalinism" is

nothing but a concrete projection of anti-Marxism-Leninism.

The political and ideological boundaries between the Titoites, Khrushchevites, and Trotskyites have actually been obliterated, and what exists now is a division of labor between them.

Having achieved a high degree of "Unity" it is obvious that the counter-revolutionary forces should "advance" to new expressions of their "ideology" and policy. Thus we witness the following, in a review published in the Jan. 1963 *World Marxist Review* of the Soviet text *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, new edition:

"These ideas, the return to the Leninist approach to questions of political strategy and tactics, are further elaborated in the new edition. It contains a more profound criticism of Stalin's erroneous postulates. In 1928 Stalin went so far as to declare the Left Social-Democrats "the most dangerous exponents of bourgeois policy in the working class" and he introduced a corresponding amendment to the theses of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern and the Tenth Plenary Session of its Executive Committee, thereby impelling the Communist parties of the capitalist countries onto the path of barren sectarianism."

The very time when the Communist Parties became a world political force, the glorious battles in France and Spain in 1934, the militant battles of the CPUSA, the Long March in China — all this was "barren sectarianism." Note that it is not Stalin who is under attack, but the Communist International. We quote this merely to illustrate the path tread by the revisionists.

The process of downward motion on the part of the revisionists has brought about its negation, that is a great speeding-up of the forward motion of the Marxist-Leninists. This is evident in Latin America, where the revolutionary forces are reaching new heights of ideological and political maturity. In the Dominican Republic, for example, at the same time revisionism was killing the Party, a new force, the Dominican People's Movement (MPD), was emerging from the mass struggles of the people, and, under the influence of the Cuban revolution, taking the path of Marxism-Leninism.

## POLARIZATION OF LATIN AMERICAN PARTIES

We see, on the one hand the endless meetings of the revisionist leaders of the Latin American Parties (an example of this was the round-table affair published in the Jan. 1963 *World Marxist Review*, in which they spend all their time talking about electoral alliances and unity with the national bourgeoisie, without once mentioning armed insurrection), and on the other hand the reality of the armed struggle in Venezuela, Guatemala, Columbia, Ecuador, Brazil, and now Mexico.

Fidel Castro highlighted this in his speech of Jan. 16, 1963:

## "HURL THE MASSES INTO COMBAT"

"The art which must be learned and which must be developed — how to lead the masses to revolution. For the masses are the ones who make history. But in order for them to make history the masses must be led into battle. And that is the duty of leaders and revolutionary organizations. They must put the masses into action, to hurl the masses into combat.

"And that is what they did in Algeria. And that is what the patriots of South Vietnam are doing. They have hurled the masses into struggle, with correct methods, with correct tactics, and they have taken along with them the largest possible number of the masses into the struggle.

"There are some concepts in regard to these matters which

we would like to clear up, for there have been some vulgar theoreticians who have asserted that in Cuba a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism took place.

"This was not a peaceful transition. It was a transition made through combat, without which there would not have been any transition in our country. Without that heroic struggle, without that armed struggle of the Cuban people, perhaps we would still have here Mr. Batista, 'made in USA'.

"These are historical truths. And we believe that at least about our historical truths we have a right to speak. And we are not going to permit certain theoreticians, from a distance and without ever having been here, to tell us what happened here.

"Let the theoreticians of imperialism preach conformity. Let the theoreticians of the revolution fearlessly preach the revolution.

"That is what we think. That is what we said in the Declaration of Havana, a declaration which was honored by some revolutionary organizations in some sister countries by being put into a desk drawer instead of being disseminated as it deserved."

Several months earlier, on Nov. 19, 1962, Castro had stated:

"The policy of peaceful coexistence has put to sleep the communist parties of Latin America. Only the Communist Party of Venezuela is playing a consistently revolutionary role which insures its growth. The Communist Party of China grew during the war, whereas before it was a small and weak party. On all sides the communists yell 'peace'; but with this alone we don't advance." (Fidel Castro's Nov. 19, 1962 speech — quoted in *La Prensa* Jan. 15, 1963)

## MLPR vs REVISIONISM

In Puerto Rico, too, the degree of maturity is being felt. El Imparcial of San Juan reported on Feb. 1, 1963 that in a recent meeting in New York Pelagrin Garcia, leader of the Liberation Movement of Puerto Rico (MLPR) "announced the determination of the MLPR to not cease in its struggle for independence, maintaining that 'nothing nor nobody will detain the Liberation Movement of Puerto Rico in its public projections, least of all the secret arrangements that they want to impose on us in order to reduce the revolutionary and liberationist character of this dispute in favor of an anemic 'peaceful coexistence' between exploiters and exploited, between master and slaves. . . Munoz Marin says that we will have to wait 50 years (for independence), but this is part of the agreements between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev. The regime of Munoz Marin won't last 50 years, nor will that of the North American imperialists."

Another aspect of the leap forward taking place among the Marxist-Leninists is the decision of the Korean People's Democratic Republic to become self-sufficient in economic development, brought about by a desire to be free of Khrushchev's revisionist economic blackmail. The success of the People's Republic of Albania in overfulfilling the year's plan for industrial growth is also a slap in the face to the Khrushchevite pawnbrokers.

An example of the living strength of Marxism-Leninism when contrasted to the wile, washed out nature of revisionist theories is the great economic progress made in the three years of the Cuban Revolution. Overall economic growth since 1959 has advanced 90 percent, unemployment has been reduced from 500,000 to 220,000, despite U.S. imperialism's blockade. Furthermore, about half the arable land is under socialist forms of production, and more than 50 percent of industrial production

(Continued on page 6)

# Polarization

(Continued from page 5)  
comes from state-owned enterprises. (Christian Science Monitor Jan. 3, 1963, quoting an article in a Cuban journal). Contrast this with Poland, for example, where sixteen years after the Party assumed power, only 9 percent of the land is collectivized.

And let's not talk any nonsense about "Socialist Yugoslavia" as does Nikita.

How is the phenomenon of world revisionism explained historically? How does historical polarization emerge?

## HOW POLARIZATION EMERGED HISTORICALLY

Lenin wrote, in *Opportunism and the Collapse of the Second International*:

"The relatively 'peaceful' character of the period between 1871 and 1914 first of all fostered opportunism as a mood, then as a trend, and finally, as a group or stratum of the labor bureaucracy and petty-bourgeois fellow-travellers. These elements were able to gain the upper hand in the working-class movement only by recognizing, in words, revolutionary aims and revolutionary tactics. They were able to win the confidence of the masses only by solemnly vowing that all this 'peaceful' work was only preparation for the proletarian revolution. This contradiction was an abyss which had to burst some day, and it has burst! The whole question is: is it necessary to try, as Kautsky and Co. are doing, to reinject the pus into the

body for the sake of 'unity' (with the pus), or whether, in order to help the body of the working class movement fully to recover, to remove the pus as quickly and as thoroughly as possible, notwithstanding the acute pain temporarily caused by the process." Lenin, *Selected Works in Two Volumes*, Vol. 1, part 2, p. 422.

Further, he wrote:  
"It is absurd to go on regarding opportunism as an intra-Party phenomenon. It is absurd to think of carrying out the Basle resolution in conjunction with David, Legien, Hyndman, Plekhanov, and Webb. Unity with the social-chauvinists means unity with one's 'own' national bourgeoisie, which exploits other nations; it means splitting the international proletariat. This does not mean that an immediate rupture with the opportunists is possible everywhere; it means only that historically this rupture has matured; that it is necessary and inevitable for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat; that history, which has led us from 'peaceful' capitalism to imperialist capitalism, has prepared for this rupture." (Ibid)

Lenin wrote the above words in relation to a previous period of polarization. This applies with equal force today, now that the present polarization has reached its decisive stage.

How do we view the present lineup of forces? In our opinion, China, as the strongest state in the world, when considered in all its aspects, is the base of the

revolutionary movement. Cuba is the main outpost, its spearhead.

At our 5th POC Conference we stated:

"The end may come through a revolutionary explosion in the colonial world or it could be, yes, it will be, precipitated by China getting the atom bomb, and as a result releasing the world-wide revolutionary energies that Nikita Khrushchev, Tito, Gus Hall and company have helped to contain with their revisionism and opportunism."

The 81 Party Statement describes the present condition of the world capitalist system in the following terms:

"The world capitalist system is going through an intense process of disintegration and decay. Its contradictions have accelerated the development of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism. By tightening the monopolies' grip on the life of the nation, state-monopoly capitalism closely combines the power of the monopolies with that of the state with the aim of saving the capitalist system and increasing the profits of the imperialist bourgeoisie to the utmost by exploiting the working class and plundering large sections of the population.

"But no matter what methods it resorts to, the monopoly bourgeoisie cannot rescue capitalism. The interests of a handful of monopolies are in irreconcilable contradiction to the interests of the entire nation. The class and national antagonisms, and the internal and external contradictions of capitalist society, have sharpened greatly.

"Never has the conflict between the productive forces and relations of production in the capital-

ist countries been so acute.

"The decay of capitalism is particularly marked in the United States of America, the chief imperialist country of today."

That is how we see it, and that is why we are confident of the complete victory of our class — and not somewhere off in the distant future, either.

In the main report delivered to the POC Labor Conference in July 1962 we stated:

### SITUATION IN USA

"I think, Comrades, that the most fundamental point of the report is the fact that the deepening of the third stage of the crisis of imperialism is today developing towards a revolutionary situation in the United States, and that this is the key that we must seize hold of. And yet we know — because we are Marxist-Leninists, because we are materialists, and because we understand dialectics — that life is not one continuous flow, that we see also the contradictions.

"What is the contradiction in this situation? The contradiction is this: that this development toward a revolutionary situation in the United States has its contradiction in the fact that it takes place in the absence of a revolutionary Communist Party; that this development takes place in a situation where revisionism has become a world-wide phenomena, and therefore, our tactics must take into full account both of these developments — the development of the revolutionary trend and its apparent contradiction in the absence of a revolutionary Communist Party."

It is the resolving of this contradiction which forms the central task of POC.

ments in India have increased rapidly. In June 1948, foreign investments in Indian enterprises (not counting bank investments) totalled 2,560 million rupees. This sum increased to 6,550 million rupees in 1960, that is, increased by 150 per cent within thirteen years. In 1948, foreign capital amounted to 34.8 per cent of the paid-up capital of Indian joint-stock companies. By 1960 this figure had increased to 38 per cent.

At the same time, the number of enterprises which are jointly owned by Indian monopoly capital and foreign capital but are actually under the control of the latter has also grown rapidly. According to a report in the Indian journal *Economic Times* of July 23, 1962, such jointly owned enterprises increased by 103 in 1958, 150 in 1959, 380 in 1960 and 403 in 1961. By March 1962, the total number of such jointly owned enterprises had reached 1,240. It is the amount of U.S. capital that has increased most rapidly. From 1948 to 1959, British investments in India doubled but U.S. investments increased seven times. From 1948 to 1960-61, the proportion of India's imports from Britain decreased from 22.8 to 19.8 per cent, while the U.S. share increased from 16 to 27 per cent (not including the grains imported from the United States), thereby surpassing Britain.

### GROWING DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN AID

What is particularly noteworthy is the fact that the Nehru government has become increasingly dependent on foreign aid. Foreign aid accounted for 9.6 per cent of total expenditure under India's first "Five-Year Plan", and for 20.6 per cent under its second "Five-Year Plan"; it will account for 30 per cent under its third "Five-Year Plan". According to the October 1961 and April 1962 issues of the *Foreign Aid of the U.S. International Co-operation Administration* and other U.S. official material, the "aid" which the U.S. extended or promised to extend to India between 1949 and the end of July 1962 amount-

ed to U.S. \$4,754.2 million. If to this is added the "aid" extended to India during the same period by international financial organizations controlled by the United States, the grand total will reach U.S. \$6,598.2 million.

The overwhelming proportion of the large amount of foreign aid received by the Nehru government consists of loans repayable with interest and the annual interest rates of these loans run as high as 6 per cent. As a result, India's foreign debt burden grows heavier and heavier, and it becomes more and more difficult for India to extricate itself from its economic dependence on foreign monopoly capital. The Indian weekly *Link* wrote in its August 15, 1962 issue, "... instead of helping India to move ahead towards the goal of independent development, these foreign loans will for a long time remain a halter round the country's neck."

### U.S. TAKING OVER BRITISH MONOPOLY POSITION IN INDIA

These facts prove that economically India has not freed itself from dependence on imperialism. What is different from the past is that U.S. imperialism is gradually taking over British imperialism's monopoly position in India.

The Nehru government has established a number of state-run enterprises in India which are nothing but state-capitalist enterprises dominated by the big bourgeoisie and big landlord and actually dependent on foreign monopoly capital. Such enterprises serve the interests of both the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords and of foreign monopoly capital. They are in essence Indian bureaucrat monopoly capital. This bureaucrat monopoly capital is developing. It develops at the expense of the Indian working people and even of the capitalist owners of small and medium-sized enterprises.

In 1960 Nehru openly called on the Indian people to "tighten their belts" in order to carry through his "industrial revolu-

tion." The living standards of the masses of the Indian working people have been deteriorating in recent years. Prices have been mounting continuously and taxes increasing. The number of unemployed has become ever greater, and the life of the peasantry has become increasingly hard.

India's basic domestic problem is the peasant problem.

### INDIA'S PEASANT PROBLEM

When they ruled India, the British imperialists, to serve their predatory ends, supported the feudal landlord class. The broad masses of the peasants were subjected to all kinds of exploitation in the form of rent, taxes and usury, and agricultural production was at a very low level.

After India's proclamation of independence what policies did the Nehru government adopt in regard to the feudal land system?

In the initial period of India's independence, the Nehru government, in order to meet the needs of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords to concentrate power in their own hands, abolished the political privileges of some of the local feudal princes and the zamindari (tax-farming) privileges of some landlords, but the Indian feudal land system as a whole was preserved. According to the national *Sample Survey of 1954-55* published by the Indian Ministry of Finance in 1958, land distribution in India was as follows: Poor peasants and farm laborers, comprising 75 per cent of all agricultural households, owned 17 per cent of all cultivated land; lower middle peasants, comprising 12.5 per cent, owned 16.5 per cent of the land; the better-off middle peasants, rich peasants and landlords working their own farms, comprising 8.5 per cent, owned 32.5 per cent of the land; while the feudal landlords and the more wealthy rich peasants, comprising only 4 per cent, held as much as 34 per cent of the land. As a result of large-scale evictions by feudal landlords in recent years, the concentration of landholdings has become even greater, and the ranks of the poor peasants and farm laborers have grown.

According to a survey of agricultural labour published by the Indian Ministry of Labour, in 1951-52 the number of peasant households which were in debt was 44.5 per cent of the total number of peasant households, and in 1956-57 the figure increased to 64.5 per cent. An official survey in 1960 showed that peasant indebtedness had grown to a total of 9,000 million rupees. Yojana, a biweekly published by the Indian Government, admitted in its October 1, 1961 issue that there had been no improvement in the status of the rural proletarians — the landless farm laborers — in fact, if there was any change, it was a change for the worse, as prices were all rocketing up.

### CONGRESS PARTY LOSING OUT

In view of the economic conditions mentioned above, the prestige of Nehru's Congress Party is steadily declining and dissatisfaction and opposition among the broad masses of the people are growing day by day. Big-scale strikes and struggles for land have flared up one after another. The victory won by the Indian Communist Party in Kerala in India's second general election in 1957, the struggle against hunger in West Bengal and Uttar Pradesh in 1958, the struggle against taxation launched by the Punjab peasants in 1959, the struggle for food waged by the one and a half million people of West Bengal in 1959, the great strike staged by 500,000 employees of the central government in 1960, the struggles against taxation which swept the whole country

(Continued on page 7)

## More On Nehru's Philosophy In the Light of The Sino-Indian Boundary Question

(Continued from page 1)  
try to upset the land system or the capitalist system. They never claimed to do so." (Jawaharlal Nehru, *Autobiography*, The Bodley Head, London, 1949, pp. 366-367.)

In the course of the Indian people's movement for national independence, the British colonialists reached a compromise with the big bourgeoisie and big landlords of India and turned over their rule to the latter on conditions which basically kept the economic interests of the British colonialists intact. Thus, the fruits gained by the Indian people in their anti-British struggle were seized by India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords.

After India proclaimed independence, Nehru, who once represented to a certain degree the interests of the Indian national bourgeoisie, gradually, as the class struggle developed at home and abroad, became a loyal representative of the interests of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords of India. The Nehru government has substituted reactionary nationalism for the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, and tied up ever more closely with the imperialist and feudal forces. Of course, certain contradictions exist between India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords and foreign monopoly capital, whose interests are not in full conformity. Therefore, when the contradictions between imperialism and the Indian nation sharpened, the

Nehru government, under the pressure of the masses of the people, showed a certain degree of difference from imperialism. But the class nature and economic status of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords determine that the Nehru government depends on and serves imperialism more and more.

### IMPERIALIST GRIP ON INDIAN ECONOMY

India did not gain economic independence after its proclamation of independence. Imperialism still retained its economic influence in India. Foreign capital still controlled many vital branches of the country's economy. According to statistics submitted to the Indian Prime Minister by the secretariat of the Indian Cabinet in 1951, foreign capital controlled 97 per cent of India's petroleum industry, 93 per cent of the rubber industry, 90 per cent of the match manufacture 89 per cent of the jute industry, 86 per cent of the tea processing industry and 62 per cent of the coal-mining industry. Even in the cotton textile industry, which used to be called the national industry of India, 21 per cent was controlled by foreign capital. Although in the early days of independence, the Indian Government nationalized a few enterprises run by British capital by paying large sums in compensation, the fundamental interests of imperialism in India were not touched.

In recent years, foreign invest-

# More On Nehru's Philosophy In the Light of The Sino-Indian Boundary Question

(Continued from page 6)  
and the struggles for land in many places in 1961 and 1962 — all these are important indications of India's ever sharpening class contradictions and social contradictions and of the deepening of the political crisis facing the Nehru government in recent years.

Nehru constantly slanders Marxism as being "out of date," and trumpets his philosophy of "tolerance," "non-violence" and "peaceful means." But the realities in India are a great mockery of Nehru's philosophy. Nehru is indeed tolerant of imperialism and the feudal forces, but he is not "tolerant" of the people and the progressive forces, nor "non-violent" towards them. Since coming to power, Nehru has used violence to suppress the masses of the people and the progressive forces; he has become an old hand at opposing communism and the people.

## BRUTAL REPRESSION

According to Indian official statistics, in the three years from the date of India's independence to August 1950, Indian troops and police opened fire on the masses on as many as 1,982 occasions, killing 3,764 people, wounding 10,000 and throwing 50,000 into jail. In the past few years, there has been an increasing number of incidents in which the Nehru government used violence against the masses. Nehru openly encouraged the reactionary forces in Kerala to use violence to overthrow the Communist-led government of Kerala in July 1950. His government has adopted large-scale measures of repression against the masses' struggles for the right to live; in the struggle for food in West Bengal in August and September 1959 alone, 80 people were killed, 3,000 wounded and more than 20,000 arrested. Prasad, the former President of India, at the Conference of Indian Governors of States held in Delhi on November 9, 1960, admitted that in the previous thirteen years, the number of incidents in which the police had opened fire surpassed the number under British rule.

The Nehru government has used extremely brutal measures of repression against many minority nationalities in India. Available information indicates that over many years Indian troops have killed tens of thousands of the Naga people in the northeastern part of India, and detained tens of thousands more in concentration camps. Even the *Observer* of London pointed out in a recent article that the Indian Government was carrying out a policy of "genocide."

Nehru wrote in his book *Glimpses of World History* in 1934 that "so long as capitalism can use the machinery of democratic institutions to hold power and keep down labor, democracy is allowed to flourish. When this is not possible, then capitalism discards democracy and adopts the open fascist method of violence and terror." (Lindsay Drummond Ltd., London, 4th ed., 1949, p. 826.) At that time Nehru did not know that these words, after a number of years, would serve as an apt description of his own policy.

## NEHRU'S "SOCIALIST PATTERN OF SOCIETY"

In view of the actual economic and political conditions in India, is not the building of a "socialist pattern of society" in India, as advertised by Nehru, an out-and-out hoax? Commenting on Nehru's "socialism," Harriman, spokesman for the U.S. monopoly groups, said on May 4, 1959:

"I think it is a good thing that they [Nehru and his like] use this word ["socialism"]. It is a highly popular word among the Asian peoples, where capitalism has become closely identified — almost synonymous — with colonialism. The Indians [Nehru and his like] have taken it away from the Communists."

Harriman's remarks serve to show that Nehru's "socialist pattern of society" is really worth.

With any country, a given foreign policy is necessarily the continuation of a given domestic policy. Like its domestic policy, the foreign policy of the Nehru government reflects its reactionary class nature.

At one time some actions of the Nehru government were helpful to world peace. It refused to join imperialist military blocs, turned down the imperialists' request to establish military bases in India and declared its adherence to the policy of "non-alignment." It stood for peaceful co-existence with socialist countries and joined with China in initiating the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. The Nehru government played a positive role in sponsoring the first Asian-African Conference.

## CRITICIZING IN A SMALL WAY AND HELPING IN A BIG WAY

However, even in that period, Nehru seldom voiced opposition to the major acts of aggression by imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, but constantly came out against the just struggles of the people of various countries, and against the socialist countries. On many important, key international questions, Nehru always stood on the side of imperialism, adopting in the main a policy of "criticizing in a small way and helping in a big way" towards imperialism. For instance, during the war of U.S. aggression in Korea, the Indian Government put forward a proposal in the United Nations in November 1952 supporting the forcible retention of prisoners of war by the United States. In the counter-revolutionary event in Hungary in 1956, Nehru maliciously slandered the Soviet Union and attacked the Hungarian Workers' and Peasants' Revolutionary Government.

When the U.S. and British imperialists sent troops to Lebanon and Jordan in 1958, Nehru openly spoke up for the U.S. and British aggressors, characterizing their act as "protecting their own interests." Nehru said that "he was sorry" about the death of Faisal, the common enemy of the Iraqi people. In 1958, in his article "The Basic Approach," Nehru vilified the Soviet Union for using "violence." He distorted the criticism of Yugoslav modern revisionism by the Communists of various countries as "interference in the internal affairs

of other countries" and described the execution of the traitor Nagy by the Hungarian people as "contributing to world tensions."

With the changes in India's domestic situation and in the international situation in recent years, Nehru's foreign policy has leaned more markedly towards imperialism. In addition to intensifying its suppression and exploitation of the people, the Nehru government has relied more and more on imperialism as a major means of coping with the economic and political difficulties and crisis in India. On the other hand, in order to counter the influence of socialism, particularly that of China's socialist revolution and socialist construction, to obstruct the national-liberation movements, and to fight for control of the intermediate zone, U.S. imperialism now attacks greater importance to the part played by Nehru. As the general crisis of capitalism deepens daily, U.S. monopoly capital is trying all the harder to penetrate India and turn it into an important market for the export of U.S. commodities and capital. As a result, the United States in recent years has made an obvious shift in policy towards the Nehru government, from opposition to its policy of "non-alignment" to vigorous aid to it; from refusal to supply machinery and technical knowledge to the Indian big bourgeoisie to co-operation with the Indian big bourgeoisie in joint exploitation of the Indian people. In a word, U.S. imperialism pursues a policy of paying a high price to buy over the Indian big bourgeoisie represented by Nehru.

## U.S. "AID" TO INDIA — A BAROMETER OF NEHRU'S FOREIGN POLICY

An analysis of the figures of the "aid" granted to India by the United States and U.S.-controlled international financial organizations in the past ten years and more shows that their "aid" to India is a barometer of the foreign policy of the Nehru government, and particularly its policy towards China. Statistics show that in the period from 1949 to the end of the first half of 1956, their "aid" to India amounted to U.S. \$789.1 million, averaging U.S. \$105.2 million a year. In the period from the second half of 1956 to the end of the first half of 1959, when the foreign policy of the Nehru government gradually turned to the right, their "aid" to India was U.S. \$1,936.7 million, averaging U.S. \$645.5 million a year. And in the period from the second half of 1959 to the end of July 1962, that is, after the Nehru government had stirred up the anti-China campaign, their "aid" to India was U.S. \$3,872.4 million, an annual average of U.S. \$1,290.8 million.

It is precisely in these circumstances that over the past few years Nehru has practically thrown away the banner of opposition to imperialism and colonialism in international affairs, suited himself to the needs of U.S. imperialism, become a busy spokesman for U.S. imperialism, and even openly made Indian troops serve as an international policeman for U.S. imperialism in its suppression of national-liberation movements.

## HERE'S THE RECORD

Nehru neither supported nor sympathized with the great struggle of the Japanese people against the U.S.-Japan military alliance treaty in 1960, saying "it is not for me to discuss the issue."

After U.S. mercenaries invaded Cuba in April 1961, Nehru said that "India could not judge, nor was she in a position to judge, the international conditions of Cuba — who was right and who was wrong."

In March 1961, when Mali, the United Arab Republic, Ceylon,

Indonesia, Morocco, Burma, Guinea and other Asian and African countries announced one after another the withdrawal of their troops from the Congo in protest against the use of the United Nations by imperialism for intervention in the Congo, the Nehru government, on the contrary, agreed to send a contingent of 3,900 Indian troops (afterwards increased to 6,000) as reinforcements for the "United Nations Forces" in the Congo to suppress the nation-liberation struggle of the Congolese people and assist U.S. imperialism in its attempt to swallow up the Congo. The Nehru government is in a way responsible for the fact that, after the murder of the Congolese national hero Lumumba, his successor Gizenga was imprisoned.

In September 1961 at the conference of the heads of state of the non-aligned countries, Nehru, going contrary to the opinions of the heads of many countries, held that the question of opposing imperialism and colonialism should occupy "a secondary place"; he disagreed with the adoption of "brave declarations" condemning imperialism and colonialism, and thus helped in a big way the Western countries especially U.S. imperialism.

## A TOP FAVORITE OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

On May 29, 1961, the U.S. News and World Report in an article entitled "A Close Look at the Man U.S. Is Betting On in Asia" said that "Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, is turning out to be a top favorite of the Kennedy Administration among statesmen of the world." But public opinion in Asia and Africa indicates that the role played by Nehru in international affairs has given him "a bad name". Even the *Ananda Bazar Patrika* admitted in its September 14, 1962 editorial that the Indian Government is "in an isolated position in international relations" and that "India has almost no friend in Asia." On

September 22, 1962, the Indian weekly *Blitz* also said regretfully that among the Asian and African countries, "we Indians [read Nehru and his like] are becoming conservative, if not reactionary."

## NEHRU'S "NON-ALIGNMENT" — A MERE FACADE

Thus it can be seen that the policy of "non-alignment" publicized by Nehru has obviously become more and more a mere facade behind which he is actually carrying out a policy of opposing the national revolutionary movements of various countries, opposing socialism, and serving imperialism.

It is at a time when their entire home and foreign policy has become increasingly reactionary that the Indian ruling circles headed by Nehru have instigated the Sino-Indian boundary dispute, provoked China and finally launched large-scale armed attacks on China. They have done so because they persist in their expansionist policy and, by sabotaging Sino-Indian friendships and stirring up reactionary nationalist sentiment, attempt to divert the attention of the Indian people, intensify their exploitation and oppression of the people, and strike at the progressive forces. They have done so, too, because they seek to make use of the anti-China campaign to curry favor with U.S. imperialism and get more U.S. dollars. In a word, in the effort to satisfy their own needs and meet the demands of U.S. imperialism, the Indian ruling circles headed by Nehru have become pawns in the international anti-China campaign. This is the root cause and background of the Sino-Indian boundary dispute.

## III

Marxism-Leninism points out that bourgeois nationalism under different conditions plays different historical roles. Marxism-Leninism has always drawn a distinction between the nationalism of the oppressed nations and

(Continued on page 8)

## Recommended Reading

- Long Live Leninism
- The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us
- Workers of All Countries, Unite, Oppose Our Common Enemy
- Leninism and Modern Revisionism
- Whence the Differences?
- Let Us Unite on the Basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement
- A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.
- A Mirror for Revisionists
- Revolutionary Dialectics and How to Appraise Imperialism
- More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us

All the above literature can be obtained through

**WORLD BOOKS**  
747 Broadway  
New York, N.Y.

**GUOZI SHUDIAN**  
P. O. Box 399  
Peking, China

Available free to readers of *Vanguard* are POC reprints of the following:

The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us (In Spanish)

A Comment on the Statement of the CPUSA

Subscriptions to *Peking Review* obtained through Guozi Shudian, P.O. Box 399, Peking, China, \$4. year

# U.S. Parliamentary "Democracy" at Work

We'd like to bring to the attention of the revisionists here and abroad a news item which appeared in the *Herald Tribune* of July 11, 1962. It describes the "parliamentary" methods employed by the ruling class in conducting an election. Could this be an example of what the revisionists expect to lead to "peaceful parliamentary transition"?

Former State Sen. Paul Cantrell, 65, the county political boss who was run out of town 16 years ago in perhaps the wildest shooting, bloodiest election in American history, died Sunday night.

Mr. Cantrell, a Democrat, had ruled McMinn County for 10 years when a 'GI Non-Partisan League' made up chiefly of war veterans,

opposed him in the 1946 primary.

On the morning of the primary Athens was tense. By mid-afternoon it was brawling. Mr. Cantrell's lieutenant, Sheriff Pat Mansfield, had sworn in 300 men as deputies "to maintain order." Seven of them surrounded and threatened to kill two GI poll watchers in a precinct at the city Light and Water Building.

The two, Charles Scott Jr. and Ed Vestal, hurled themselves through a glass door and escaped.

A mob of veterans entered the Light and Water building and beat the deputies senseless.

### DUELLING STANTS

Deputies and veterans began dueling with fists, clubs and live irons all over town. The deputies hauled 20 veterans off to the Athens jail. At day's end Sheriff Mansfield announced he was hauling the ballot boxes off to jail, too — "for safe counting."

The veterans, led by towering, hulking Jim Buttram, a former football player, sent up the cry for a march on the jailhouse. By nightfall the scene around the jail, except for the natural setting of Tennessee loblolly pines and clay county dust, looked like a Rhine Valley infantry siege.

More than 1,000 veterans and their partisans were closing in on the red brick building with

tommyguns, rifles, shot guns, pistols and dynamite bombs. Seventy-five deputies were holed up in the jail with pistols and squirrel rifles.

Shortly before 9 p.m. one of the veterans fired a shot through a jailhouse office window and demanded that the prisoners be freed. A deputy answered, "— —" and the battle was on.

### DEPUTY KILLED

A deputy was shot dead and another yelled out that if the veterans did not stop shooting, three of the prisoners, members of the GI Non-Partisan League, would be executed with bullets in the brain.

A veteran replied with a curse and the battle was on again. The shooting had gone on for six hours, with eight deputies and 15 veterans wounded, when the vet-

erans moved their grenade throwers in close.

Using homemade dynamite bombs, they began reducing the front wall to a slag heap. One veteran zigzagged into the jailhouse yard just like the Army had taught him and pitched a bomb on the jailhouse porch as easy as delivering the morning newspaper. It blew the porch and the front door to smithereens.

A voice from inside the jail shrieked:

"We surrender!"

The deputies straggled out of the jail with their hands on top of their heads, like prisoners of war. The deputies the veterans despised most were beaten into pudding. . . .

A few hours later the GIs were declared winners of the election, an emergency local government was set up, and the Cantrell era was over.

# More On Nehru's Philosophy In the Light of The Sino-Indian Boundary Question

(Continued from page 7)

the nationalism of the oppressor nations, between progressive nationalism and reactionary nationalism, and has taken different attitudes to nationalism in accordance with this distinction.

### THE DUAL CHARACTER OF THE NATIONAL

#### BOURGEOISIE

In modern times, the national bourgeoisie of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, because of their contradictions with imperialism and the feudal forces, can take part in the revolutionary anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle during certain historical periods and to a certain extent and therefore play a progressive role in history. As Lenin said: "Bourgeois nationalism. . . has an historical justification." During the period of the bourgeois national-democratic revolution in China, Dr. Sun Yat-sen's policies of alliance with the Soviet Union, co-operation with the Communist Party and assistance to the workers and peasants provide an outstanding example of progressive nationalism.

On the other hand, however, the bourgeoisie of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, because of their class status, are inclined to compromise with imperialism and feudalism and are liable to waver in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. One section, the big bourgeoisie, whose interests are closely connected with those of imperialism and domestic feudalism, are the reactionaries among the bourgeoisie. Under certain circumstances, they may join in the national-independence movement, but,

when the broad masses of the people have really stood up, when class struggle becomes acute, and when bribed by the imperialists, then they will betray the revolution, suppressing the people, the Communist Party and the progressive forces at home and selling out to imperialism and opposing the socialist cou-

tries abroad. The Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries who have been overthrown by the Chinese people furnish a particularly glaring example of this.

Since the end of World War II, a number of newly independent countries led by bourgeois nationalists have emerged in Asia and Africa. Many nationalist states in Asia, Africa and Latin America have a common desire to oppose imperialism and colonialism and defend world peace, because they still suffer from aggression and intervention by imperialism and are victims of control and plunder by the new and old colonialists. They continue to struggle against imperialism and new and old colonialism, establish and develop relations of friendship and co-operation with the socialist countries, and thus make positive contributions to world peace.

### CHINA'S POLICY TOWARDS THE NATIONALIST COUNTRIES

The Chinese people and the peoples of the nationalist countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have all suffered from brutal oppression and plunder by the imperialists. China is now still subjected to aggression by U.S. imperialism, and its territory of Taiwan is still under the occupation of U.S. imperialism. It is only natural that the Chinese people should cherish a profound sympathy and concern for the peoples of the nationalist countries.

The basis of China's policy towards the nationalist countries is this: Firstly, the primary common task of China and all nationalist countries is to oppose their common enemy, imperialism and colonialism, especially U.S. imperialism. They must support one another in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. China has consistently given active support to the struggles waged by the various nationalist states against imperialism and colonialism. Secondly, it is necessary

and entirely possible to establish and develop, between China and these countries, relations of friendship and co-operation on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. It is necessary and fully possible to bring about, through friendly consultations, a reasonable settlement of all outstanding disputes among them in accordance with the Five Principles and the Bandung spirit.

Similarly, China stands firm in its desire to live for ever in friendship with India. The relations of friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples have a long history. There is no conflict of vital interests whatsoever between the peoples of our two countries. In 1954 the Chinese and Indian Governments jointly initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, and Sino-Indian relations built on this basis were once good. The Chinese people, like the Indian people, cherish the memory of the years

when the two countries were on friendly terms.

But even in the period when Sino-Indian relations were good, the Indian ruling circles headed by Nehru repeatedly interfered in China's Tibet and harboured expansionist designs against it, thereby revealing their policy of reactionary nationalism. Then in 1959, when the rebellion of the reactionary clique of the upper social strata of the Tibet region instigated by Nehru was defeated and Nehru's expansionist dream about Tibet was shattered, and when he took a more reactionary line in all his home and foreign policies, Nehru immediately turned against his friend, switching from professions of friendship for China to frantic hostility to China.

### NEHRU'S PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

Nehru believes that his fickle and erratic behaviour is in keeping with his "philosophy of life." In his book *The Discovery of India* Nehru said, "Life is too complicated. . . for it to be confined within the four corners of a fixed doctrine." (Meridian Books Ltd., London, 3rd ed., 1951, p. 16.) He also said, "It is never easy to reconcile a strict adherence to truth as one sees it, with exigencies and expediencies of life, and especially of political life." (Ibid., p. 421.) He held that "to take expediencies as a criterion of action was "the universal rule" in politics.

In a word, his expressions of friendship for you at a certain time conform to his philosophy; his ambition to face you in anger "for hundreds and hundreds of years" conforms to his philosophy; and his intention to get rid of you also conforms to his philosophy. This is the sort of "philosophy" Nehru has used in guiding his reactionary policy. Both his reactionary policy and erratic behaviour serve the interests of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords of India and in Nehru's own words, are to bring "rich divi-

dends" to them.

### MARXIST-LENINIST STAND ON REACTIONARY NATIONALISM

What stand should be Marxist-Leninists take on this policy of reactionary nationalism followed by Nehru?

Here a review of an episode in Chinese history of more than thirty years ago may be useful.

The Chinese people still remember that when the Soviet Union was the only socialist state in the world it was provoked and attacked by China's reactionary big bourgeoisie and big landlords represented by Chiang Kai-shek. At that time, despite the fact that the Soviet Government had given vigorous support to the Kuomintang of China, the Kuomintang reactionaries headed by Chiang Kai-shek, immediately after their betrayal of the revolution and their surrender to imperialism, whipped up a frantic anti-Soviet

campaign simultaneously with their unbridled anti-Communist, anti-popular moves. In December 1927, the Kuomintang reactionaries forcibly and outrageously closed down Soviet consulates in various cities of China, arrested and killed Soviet diplomatic officials and broke off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. A year and more afterwards, in July 1929, the Kuomintang reactionaries, in violation of the "Sino Soviet Agreements of 1924," manufactured the "Chinese Eastern Railway Incident" and arrested more than 300 Soviet nationals.

Although the Soviet Union repeatedly showed forbearance and proposed the holding of a meeting to settle the Chinese Eastern Railway question peacefully, Chiang Kai-shek took the self-restraint of the Soviet Union to

mean that "the Soviet Union meekly submits, not daring to make the slightest resistance." In October of that year the army of the Kuomintang reactionaries attacked the Soviet border, stirring up an armed conflict between China and the Soviet Union. Thus, the Soviet Union was compelled to act in self-defence and defeated this military provocation of the Kuomintang reactionaries.

### THE RIGHT THING TO DO

Did the socialist Soviet Union do the right thing at the time? History has long since rendered its verdict: It was the perfectly right thing to do. The Soviet Union's resolute counter-blow to the military provocation of the Kuomintang reactionaries not only defended the interests of the socialist state but also accorded with the interests of the Chinese people and of the revolutionary people of the world.

### Sino-Indian relations today

mean certain similarities to Sino-Soviet relations of more than thirty years ago.

The principles of China's foreign policy and of its policy towards India have been consistent. Despite incessant provocation by the Nehru government, China has still maintained an attitude of maximum restraint. It was only when the Nehru government had recently launched large-scale attacks that China was compelled to hit back in self-defence to safeguard its sovereignty and territorial integrity and to repulse the attacks of the Indian reactionaries. It is fully necessary and perfectly just for China to do so, and it is the least a sovereign state should do. It is precisely for this reason that China has won the sympathy and support of the people of the world who cherish peace and uphold justice. (To be continued)

## Literature of the POC

Main report to 5th POC Conference	25c
Economic Situation U. S. A.	50c
Two Roads	35c
Against Opportunism	35c
Marxism-Leninism or Revisionism	—
Main Report to Founding Conference of POC	25c

Available soon:

- The Historical Development of the Puerto Rican National Minority
- Proceedings of the POC Conference on Negro Work April 12-13, 1963

## Vanguard

Box 137  
Planetarium Station  
New York, New York  
— I enclose \$1.00 for a one year subscription.  
— I would like further information about POC.

Name .....  
Address .....  
City .....