





Jose Maria Sison

Table of Contents

[Title Page](#)

[Socialism: Resistance | and Resurgence](#)

[Sison Reader Series | Book 10 | Julieta de Lima | Editor](#)

[Preface](#)

[Carry the Struggle against Modern Revisionism through to the End](#)

[Pomeroy's Forest Nightmare](#)

[A Work of Two Renegades](#)

[Pomeroy's Apologia for Soviet Revisionism](#)

[Apologia for US Imperialism](#)

[Lavaites Are Anti-Marxist and Anti-Leninist Obscurantists and Chauvinists](#)

[Reiko Interview](#)

[The Decline and Rise of Socialism](#)

[On the Problems of Socialism and the Disintegration of Modern Revisionism](#)

[Stand for Socialism Against Modern Revisionism](#)

[On the Petty Bourgeoisie and the Future of Socialism](#)

[The Bankruptcy of Imperialist Globalization and Urgency of the Socialist Cause](#)

[Contradictions in the World Capitalist System | and the Necessity of Socialist Revolution](#)

[Our Current International Work | and Internationalist Tasks](#)

[Anti-revisionist Struggle and Cultural Revolution: Consequence to the Communist Party of the Philippines | Delivered at the International Forum on The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and Lessons to the Working Class Movement | April 1, 2007](#)

[Validity and Relevance of the October Revolution | in Response to the Challenges of the 21st Century](#)

[Validity and Relevance of the October Revolution | in Response to the Challenges of the 21st Century](#)

[On China Today](#)

[Capitalist Crisis Makes Socialism Necessary Statement on the 20th Anniversary of the Fall of the Berlin Wall, November 9, 2009](#)

[The Relation between the Immediate Tasks of Communists and their Struggle for Socialism](#)

[Requisites For Building the Socialist Future](#)

[Revisionist Betrayal of Socialism in the Soviet Union](#)

[Historic Significance, Global Impact and Continuing Validity of the Great October Socialist Revolution Led by Lenin](#)

[Carry Forward the Legacy of the Great October Revolution](#)

[Turn the Grave Crisis to the Revolution's Advantage](#)

[The Future of Imperialism and Socialism](#)

[Message to Participants in the Launch and Forum on Lenin's "Imperialism" in the 21st Century](#)

[Uphold the Validity of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Fight to Defeat Imperialism and Advance the Proletarian Revolution](#)

[On the Significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution](#)

[The October Revolution Lives, Conclusions for the Revolutionary Class Struggle Today](#)

[Favorable Conditions for the Subjective Forces of the Revolution](#)

[Requisites in Revolutionary Class Struggle for Building Socialism](#)

[The World Capitalist System Is Bankrupt and Breaking Down, Causing the Resurgence of the World Proletarian Revolution](#)

[In Transition to the Resurgence of the World Proletarian Revolution](#)

[On Trotskyites and other Slanderers](#)

[Rising Movement in the West](#)

[Socialism and Capitalist Restoration in China](#)

[In Transition to the Resurgence of the World Proletarian Revolution](#)

[On the International Situation, | Covid-19 Pandemic and the People's Response](#)

[An Update on the International Situation for the International Coordinating Committee of the International League of Peoples' Struggle](#)

[In Prospect of Socialism](#)

[On the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution](#)

[On the Launch of Upsurge of People's Resistance | in the Philippines and the World](#)

[Trotskyitis Is a Virulent Type of Psychopathic Anti-Communism](#)

[Significance and Relevance of the Paris Commune of 1871 to the World Proletarian Revolution](#)

[About the Communist Party of China](#)

[On Revisionism](#)

[On Socialism and Related Issues](#)

[On The Theory Of Continuing Revolution under Proletarian Dictatorship](#)

[On the Philippines, US, China and other Matters](#)

[Author's Remarks](#)

[On the Historic Mission of the Proletariat to Defeat Capitalism and Build Socialism](#)

Socialism: Resistance

and Resurgence

Sison Reader Series

Book 10

Julieta de Lima

Editor

Copyright © 2022

by International Network for Philippine Studies (INPS)

Published by

International Network for Philippine Studies (INPS)

Cover and Book Design by Biko & Lukas Mak

Preface

I thank the Editor for compiling my essays in defense of socialism against modern revisionism and capitalist restoration in order to constitute this book: *Socialism: Resistance and Resurgence*. I hereby dedicate and offer it to the proletariat and people of the world so that they can better analyze national and global conditions and fight for a fundamentally better and brighter world in socialism.

As editor of the *Progressive Review* from 1963 onward, I started to write essays in defense of socialism as a result of my study of the Sino-Soviet ideological dispute. As Chairman of the Interim Political Bureau of the projected Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP), I continued to write such essays from 1966 onward in connection with the critique of past and continuing errors in the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist Parties and the preparations for the reestablishment of the CPP.

As Chairman of the Central Committee of the CPP and as editor of *Ang Bayan*, I wrote anti-revisionist essays against Soviet modern revisionism and against the Lava revisionist party. These essays contributed a lot to strengthening the Marxist-Leninist foundation of the CPP during its first decade of existence as well as in ensuring the eventual total discredit of the Lava revisionist party due to its flunkeyism to Soviet social-imperialism and collaboration with the Marcos fascist dictatorship.

After my release from fascist prison in 1986, I became active in international conferences on socialism against imperialism and modern revisionism. I was a frequent speaker in the Brussels Communist Seminar in the 1990s and in my capacity in 1992-1994 as Chairman of the International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations based in Germany. I have had even more ample opportunity to promote anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles and advocate socialism in my various capacities in the International League of Peoples' Struggle (ILPS).

I was Chairperson of the International Initiative Committee that prepared the establishment of the ILPS from 1998 to 2001, ILPS General Consultant from

2001 to 2004 and ILPS Chairperson from 2004 to 2019 and currently Chairperson Emeritus. The ILPS has given me for a long time the platform for speaking on the people's democratic revolution and the socialist cause. But on many occasions, I have been able to speak on these subjects as Founding Chairman of the CPP, as a teacher of political science and as writer.

I have had many opportunities to critique the ideological and political line of the revisionist ruling cliques, the restoration of capitalism in former socialist countries, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Dengist counterrevolution in China as well as to promote the anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles and the socialist cause. I have tried to do my best in upholding the socialist cause and fighting for its advance and triumph over the unjust capitalist system.

Socialist perspective of the people's democratic revolution

In carrying out the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines, the Communist Party of the Philippines has targeted as enemies of the Filipino people not only US and other foreign monopoly capitalist powers and the local reactionary classes of big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists but also the revisionists who pose as revolutionaries but in fact espouse bourgeois reformism and pacifism and support what has amounted to capitalist restoration in socialist countries after the first half of the 20th century.

The CPP considers its firm anti-revisionist stand as a major reason for being able to learn and apply effectively the revolutionary theory of the proletariat (Marxism, Leninism and Maoism), in understanding the most important issues in the world and in the Philippines and in carrying out the people's democratic revolution along the strategic line of protracted people's war and in the direction of the socialist revolution.

The CPP has been able to grasp armed revolution as the essence of the people's democratic revolution and to apply the strategic line of people's democratic revolution in the concrete conditions of an archipelagic and mountainous country like the Philippines. It has also embraced as unbreakable principle of proletarian leadership the socialist revolution as the necessary consequence of the people's democratic revolution.

The CPP has been able to persevere in revolutionary struggle and achieve major victories in more than 53 years because it has confronted and overcome

tremendous difficulties and discovered and developed the ways of making significant advances. The old merger party of the Communist and Socialist Parties was able to build a people's army in the anti-Japan struggle from 1942 onward during World War II.

But swings from the correct line of anti-imperialist resistance to Right opportunism under the Vicente Lava leadership, then from Right to "Left" opportunism under the Jose Lava leadership in 1948-1949 and then from "Left" to Right opportunism under the Jesus Lava leadership led ultimately to the defeat and liquidationism of the old merger party from the early 1950s onward. The mishandling of the armed revolutionary struggle and the subsequent period of bourgeois legalism had to be criticized and repudiated from 1966 onward.

By that time the Sino-Soviet ideological dispute was in full swing. In fact, Soviet modern revisionism had further degenerated from the bourgeois populism and pacifism of Khrushchov to the social fascism and social imperialism of Brezhnev. But in 1966 I was happy to witness the launching of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China as implementation of Mao's theory of continuing revolution through cultural revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

The CPP was able to deliberate on and ratify the guiding document of the First Great Rectification Movement ("Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party"), faced the challenges posed by imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction and was inspired by the unprecedented cultural revolution in China and by the fast-growing mass movement in the Philippines. The ground was favorable for the reestablishment of the CPP under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the promulgation of its Constitution and its Program for People's Democratic Revolution on December 26, 1968.

The CPP built the New People's Army as the main weapon for carrying out the agrarian revolution, defeating the enemy and enabling the revolutionary mass organizations and the people's democratic government. The CPP also built the National Democratic Front of the Philippines in order to arouse and mobilize the people in their millions in both urban and rural areas and facilitate the integration of the patriotic and democratic forces in the underground and in the guerrilla fronts. The CPP and all other revolutionary forces expanded nationwide and became integrated with the roiling masses of workers and peasants.

The CPP has made great ideological, political and organizational achievements in the Philippines, self-reliantly and without the cross-border advantages which favored the Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese Communist Parties and revolutionary movements. It has scored victories in an archipelagic country which has been used as launching base for wars of aggression by US imperialism in Asia and has been called an unsinkable aircraft carrier of the US. But wonder of wonders the CPP has been able to build a people's government in the countryside.

What makes the revolutionary victories of the CPP even more astounding is that the Dengist counterrevolution in China has condemned the GPCR of Mao as a complete catastrophe and has restored capitalism since 1978 at a rate even faster than that in the Soviet Union, under the slogan of "reforms and opening up" to the US and world capitalist system. As in the Soviet Union which which would totally collapse in 1991, the Dengist revolution privatized the communes and many industries. But it kept a state sector of the economy for prompt adoption of new technology and mobilization of economic resources.

Socialist resistance and resurgence in the world

The CPP is required by circumstances to become ever more self-reliant and resolute in carrying the people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war; and to remain optimistic that the socialist future for the Philippines and the world remains valid after the revisionist betrayal of socialism in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China, the acceleration and aggravation of the crisis of the world capitalist system under the policy of neoliberalism, fascism and wars of aggression.

Because of the previous close relations of the CPP with the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of the great Mao Zedong, the US imperialists and their political agents in the Philippines have imagined that the CPP would give up or lose its revolutionary character and socialist direction because of the Dengist counterrevolution. But the opposite has occurred. The CPP has not only retained and enhanced its revolutionary integrity and made great advances in the people's democratic revolution but has also become outstanding in the world for upholding, defending and advancing the socialist cause.

The thinkers, cadres and members of the CPP have been excellent and outstanding in criticizing and fighting imperialism, revisionism and all reaction

and have seen the emptiness and ephemerality of the US title of sole superpower and winner of the Cold War, the dismal failure of the US ideological, political and military offensives, the continuing strategic decline of the US and world capitalist system, the breakdown of the neoliberal policy regime, the worsening conditions in former socialist countries, the sharpening contradictions among the imperialist powers and the growing threats of a third world war and nuclear war.

Especially since the 2008 financial meltdown and protracted depression in the world capitalist system, all types of contradictions in the world are intensifying: among the imperialist powers, between labor and capital, between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations and between the imperialist powers and countries assertive of national independence and assertive of socialist programs and aspirations. All these are generating today anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles and are the prelude to the resurgence of the socialist cause.

In 1956, when one third of humanity was already in socialist countries and the national liberation movements were spreading in Asia, African and Latin America, there was an expectation that before the end of the 20th century the socialist cause shall have won in most countries in the world. As late as in the 1966, there was even a prognosis in the GPCR that capitalism was moving towards total collapse and that socialism was marching towards world victory. That underestimated the combined phenomena of imperialism and modern revisionism and the lethal consequences especially of the latter.

But now the crisis of the world capitalist system is worsening at so rapid a rate and to such an extent reminiscent of the crises that brought about World Wars I and II. However, World War I brought about the first socialist country. And World War II brought about several more socialist countries and the national liberation of other countries. The current and forthcoming crises and conflicts have the potential of bringing out the worst destructiveness of the monopoly bourgeoisie as well as the best revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and people of the world even before the imperialist powers can unleash a third world war and a nuclear war or tarry on with pandemics and global heating.

Knowing the terrible consequences of not waging class struggle and social revolution, the proletariat and peoples of the world are driven by their own suffering and the threat of human extinction to wage class struggle and social revolution resolutely and militantly and seize all the levers of power and control

from the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie and its minions in order to achieve national liberation, democracy and socialism against imperialism, revisionism and all reaction on an unprecedented scale.

Jose Maria Sison

Utrecht, The Netherlands

August 14, 2022

Carry the Struggle against Modern Revisionism through to the End

First published in Ang Bayan, Vol. I, No. 2, July 1, 1969

The revisionist renegades are creating trouble locally and all over the world and are vainly trying to impede the victorious advance of the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines and of the world proletarian revolution.

It is impossible to fight and defeat US imperialism and local reaction without fighting and defeating modern revisionism.

Modern revisionism performs the special task for US imperialism and local reaction of undermining and sabotaging the revolutionary movement from within.

For a long period of time in the Philippines, Lavaism and Taruc-ism—the two major local sources and bases of modern revisionism—derailed the Philippine Revolution and besmirched the honor and prestige of the Communist Party of the Philippines. At present, they continuously try to hamper the advance of the revolutionary movement by confusing the friends of the revolution, by spreading slander against proletarian revolutionary cadres, by betraying them to the enemy and by resorting to intimidations.

Though they have their own contradictions, the two “independent kingdoms” of the Lava revisionist renegade clique and the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, consistently attack the Communist Party of the Philippines which is under the powerful inspiration of Mao Zedong Thought by employing the same dirty tactics.

Though the Taruc-Sumulong clique appears to be the more dangerous of the two renegade cliques in the country today, the Lava revisionist renegade clique is actually the one that poses a greater danger to the Party of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It consistently performs revisionist work ideologically, politically and organizationally and its “intellectual” bluster impresses so much the social strata (the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie) that usually serve as the basis of subjectivism and opportunism and it tries to spread the spirit of reformism among the peasants and workers. In the case of the Taruc-Sumulong clique, it is so bereft of any kind of support now that it has become purely a crime gang. The Lava revisionist renegade clique carries the support of Soviet revisionist social imperialism. Though it is wracked by internal contradictions, a majority within determines the character of the clique as a puppet of Soviet revisionist social imperialism. With the knowledge and tacit approval of the reactionary government, it was able to send five “secret” delegates to the “World Communist Conference” organized by the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique.

The Lava revisionist renegade clique is the purveyor of the worst sustained attacks against Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. At every turn it defends the most glaring acts of Soviet social imperialism such as the Soviet aggression against the Czechoslovak people and the armed provocations against the Chinese people on China’s frontiers.

The Lava revisionist renegade clique stands to gain temporarily from the “new” foreign policy of the reactionary government and the current attempts to “legalize” the Communist Party of the Philippines. The principal leaders and henchmen of this clique are openly in the payroll of the reactionary government, in the state university, in “brain trust” groups for high reactionary politicians and in business enterprises.

It is necessary for the Party of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to sustain a protracted struggle against modern revisionism, whether it be of the Lava or Taruc-Sumulong brand. All proletarian revolutionary cadres should always maintain the spirit of carrying through to the end the rectification movement and the fight against modern revisionism, Lavaism and Taruc-ism.

Under the present historical circumstances, the heirs and propagators of Lavaism and Taruc-ism have a resilience that can be fatal to genuine Marxist-Leninists if there is no constant revolutionary vigilance and active struggle against their

revisionist intrigues and machinations.

The proletarian revolutionary cadres of the Communist Party of the Philippines should steadfastly rebuild and consolidate the Party. Armed with Mao Zedong Thought, they should strengthen the Party ideologically, politically and organizationally on the basis of resolute mass struggle against the class enemy.

Pomeroy's Forest Nightmare

First published in Ang Bayan, Special Issue, November 1, 1971

The Forest is a “personal history” of a special agent of US imperialism who at the same time serves as a hack of Soviet modern revisionism. It is admittedly a subjectivist piece of work, harping on the theme of bourgeois pessimism and misrepresenting revolutionary struggle as a nightmare. The vile purpose of William J. Pomeroy in writing the book is to frighten people away from armed revolution and to convince them that it is hopeless. He employs the cheap method of posing himself as a tragic hero against the forest and makes the forest loom larger as his enemy than US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. It is convenient for Pomeroy to write on his own narrow experience under the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership from April 1950 to April 1952 in his malicious scheme to draw a bleak picture and a dark prospect for the Philippine revolution; and whip up erroneous and counterrevolutionary ideas. Though published in 1963, The Forest absolutely fails to shed light on the “Left” opportunism of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership and the subsequent Right opportunism of the Jesus Lava leadership since 1955. Pomeroy goes as far as to single out the Lavas, Luis Taruc and even Sumulong for praise. While a true proletarian revolutionary would make a clear Marxist-Leninist analysis and summing-up of historical events in order to illumine the road of revolutionary struggle, Pomeroy would rather wallow in the muck of bourgeois pessimism, set himself up as a “tragic hero” in a Greek drama, express disdain for the Filipino people and obscure the causes for the failure of the Lava leadership in the revolutionary movement. The Party document of rectification, “Rectify Error and Rebuild the Party,” has long ago shed light on the period of the revolutionary struggle about which The Forest tries to spread poisonous ideas.

I. The theme of bourgeois pessimism

It is of utmost importance to recall the words of Chairman Mao Zedong regarding the counterrevolutionary revisionist “theory of human nature”: “There is only human nature in the concrete, no human nature in the abstract. In class society there is only human nature of a class character; there is no human nature above classes. We uphold the human nature of the proletariat and of the masses of the people, while the landlord and bourgeois classes uphold the human nature of their own classes, only they do not say but make it out to be the only human nature in existence.”

Pomeroy opposes the proletarian revolutionary class standpoint. In doing so, he cowers behind such pious expressions of bourgeois humanism as “love of man,” “dignity of all” and “brotherhood of all.” Grandiosely, he babbles: “We stand together in the love of man, enriched by it, adding to it our own little glory.... I have always been guided by the love of man; it is the love of man that beats in my pulse.... I realize that there cannot be mutual respect until the dignity of all is established. The road to the brotherhood of man lies through the struggle for the achievement of the dignity of each.”

All this preaching is calculated to slur over and obscure the national and class struggle. It actually leads to a mockery of the Filipino proletariat and people. The scoundrel bleats: “A theory exists that misery breeds revolts, but that is true most often when misery follows from a loss of what one has had. But when one has known nothing for four hundred years, it crushes, subdues, becomes a pattern of life. The few who revolt are butchered; the amok is shot down in the street. The many who squat in the floor of a hut look out with lackluster eyes at the will of God.”

This bourgeois pessimist view attacks dialectical materialism and denies that the internal law of motion of things impels them to move forward and change. It rejects the ascendance of the new and progressive forces and the obliteration of the old and reactionary forces. It runs counter to the correct view that history is a spiraling process. It dismisses as “nothing” the revolutionary tradition and struggles of the Filipino people. It slanderously compares the revolutionary masses to a crazed fanatic (an “amok”) and describes them as too few while those “who look out at the will of God” are too many.

Chairman Mao teaches us: “We should rid our ranks of all impotent thinking. All views that overestimate the strength of the enemy and underestimate the strength of the people are wrong.”

Devoid of any revolutionary class perspective, Pomeroy sinks to the lowest depths of fatalism and defeatism: “Here in the primeval forest, I have never felt so overwhelmingly that human insignificance. Life means nothing in this geological immensity.” The anti-communist scoundrels always find it rewarding to make a whine of despair: “a time of grimness has come into our lives. I have been touched with fatalism. I think I am going to die in the forest....”

In the entire book, what Pomeroy poses as the main contradiction in the Philippine society is that between man (represented by him) and nature (the forest). He lashes out at the rain: “The rain. It is the enemy that follows us forever, striking upon all the trails and besieging every hut.” Here is a sham revolutionary who hates and does not appreciate tropical forest and rain as advantageous conditions for fighting the real enemy. In the most critical situation, he soliloquizes: “What is the forest now, a friend or an enemy?”

What makes the forest a ghastly enemy for Pomeroy is that the squad’s balutan (porters) are prevented by the enemy from bringing in canned goods and rice bought from the town market to the camp. Instead of making a political analysis of the plight he is in together with others, he lets loose a ceaseless verbal barrage of abuse against the forest and plays up above all the problem of survival against nature. Yet he is in a tropical forest with a variety of edible flora and fauna and fringed with coconut groves; and he also treads upon rivers which breed fish and snails. The primitive Dumagats whom Pomeroy comes across actually have more ingenuity and foresight than the entire Jesus Lava leadership on the problem of physical survival.

Pomeroy contends in keeping with his bourgeois humanism: The forest is a strange place for freedom to live. Wherever one would turn there is the wall of trees. It is a wall to all sides and a wall above, shutting out the sky. In the open world there were horizons; here the only horizon is in the heart. He regrets having ever joined the revolutionary struggle and being imprisoned by the forest. He hankers for the enemy bases, “the open world where there are horizons.”

Let us scan his kind of “horizon in the heart.” Even before he experiences any hardship from an enemy offensive, he expresses resentment against the forest. As soon as he steps into the forest, he is discomfited by his new shoes getting wet. Subsequently, the most trivial and pathetic resentments are elevated to the “tragic grandeur” of the self-centered author. The mud, the tiny leeches and ants and the actual or imagined falling of trees and branches are perennial torture for

the sham hero. When he contracts athlete's foot (alipunga), he raises it with stupendous efforts to a major tragedy.

Pomeroy is obsessed with interpreting all things of the forest as symbols of death and decay. He flies into a fantasy: "Behind our hut is an ancient leaning tree, covered with the pustules of decay. Some of its limbs have broken off, the hollow stumps lifted in mute agony. It leans so far, there above us, that one would think that it is in the very act of falling upon us and smothering us in its black limbs and in its crawling moist dust."

Pomeroy always strains to create an atmosphere of gloom. He bleats: We lie there in the damp darkness, with the odor of dank vegetation in our nostrils, hearing legions of frogs singing the elegy of the night, and we are filled for the first time with the quiet despair of the lost. The forest is filled with mist and the bushes loom around me, loom out of it with the arms of the drowning.... I think that we are all ghosts in a phantom forest. These are the words of delirium that the anti-communist Pomeroy uses to misrepresent revolutionary thinking in the face of hardship. These serve nothing but to whip up fear of revolution.

Pomeroy's jeremiads are ceaseless and utterly sickening. He chatters: "I do not think of a destination; I only think of the next spot to place a foot." He weeps: "On what circle of hell are we doomed to wander?"

We find no relief in the author's few moments of euphoria such as when he compares himself to Robin Hood in Sherwood Forest or when he paints a love scene between him and Celia in a creek. There is also no relief in his bourgeois comparisons, say, between the womenfolk in the forest with James Joyce's washerwomen in the twilight by the River Liffy. All these serve to reinforce his theme of bourgeois pessimism.

When an expansion group leaves the forest camp, Pomeroy feels that "something has somehow gone out of our lives." Such can only be the feeling of a hidden traitor who does not consider expansion as an extension of the revolutionary struggle. At the first alarm for evacuation that he experiences, he confesses that the mere sight of the emergency packs makes him feel more helpless and more impotent than the report of the danger. "The first thin wire of uncertainty has been touched in our hearts," he wails. At the sight of the enemy observation plane, he shakes in his pants and makes a craven report: "As long as it is there we lie and hold our breaths, as if our breathing could be heard." This is taking

melodrama too far.

When he asks a Red fighter why he has joined the revolution, he leads the discussion into how one's selfish interest can be served. He plays up the spirit of self-interest rather than the revolutionary spirit serving the people. In trying to draw a picture of discipline in the camps, he lays emphasis on the coercive administrative measures against misdemeanors. He is extremely proud of the fact that for minor infractions of rules comrades are treated like enemies and subjected to needless humiliation or even the death penalty. He completely assails the idea that rectification is essentially class education. In too many sections of the book, he harps on the "unreliability" of the Red fighters and people in the face of the enemy offensive.

Pomeroy has absolutely no faith in the victory of the Philippine revolution. At parting with comrades, he readily refers darkly to them: "The lit faces of all those whom we may never see again." And he is too proud to claim: "See you in Muntinglupa, we call to each other." This is the extreme reverse of previous "Left" opportunist words of parting among the Lavaites: "See you in Malacañang."

Summing up his kind of participation in the Philippine revolutionary movement, he declares: "When Celia and I passed beyond the open and comprehended world to enter the unknown forest, it was without any sense of being cut adrift, because we felt part of a great movement that had direction and goal, and every trail and the goal began to be blocked that we felt the forest loom around us and had the sensation that we were cutting paths blindly through it. Now in this remote and unknown region, where every intersection of rivers poses an unanswered question, this group of ours is the epitome of our struggle, lost and driven into unknown courses."

Surrender to the enemy is the end of Pomeroy's bourgeois pessimism. He reports on his own craven surrender to the enemy: "I give a great shout from behind the tree. The firing above slackens and I hear voices calling me to come out. I do not know what will happen but I step out from behind the tree. It is the last tree in the forest for me."

He curses the revolutionary armed struggle: "Strange blind struggle in the forest." And he commends the enemy; "The army men come to watch me curiously. "It is odd: most of them are friendly and decent, officers and enlisted

men alike.” Here Pomeroy gives himself away.

Against bourgeois pessimism, Chairman Mao teaches us: “Be resolute, fear no sacrifice and surmount every difficulty to win victory.” We must maintain our revolutionary optimism and our will to fight and win. Chairman Mao combats capitulationism in the following terms: “This army has an indomitable spirit and is determined to vanquish all enemies and never to yield. No matter what the difficulties and hardships are, so long as a single man remains, he will fight on.”

II. The purely military viewpoint

William J. Pomeroy does not question but upholds the purely military viewpoint that prevailed in the old merger party under the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership. He sometimes appears to be critical of the errors of this leadership. But that is only because he cannot help mention the facts of defeat to promote his theme of bourgeois pessimism. Thus, he goes as far as to say: “We have been living in a fools’s paradise.”

On his own account Pomeroy refers to the Communist Party as merely the “political wing” of a military organization. The central leadership of the old merger party is considered as merely the executive body of the political wing of the Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan. The regional Party committee is considered as merely the political wing of the regional army command. Pomeroy puts the military in command, instead of politics. He denies the absolute leadership of a proletarian revolutionary party over a genuine people’s army.

Regarding the relationship between the Party and the people’s army, Chairman Mao points out: “The Party commands the gun and the gun must never be allowed to command the Party.” He further teaches us: “If there is to be a revolution, there must be a revolutionary party. Without the revolutionary party, without a party built on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory, and in the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary style, it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its running dogs.”

At a point that he seems to recognize the need for centralized political guidance in the revolutionary struggle, Pomeroy describes the Party as a commandist organization “separate from the armed forces but protected by it.” By way of trying to prove that the Communist Party is a surplusage in the revolutionary

movement, he boasts that many HMB commanders are not Party members and that in towns near the forest camp there is not a single Party member though these are “solidly pro-Huk, up to and including town officials.” On our part, we say that without clear and correct Party leadership a military organization and the localities can never be consolidated. Mr. Pomeroy’s experience demonstrates the truth of this statement.

Chairman Mao teaches us: A well-disciplined Party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, using the method of self-criticism and linked with the masses of the people; an army under the leadership of such Party; a united front of all revolutionary classes and all revolutionary groups under the leadership of such a Party—these are the three main weapons with which we have defeated the enemy.”

Though the flimsiest of circumstances are dealt with by Pomeroy, he avoids a thorough ideological and political analysis of the errors of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership. He would rather deal at great length with the “revolutionary solution to the sex problem,” the “dialectics of love,” the “strategy and tactics of courtship,” and his lovemaking with Celia. On the arrest of the “Politburo-In” or the Secretariat in Manila in October 1950, he can only conjecture superficially that it may be the first result of enemy infiltration, carelessness or laxity of security. He fails to inquire thoroughly into the subjectivism and “Left” opportunism of the Jose Lava leadership and, therefore, lets down every valid reason for writing the book.

At the most, he is willing to admit only that the cause of the defeat under the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership is “the very low technological level of the people’s army.” With sarcasm, he goes on to say: “It is on par with the half-primitive methods that the average peasant uses to work his farm. It is a matter of fact that could, of course, be overcome, if the knowledge were supplied. However, in the entire Philippine national liberation movement there is not one military leader of any professional caliber.”

Here Pomeroy puts weapons ahead of politics; and external factor ahead of internal factors.

Expressing awe for the army and disdain for the Red fighters, he rails: “some of the best minds from American military academies are out here meeting their match from untrained peasants”; and “the enemy has the advantage in firepower

and modern weapons.” Pomeroy’s bourgeois militarist mentality is consistent: The people’s army has no chance against the military superiority of the enemy since the military is more important than politics and the peasants are inferior to US-trained officers.

In writing about the February-March 1950 conference of the central committee of the old merger party, Pomeroy fails to present anything—his own or that of the conference—which can shed light on the disastrous line and policies taken by the Jose Lava leadership or a new line of policies that can carry the revolutionary movement forward. The decisions of the conference carry on the false assumptions of the Jose Lava leadership against a protracted people’s war and, therefore, involve basically the continuance of a wrong line and wrong policies.

There is no concrete analysis of the situation, particularly of the balance of forces in the struggle. There is no grasp of the ideological, political and organizational strength of the revolutionary forces and there is also no grasp of the need to develop through a protracted period of time the people’s armed struggle. Under these circumstances, it is not possible to set forth the correct tasks concerning the building of the Party, people’s army, united front, mass organizations and organs of political power. The conference calls for the “regularization” of guerrilla units but it hitches this to the illusion of quick military victory in the absence of the fundamental criticism of the “Left” opportunism of the Jose Lava leadership. On the basis of the wrong notion that the enemy is to collapse on its own, Pomeroy and his fellow Lavaites put too much reliance on the success or failure of their “boycott” policy on the reactionary elections of November 1951. They posited that if this electoral farce is more fraudulent and terroristic than the one in 1949 then the people will spontaneously abandon the enemy and join the people’s army to overthrow the state within the short period of time. Essentially, the Jose Lava leadership continues the error of the Jose Lava leadership in onesidedly setting a timetable for quick military victory within two years.

Pomeroy and his Lavaite cohorts are unaware all along that they themselves have been isolated in the forest as a result of the disastrous “Left” opportunist line and policies of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership. Even their leaflets calling for boycott of the reactionary elections cannot be distributed in parts of the country previously reached by the people’s army. The “solidly pro-Huk areas” have suddenly turned hollow because in the first place the factors of consolidation

have not been properly attended to.

The Forest itself is a testimony to the fact that the Sta. Cruz raid launched on August 26, 1950 extremely overextended the people's army. The forest camp is left with no security detail at all since the raid entailed the participation of every fighter from the camp. In the course of the raid, putschist acts like the unnecessary burning and the killing of an enemy officer who offers to surrender his men are perpetrated for lack of time to withdraw. The raiders are short of time because they have to withdraw to distant points over extremely unreliable areas.

When the enemy launches its own offensive against the forest camp, it inevitably turns out that political work has not been well carried out among the people in the surrounding areas and even within the camp itself. It turns out that the forest camp is relying mainly on physical concealment and not on a well-consolidated base. District organizing committees disintegrate in a day; the enemy forces either seized or poisoned the food supplies before being allowed to pass through. Within the camp itself, harsh punishments are the order of the day to maintain "discipline." Pomeroy misjudges and cannot trust even his own guard.

In January 1951 the enemy succeeds in penetrating the forest camp, first the cluster of huts of the Education Department and Jesus Lava's hut where the stocks of food for the entire camp are seized. From then on, the problem of supply and communications becomes extremely acute. Yet after the February-March conference, the Secretariat with a personnel of 200 men and women, including a handful of armed guards, is set up in the forest. This soon becomes a definite and isolated target for intensified enemy operations.

Pomeroy acknowledges the fact that food for the forest camp comprises canned goods and rice bought from the town market. This is true especially after the enemy destruction of the "kaingins" (forest clearings). The forest camp were supported almost wholly by funds taken from town raids and the gangster-like activities of "economic struggle" units which included robbery of ordinary bus and train passengers. It is anomalous that there is not a system of collecting grain contributions or even buying rice directly from the peasants instead of from the town market. Grain tax cannot be collected from the peasants because in the first place the old merger party has failed to carry out agrarian revolution or land reform and has also failed to lead production campaigns for support of the people's army.

Mustering all dishonesty, Jesus Lava contends in his Camp Crame article “Paglilinaw sa ‘Philippine Crisis’” (Clarification on “Philippine Crisis”) that the HMB under his leadership never had its supply and communication line cut off by the enemy. Pomeroy’s *The Forest* can be slapped on his face. The Secretariat precisely had to break up because its large personnel would starve if not physically wiped out by the enemy offensive. The book deals mainly with panic and blind flight through the forest and sheer struggle for physical survival in the absence of a wide and strong political base to rely on.

In the notorious Lavaite style, Pomeroy makes self-contradictory statements. He implies at the early part of his book that upon the ascendance of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership in 1948 the old merger party becomes “well organized” and has “clear strategic and tactical aims.” But the whole book shows the opposite.

However, Pomeroy does not hold the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership responsible for any serious errors and for the defeat. He blames “men for their individual weaknesses”! He prates: “When the tide of struggle is running our way, individual weaknesses are submerged in the flood of high spirits; when the enemy is strong and the tide is not our way, these weaknesses emerge and turn men into slimy things that scuttle for the safety on the exposed shoreline.” What a malicious excuse for the colossal errors of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership.

A true scoundrel, Pomeroy blames the people. And he combines self-adulation with condemnation of the people. He boasts: “We had thought that the people moved at our pace, to the rapid click of the mimeograph machine. We had thought that the morale and discipline in this camp was the morale and discipline everywhere. We had thought that by the leaders setting a high tempo we could set the tempo of the revolution.”

Pomeroy considers himself and his ilk as having properly done their part. But the people do not respond, so, he resorts to an ugly metaphor: “We are like those who lean over a deep well and drop pebbles into its interior, waiting to hear the far hollow echo of them striking water. When the sound comes back to us it is a strange echo, like the lost cry of someone drowning in that depth.”

To Pomeroy, it is not the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership but the people that are guilty of opportunism. He says so in an unsubtle manner: “Some of the Huks are bitter about the people. The people, they say, are opportunistic. When we are with them they are friendly to us; when the enemy is with them they were

friendly to the enemy.... They are flesh and blood and they suffer much. We are in the forest, where we can hide and fight, but they are naked to suppression. They are helpless before abuse, and who can stand up to abuse and robbery month after month.”

An unmitigated agent of counterrevolution, Pomeroy refuses to recognize that the people themselves are the motive force of revolution and the real makers of history. Referring to the people, particularly to the peasant masses, Chairman Mao teaches us: “Every revolutionary party and every revolutionary comrade will be put to the test, accepted or rejected as they decide.” It is foolish to ever assume that a party or an army can take care of itself and fight without the people. It is always the bounden duty of the Party leadership to arouse, organize and mobilize the people for revolution. It is foolish to imagine oneself as a messiah of the people and then to fret that the people refuse to be saved when in the first place the correct line and correct policies are not taken to mobilize and serve them.

To the very end, Pomeroy insults the Filipino people. He rants: “No one looks at me, comrade of the dead. For these people life has reassumed its inexorable ways. They have seen many troops and captives. So many waves of conquest and of oppression have passed over this land that they have been numbed by it. I think how people learn to live with tragedy.”

Mr. Pomeroy, we say that the broad masses of the people—especially the oppressed workers and peasants—will keep on rising until victory is theirs. They will march from victory to victory under the leadership and under the great red banner of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

In opposition to the obscurantism of a revisionist scoundrel, we take heed from Chairman Mao who teaches us: “The rectification movement is a “widespread movement of Marxist education.” Rectification means the whole Party studying Marxism through criticism and self-criticism. We can certainly learn more about Marxism in the course of the rectification movement.

In his epilogue, Pomeroy is most concerned about his “end of the thread”; his reunion with his wife Celia. It must be recalled that these two were pardoned in 1961, so many years ahead of others who had also received jail sentences similar to theirs for political rebellion.

Pomeroy vociferously claims that it was a worldwide letter-writing campaign for amnesty that compelled Malacañang to release them from prison. But the truth was that the US embassy interceded for their release. It was obvious then that Pomeroy had finished one more tour of duty for US imperialism. Pomeroy pretends in the epilogue of his book that he is still under persecution by US authorities who “refuse” to have him reunited with his Filipino wife. His claim is as flimsy as his trying to get an exemption from the US McCarran Act so that he and Celia can be reunited in the United States. But then such an exemption would blatantly unmask a special agent of US imperialism and would prejudice a continuing sinister mission assigned to him. No one is fooled as Pomeroy and Celia are now united in London, enjoying the patronage of both US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

Today, William J. Pomeroy continues to perform counterrevolutionary work. The Forest is basically an effort to make use of the “Left” opportunism of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership as an excuse for whipping up Right opportunism and modern revisionism to subvert the resurgent revolutionary mass movement in the Philippines. Unfortunately for the revisionist scoundrel, however, the Communist Party of the Philippines has correctly rebuilt itself under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and has always stood firmly against every overt and subtle attempt to becloud the horizon.

Chairman Mao has pointed out: “The world is progressing; the future is bright and no one can change this general trend of history. We should carry on constant propaganda among the people on the fact of world progress and the bright future ahead so that they will build their confidence in victory.”

A Work of Two Renegades

First published in Ang Bayan, Special issue, November 1, 1971

Born of the People is the joint work of two renegades, Luis M. Taruc and William J. Pomeroy. Though presented as the autobiography of Taruc, this book was actually written by the hack and US imperialist agent Pomeroy as his way of sneaking not only into the ranks of the Philippine revolutionary mass movement for a certain period but also into the leading organs of the old merger party of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party.

Elder comrades can testify today that after Pomeroy collected data for his book in central Luzon in 1949 the enemy was able to conduct precision raids on places that he had visited. It was precisely because of certain suspicious of the Lavas themselves about him that it was decided that he would be "kept in camp" in Southern Luzon in 1950.

To read *Born of the People* is to discover the ideological roots of the development of Taruc into an out-and-out anti-communist and the counter-revolutionary role of Pomeroy even long before he wrote his later out-and-out revisionist works.

*Born of the People has been disclaimed by its "author" Luis Taruc. In this regard, he has acclaimed the anti-communist book *He Who Rides the Tiger*, another "autobiography" written for him by the hack and CIA agent Douglas Hyde. Pomeroy is left holding the trash. No one is surprised, however, that in sham pride he continues to hold it up as "the history of the revolutionary movement" more than the biography of a single person.*

Such apologia is idle. The book itself presents its central character Taruc as saying: "A history of the Huk alone would be my biography, and if any of my comrades read these pages, I know that they would also say: "Look, there is my biography, too."

Indeed, throughout the book Pomeroy spruces up Taruc as the "paragon" of the HUKBALAHAP and the entire revolutionary movement in the Philippines.

What a shameless calumny against the heroic Red fighters and the revolutionary masses!

Pomeroy can never wash his hands as Taruc's hack. As late as 1963, the revisionist author of *The Forest* would still praise Taruc in superlative terms: "Instead of writing a history, I wrote his 'autobiography,' calling it *Born of the People*. I tried to put into that book not only Luis but the Filipino peasantry and the Filipino people in general, struggling to be wholly free of colonialism. For a man like Luis, a leader like Luis, was truly born of the lives and struggles of the peasantry of Pampanga, and I was him as a symbol."

It is the task of this criticism to show that even at the writing of *Born of the People* both the real author and the fake author were already bent on promoting erroneous ideas to the detriment of proletarian revolutionary leadership and the revolutionary mass movement. Such erroneous ideas are in black and white in the book.

I. The world outlook of Taruc and Pomeroy

Born of the People features personal anecdotes that reveal and play up the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist viewpoint of both Taruc and Pomeroy. One of these runs as follows: He [Lope de la Rosa] told me that workers and peasants would be the makers of the new society. "When you get power," I asked, "how will you achieve the new society?" I thought that his objective sounded good, but the man and his companions astounded me. They talked about building a new society, but they were mostly semi-literate men who could hardly read. They had one copy of Marx's *Capital* but none of them could read it, so they had buried it.

The two renegades, Taruc and Pomeroy, find so much delight in satirizing the workers and peasants and in "burying" Marxism. They disregard the fact that the Communist Party, composed of the most advanced elements of the proletariat, exists precisely to translate Marxism into the language of the masses and, more importantly, into concrete revolutionary practice. What are these two scoundrels really driving at? Pomeroy lets Taruc speak out: "I had not read Marx, or anything about Marxism, so I used quotations from the Bible to defend my arguments. Strip from the ideas and preachings of Christ the cloak of mysticism placed over them by the church, and you really have many of ideas of socialism."

Even during his "bona fide" days, Taruc was already a hidden agent of "Christian socialism" within the old merger party! He preferred to translate Marxism into the pious words of the Bible and of Christ. And he found in Pomeroy a good partner in promoting his poisonous ideas repugnant to Marxism-Leninism.

Regarding theory, Chairman Mao teaches us: "It is necessary to master Marxist theory and apply it, master it for the sole purpose of applying it." Regarding attitude towards the masses, Chairman Mao also teaches us: The masses are the real heroes, while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant and without this understanding it is impossible to acquire even the most rudimentary knowledge.

Trying to make the masses look absurd because they themselves cannot read *Das Kapital* is itself an absurdity of the most vulgar kind. This is a denial of the necessity of revolutionary theory in a revolutionary movement and also necessary role of the leadership exercised by the Party.

The bourgeois egocentrism of Luis Taruc is irrepressible. Pomeroy plays on it as he picks out for special mention the incident when even as a small boy Luis Taruc wrote his name on a train only "so that it would ride across the country for everyone to see". His desire is not for revolution but for fame.

Taruc has an inveterate contempt for the peasant masses. Though born of a peasant father, he has set his mind on leaving the ranks of the peasants and joining the bourgeoisie through school. He recounts: "I told my father that I did not have the temperament for a peasant, and that I wanted to continue school." So, he prates: "The degree was the thing, the honor was the goal; it lifted a man above the sweaty mass." His childhood ambitions are apparently fulfilled now that he has become a well-paid touter of anti-communism. Even as he claims in his book to have already "the conviction that my class was all-important", he still harps on the theme of class conciliation in his narration of his love affairs that centers on his having married a rich girl despite his being a poor boy. Repeatedly he pours out the sickening line that there is such a thing as love that transcends class struggle and class hatred.

He is also extremely delighted to picture himself as a lady killer. Thus, he narrates how he and Casto Alejandrino made a "midnight picnic" with two young girls young enough to be their children. Pomeroy presents this incident as a "relief" for his hero in a period of crisis—in a period of massacres perpetrated by the enemy. It is used as an occasion for Taruc to hanker for "holidays" "to

relax among the natural beauties of my home".

Taruc prattles: "The ominous atmosphere that hung over Central Luzon produced another effect on me: it made me extremely sensitive to the peaceful beauties in the countryside and in the lives of the people. "

In the face of death in prison, Taruc considers his "love for wife" ahead of everything else. When it is his wife who dies of illness, he describes her death "a greater personal tragedy than the war with all its horrors and brought to me".

Taruc considers as praiseworthy "caution" the toadying behavior of Jesus Lava before his Japanese captors after the March raid of 1943 and for contrast he considers as "recklessness" the act of resistance shown by two heroic comrades who refused to kowtow to their fascist captors. Taking pride in the philosophy of survival and the spirit of capitulations, he praises the alacrity which Lava showed in accepting the "regimentation course" of the Japanese fascists and in teaching a Japanese officer how to play the piano. Taruc cannot cite any other example to really prove how revolutionaries can outwit the enemy.

Born of the People denounces the pro-Japanese collaborators. But consistency is lost when Taruc finds pleasure in narrating how the HUKBALAHAP leader Casto Alejandrino enjoyed himself playing cards with the top pro-Japanese collaborators and winning so much money from them in the Iwahig Penal Colony. Does it help to develop a correct and resolute attitude towards the struggle to pick out such events for representation of the revolutionary mass movement?

Pomeroy builds up Taruc as a "hero" to the extent of slandering the masses. The latter boasts in connection with an enemy campaign of "encirclement and suppression" in Mount Arayat in 1947: "To the men who were desperate and almost ready to surrender I spoke passionately, myself burning with thirst and heat. I exhorted them to remember our principles." I promised them all the cold drinks if they could stick it out.

In the book, Taruc is so cocksure that his thirsty men would have surrendered had he not preached about principles and made the banal promise of cold drinks and a big meal.

Taruc takes pride in the style of oversuspiciousness in inner Party relations and in the style of always assuming that all other people are always lying. Thus, he

praises Casto Alejandrino for introducing into the old merger party "his sway of probing for the motivations behind the an act or a position". Alejandrino is supposed to have always asked in the course of a criticism and self-criticism sessions; "I have heard your good reason, now what is your real reason?" This can be nothing but a method to put an honest fellow at a loss and make a liar insist on his lie. The tricks of a bourgeois psychiatrist are no substitute for the Marxist-Leninist method of getting to the facts and analyzing them. But Taruc triumphantly exclaims. "The good reason and the real reason became the measuring rod for the criticism and self-criticism which we developed in the Huk." The Lavas, Tarucs and Alejandrinos are so fond of deception, of making their "propaganda line" at odds with their "true line', that they always suspect others in the old merger party of being guilty of deception.

II. The "military leadership" of Luis Taruc

A certain circumstance is strikingly reflected by the writing of *Born of the People*. At the time that the US imperialists and the local reactionaries were systematically trumpeting Luis Taruc as the "supremo" (supreme leader) in their press, William Pomeroy crept into the old merger party in order to promote the sinister idea that it was Taruc who led and represented the revolutionary mass movement. In the book, the role of the Party is obscured and comes in only as some kind of afterthought secondary to the personality of the "military leader". Posing as a leading communist and as a theoretician at that, Pomeroy was quite effective in spreading the imperialist intrigue and bourgeois idea that the political leadership of a proletarian revolutionary party is secondary to "military leadership".

Putting the gun in command of the Party, Pomeroy states: "The core of the people's resistance was the people's army..." This runs counter to Chairman Mao's teaching that "the force at the core leading our cause forward is the Communist Party".

Yet on the conduct of armed struggle, Taruc cannot offer anything to prove his "military leadership". What he does is to cast doubts on the universal value of Chairman Mao's teachings on people's war which are based on vast revolutionary experience under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism.

Pomeroy's straw figure prates: "We wanted to fight, but the question of how to go about it was at first obscure. The Chinese guerrilla movement, we knew, had

been enormously successful, but in China the country was better adapted to guerrilla warfare. China had vast distances to hide an army and to provide space for maneuvering. There, largescale fighting could be undertaken, towns and whole regions liberated; in our case we had a tiny area, easily reached by overwhelming Japanese reinforcements. In China there was an established base, from which guerrilla forces radiated; we did not even have a base.”

In saying that China because of its vastness is better suited to guerrilla warfare, Taruc actually means to say that the Philippines because of its smallness is less suited to guerrilla warfare. Thus, he rails against the fact that the HUKBALAHAP had a tiny area to maneuver in against larger Japanese military forces. He narrates that successful converging attack on the small area of Mount Arayat by Japanese troops only with the view of presenting how "hopeless and desperate" is guerrilla warfare in the Philippines. His intention is not to show the peculiarities of different tactics of guerrilla warfare in the Philippines but to obfuscate the basic principles tested and proven correct in the Chinese revolutionary experience.

Taruc has no right to complain at all that the Philippines is too tiny a place for the revolutionary forces to fight a militarily far superior enemy because he and his cohorts in the first place did not care to deploy cadres and fighters beyond a limited part of Central Luzon and a still more limited part of Southern Luzon in order to lead and build the nationwide guerrilla warfare that did develop during the war of resistance. By default, guerrilla warfare outside Central Luzon came under the counter-revolutionary command of the USAFFE. In a semifeudal country like the Philippines, there is no choice for revolutionaries in initiating armed struggle against a far superior enemy force but to wage guerrilla warfare. At the inception of people's war, positional regular warfare or strategically decisive engagements in which the stake of the entire revolutionary movement is involved or city uprisings without rural base areas to rely on is the fool's choice. Nowhere else but in the countryside can guerrilla warfare be developed and the people's army be built by stages and have sufficient area for maneuver while gathering strength. The fact that the country is small, archipelagic, narrow and detached by sea from friendly countries only supports the line that guerrilla warfare has to be developed and expanded nationwide.

Contrary to Taruc's idealist assumption that the Red army and the base areas in China dropped from the sky or grew spontaneously from the wide expanses of China, these grew from small to big and were tempered through a long period of

struggle under the correct leadership of the Communist Party and Chairman Mao. At the beginning of the agrarian war or at the beginning of the war of resistance against the Japanese fascists, the Red army was always several times outnumbered by well-equipped millions of enemy troops and the Red base areas were always far smaller than the White areas. One must have the correct class standpoint and also an acute sense of proportion to see the applicability of the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions of the Philippines. The strength and maneuverability of the Red army in the countryside always depend basically on how well the proletarian revolutionary party has aroused and mobilized the peasant masses. It must be well kept in mind that at no time before or during the war of resistance was the old merger party ever able to carry out agrarian revolution or a land reform program on a broad scale and in a profound manner in order to get the closest support of the peasant masses. The consideration of geographic characteristics is secondary to the all-important question of revolutionary politics. In the course of the enemy campaigns of "encirclement and suppression", the intensity of armed struggle in a small country like the Philippines is comparable to that in a specific part of a big country like China. At the same time, it is always difficult even for a large enemy force to saturate the countryside of a semicolonial and semifeudal country.

Taruc admits that he and his cohorts had the outlook of roving rebel bands when he brags: "We did not even have a base." Mount Arayat was really some kind of a "base" but it was a poorly chosen one and was not even consolidated before the Japanese March raid of 1943. After the March raid, the entire idea of developing base areas was lost among the Lavas and Tarucs. They split up the "squadrons" (each numbering 100 men or more) of the HUKBALAHAP into tiny groups of three to five men and ordered their absolute dispersal; it would turn out later in late 1944 that only the fighting units which did not follow the order managed to survive. Even today, both the Lavas and Tarucs still insist that it is impossible to develop base areas in the Philippines. Then, what is the point in the first place of trying and hoping to liberate the entire country from the reactionaries and consolidate it as a revolutionary base?

All genuine revolutionaries are determined to make the entire country no less a base of the revolution. In preparation for nationwide victory, we have no recourse but to develop rural base areas as the embryo of the political power that we shall exercise on a nationwide scale. At this stage, we cannot open guerrilla zones and fight well in them without developing guerrilla base areas. What we

simply mean is that we cannot last long in unreliable and unconsolidated areas. Guerrilla bases are the reliable rears for guerrilla zones. The former and the latter interact with each other in the same manner that consolidation and expansion interact with each other.

On the basis of the quotation that we have just made from the joint book of Pomeroy and Taruc, we can easily see why the Tarucs and Lavas failed to really develop the people's armed strength on a sound foundation during the war of resistance and why they continuously pinned their hopes on the US invasion forces for the "liberation" of the Filipino people from the Japanese fascists. We can easily see why in the period following World War II the Lavas and Tarucs went on to dissolve the people's army under the black banner of Rightism only to resort to a "Left" line when their bourgeois political ambitions were frustrated. Then, under conditions of military defeat, the Lavas and Tarucs would shift back to capitulationism and liquidationism and the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique would emerge as a Lavaite by-product to carry out roving rebel activities and gangsterism.

III. Taruc as a major representative of the old merger party

Luis M. Taruc was a major representative of the old merger party of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party. Next only to the Lavas, he represented most the wholesale entry of unremolded petty-bourgeois elements into the old merger party; he had succeeded in raising himself from the status of a poor peasant's son to that of a college student and then an independent tailor. After Pedro Abad Santos, he also represented most the motley members of the Socialist Party. For a certain period, from 1938 to 1954, he would compete with the Lavas for the distinction of being the worst saboteur of the revolutionary mass movement.

The creation of the old merger party in 1938 was directly masterminded by the now-notorious anti-communist Earl Browder who was then general secretary of the Communist Party of the USA. Vicente Lava was the principal local agent who promoted the Browderite revisionist slogan "Communism in twentieth century Americanism". The influence of this slogan runs through *Born of the People*. There is not a single word of praise for Comrade Stalin written in the book. But Taruc and Pomeroy are ecstatic about Roosevelt's leadership. They babble: "We had always referred to the Americans as our allies, and had sincerely believed that under the leadership of Roosevelt the American nation

would help usher in a new era of world peace and democracy.” Taruc and Pomeroy proudly recount the fact that immediately prior to the war of anti-Japanese resistance, the old merger party kowtowed to the puppet chieftain Quezon and the US High Commissioner Sayre by submitting a memorandum which stated the following: "The Communist Party pledges loyalty to the governments of the Philippines and the United States." The book of national betrayal goes further self-righteously: "In all matters and in all forms of public relations the Huk was free to conduct itself as it wished on the basis of loyalty to the Constitution and to the allied cause." This is puppetry to US imperialism no different from Quezon's. It shuns the principle of unity and struggle in the antifascist united front and surrenders without compunction the independence and initiative of the proletariat and its party.

During the anti-Japanese war of resistance, the slogans of "Anti-Japanese above all" and "Everything for the anti-Japanese struggle" was adopted by the old merger party to mean all-alliance and no-struggle with US imperialism and the anti-Japanese reactionaries. Taruc reveals: “In the interest of the broadest kind of unity, we adopted the slogan: Anti-Japanese above all. That meant exactly what it said. We would forego an independent struggle for separate working class demands. To show our good faith we dissolved the peasant organizations, Aguman ding Maldang Talapagobra (League of Poor Laborers AMT) and the Kapisanang Pambansa ng mga Magbubukid sa Pilipinas (National Peasant Union of the Philippines KPMP).”

To pursue the national struggle is not to forego the class struggle; to do otherwise is to betray the proletariat and the people. To dissolve peasant organization under the pretext of "the broadest kind of unity" is to fawn in the most treacherous manner on the US imperialists and their reactionary stooges.

The "promise of independence" by US imperialism was never questioned but on the contrary accepted and supported blindly by the old merger party. Even as units of the people's army and the Barrio United Defense Corps ("government" at the village level) were established in the course of the war of resistance, the Lavas and Tarucs whipped up an orientation of subservience to their colonial masters. Taruc states: “Our objective in setting up a people's democratic government was not designed to contradict the government-in-exile in Washington. We looked upon Quezon, Osmeña and their cabinet as our government.”

There is too much panegyric for the ghost of the US military officer Thorpe who during the early part of the war had merely promised to give arms to the HUKBALAHAP in Central Luzon. Taruc moans: "We felt the loss of Thorpe deeply. He was that rare type of American officer who was not entirely blinded by the glitter of his brass. If he lived he might have been a deterrent to the reactionary policies that developed later in the guerrilla forces under American influence."

Anderson, another US military officer, also receives lavish praise for "tolerating" HUKBALAHAP units in Southern Luzon. To him goes the credit of sponsoring an aborted trip of Jesus Lava to Australia via submarine. Taruc and Pomeroy rail that had Lava been able to take the submarine (which did not actually wait for him) he would have been able to report to the US Command and to MacArthur himself and thus improve the chances of the treacherous policy of all-alliance and no-struggle towards US imperialism to fare better.

In the book, Taruc and Pomeroy cannot fathom the counterrevolutionary dual policy of US imperialism and cannot see through the "good" American officers whose work merely complemented the more brazen work of the "bad" American officers. Thorpe and Anderson essentially acted as military agents of US imperialism during the war despite their pretensions of sympathy for the HUKBALAHAP.

Taruc and Pomeroy obscure the fact that it is in the nature of US imperialism and the local reactionaries to raise hell for the people's army whenever they have a chance to. Even as they reveal anti-communist onslaughts by USAFFE units during the war, the two scoundrels refuse to clarify the relationship between unity and struggle in a united front in the concrete conditions of World War II which required temporary alliance with US imperialism and the reactionaries who opposed Japanese imperialism. Passing comment on a bloody act of betrayal perpetrated against a HUKBALAHAP unit by a combined force of the USAFFE and pro-Japanese Philippine Constabulary, they babble: "That encounter stripped bare an ugly cancer that had begun to grow in the anti-Japanese struggle, the cancer of partisan politics." It is silly to prate about the "cancer of partisan politics" as if it were possible for the reactionaries or the revolutionaries to "transcend" partisanship and politics; the point is for revolutionaries to be sure about their own partisanship and politics.

Taruc and Pomeroy deliberately refuse to draw obvious lessons from the

experience of carrying out a united front policy during the war of resistance. Among these lessons should be a recognition of the need to build a strong Marxist-Leninist party, a strong people's army that the party leads and a people's government based in the countryside and having a united front character, altogether capable of confronting the return of US imperialism and the Commonwealth government at a new and higher stage of the revolutionary struggle. In carrying out the united front policy, we make it a point as Chairman Mao teaches us to "make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few and crush the enemies one by one" rather than be confused by the dual nature of certain temporary allies or surrender our independence and initiative to them.

The wartime "retreat for defense" policy gave away initiative to the USAFFE forces all over the country and weakened the revolutionary movement from within. This was a policy of disintegration and passive defense and was no different from the "lie-low" policy of the USAFFE which banked on the return of US imperialism. After the defeat of the Japanese fascists and their puppets, the old merger party would not be prepared to oppose the aggressive return of US imperialism and the Commonwealth government.

While the book reports that the Central Committee conference of September 1944 did away with the "retreat for defense" policy, it does not report that this same conference presumed that US imperialism would grant real independence, decided to wage parliamentary struggle as the principal form of struggle and designed the Democratic Alliance as the principal form of organization for bourgeois parliamentarism. Thus, upon the return of US imperialism and the puppet Commonwealth government, the old merger party would raise the slogan "Long live our American allies and long live the Commonwealth government!" Taruc raves: The invasion of Leyte by the American army on October 20 [1944] struck the first gong of doom for the Japanese in the Philippines. We were jubilant. We issued special editions of the Hukbalahap and the Katubusan ng Bayan to celebrate the occasion.

The joint authors actually insist that the "all-out offensive" carried out by the HUKBALAHAP in late October 1944 was made possible not by the preceding years of people's struggle but by the impending return of US imperialism.

The old merger party relied so much on Roosevelt. Taruc describes Roosevelt's death in the following shameless manner: "It was the bitterest blow that our

hopes for a democratic peace had received. We were certain that Roosevelt, proponent of the Four Freedoms, had not sanctioned the MacArthur brand of fascism in the Philippines.”

What obsequiousness to US imperialism! During the war of resistance, however, even MacArthur was someone to rely on for the Tarucs and Lavas. Was not Jesus Lava all set to take a submarine bound for Australia in order to report "everything" to MacArthur?

When after the war MacArthur and McNutt kept on harping on a "re-examination" of the US pledge to "grant independence" to the Philippines, Taruc and his kind could only have the silly wish that Roosevelt should have lived forever as their final resort. They would not be satisfied with having Harold Ickes for a "defender"; they wished to have a bigger Yankee brother and they wasted a lot of tears on the name of Roosevelt. Taruc and his kind in the old merger party were alien to Chairman Mao's principle of "maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts".

IV. The capitulationist line of the Lavas and Tarucs

Upon the return of US imperialism and the puppet Commonwealth government in 1945, the old merger party unilaterally disarmed the HUKBALAHAP, converted it into a veterans' organization, and whipped up the slogan of "peace and democracy". In response, the US imperialists and their puppets conducted mass arrests and massacres against the old merger party and the HUKBALAHAP. Despite all these, Taruc and his kind persisted on the line of capitulation and insisted on jostling for official positions in the reactionary government.

The US imperialists also resorted to buying-off tactics. At one point, Taruc appears to be critical of the "Banal Regiment" (a unit of the HUKBALAHAP) for going the way of mercenaries, receiving "backpay" from the US imperialists and becoming integrated into the puppet ranks. But at another point, he whitewashes the treachery by claiming that the mercenaries did not know any better. He goes as far as to state: "Banal's motivations, I believe, were not opportunist, nor did opportunism influence many of the men who followed him."

Furthermore, Taruc admits that he himself worked for "backpay" for the

HUKBALAHAP and submitted Huk rosters to the enemy for the purpose. These rosters were subsequently used as blacklists by the enemy for persecuting and murdering Party cadres and HUKBALAHAP fighters. To prettify his own deed of betrayal, Taruc rails: "Now, however, with many Huk families destitute and with a need for funds to rebuild people's organizations as part of our peaceful legal struggle, we decided to apply for backpay." The name of the people is invoked to attack the people.

Born of the People admits the undeniable truth that the HUKBALAHAP fighters and the masses, though abandoned to their own devices by the old merger party, spontaneously defended themselves from imperialist and puppet depredations. But Taruc and Pomeroy always bring to the fore the erroneous idea that the people were "tired of war" and that it was apt for the leaders of the old merger party to run for elective positions under the Democratic Alliance.

Taruc and his kind based themselves on the proposition that "the Huk is not anti-Commonwealth government" and that they "recognize President Osmeña as the legal president of the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth Constitution as the legal constitution of the Philippines". Subsequently, issues were so formulated in the old merger party and in the Democratic Alliance that their rank and file were made to choose only between the Nacionalista Party of Osmeña and the newly founded Liberal Party of Roxas in the 1946 elections.

A vote for Osmeña was interpreted as a vote for "independence" on July 4, 1946 and a vote for Roxas as a vote for the "postponement" of independence as proposed by MacArthur and McNutt. Thus, the old merger party threw in its support for Osmeña. Along this line, it was converted into a minor electoral organization helping the Nacionalista Party directly in a common effort with the Liberal Party and US imperialism to put up the farce that is the present puppet republic. The revolutionary role of a proletarian party in the struggle for national liberation was cast away. Taruc and Pomeroy still assert in the book: "A victory for Osmeña might have placed the nation on the road to real independence and real democracy." What great faith they have in a reactionary politician! They also ask rhetorically: "Could the betrayal have been avoided?" and they proceeded to answer themselves: Yes, it could have been if Osmeña had taken up the challenges and had carried the fight to the people. Instead, he allowed the rights and the strength of the people to be curtailed at every turn.

So much hope was indeed pinned on Osmeña by the sham revolutionaries. They

relied on him as their messiah.

Yet as soon as Roxas won, the Tarucs and Lavas hurried to support him in his anti-communist "pacification plan" which had been designed to destroy the old merger party and the HUKBALAHAP. They did so with the vain hope of cajoling him into granting some concessions. They did so with the main selfish purpose of trying to reverse the ouster of six Democratic Alliance congressmen (including Luis Taruc and Jesus Lava) from their seats.

Leading officials of the old merger party and the HUKBALAHAP went around shamelessly campaigning for the people to lay down and register their arms, enter their names in the enemy's rolls and accept the cantonment of troops in their barrios. This Lava-Taruc act of betrayal resulted in the assassination of revolutionary cadres and countless abuses on the people, including massacres. This capitulation to the evil scheme of Roxas was no different from the submission of Huk rosters to the US authorities in exchange for "backpay".

The Lavas and Tarucs put forward to Roxas five terms for a "democratic peace", each of which implied abandonment of the revolutionary struggle and acceptance of the authority of the enemy: 1) Immediate enforcement of the Bill of Rights, especially the right to assemble, freedom from arbitrary arrest, ending of cruel and unjust punishment, trial by unprejudiced judges; 2) dismissal of all charges against Huks, MPs and civilian guards alike growing out of events of the previous five months; 3) replacement of fascist-minded officials in municipal and provincial governments and military commands in provinces affected by agrarian unrest; 4) restoration of all Democratic Alliance congressmen to their seats; and 5) the implementation of Roxas' own land reform program, beginning with a fool-proof crop distribution law and leading towards eventual abolition of tenancy.

These terms were to be the agenda of negotiations between the Roxas puppet regime and the old merger party after Taruc and his kind complied with the "pacification plan". The traitor Taruc went about Central Luzon trying to douse the revolutionary spirit of the people, asking them to "curb their hot tempers" and to "maintain patience and discipline".

Always taking pride in counter-revolution, Taruc admits in the book: "I explained in detail the promises of the government to enforce the laws and the Constitution and (even though I myself distrusted the motivations of Roxas) I

admonished the people to act on the good faith of the government.”

What a sell-out! He admits having tried to mislead the people into trusting the evil that he himself could not trust. And he demanded the reactionary laws and constitution to be enforced against the people.

How do Pomeroy and Taruc try to cover up the patent treason of the Lavas and Tarucs? They prattle: “The demoralization that prevailed among large sections of the people was caused by their natural desire for peace and security after the difficult years of the Japanese occupation. Although they did not trust the demagogy of Roxas, many of them wanted to believe it. Many were even willing to accept the peace of slaves, just as long as it was peace.”

What a callous regard for the people! They invoke the "natural desire for peace and security" and they describe the people as "willing to accept the peace of slaves".

But Taruc and Pomeroy always unwittingly slap their own faces. They state somewhere else in the book: “In the bivouacs, in the swamps, forests and mountains, where the reassembled Huk squadrons were staying to avoid encounters [as per instructions of Taruc and his kind], I found the soldiers extremely bitter. Their experience in three years of fighting against the Japanese and puppets had made them militant and ready to leap to the defense of their families and rights. They told me that they did not feel like always running away, that they were not cowards and that they wanted to fight.”

What is the attitude of Taruc towards all these? Once more he makes an admission: “I counseled them to fall back upon their iron discipline, and to allow themselves to be drawn into trouble only when it meant actually to save their lives. They discussed it and agreed. To me the most outstanding feature of that whole period was not the encounters that did occur, but the encounters that did not occur due to the admirable restraint of the Huk soldier.”

Here it is extremely evident that Taruc and Pomeroy take pride in capitulationism, promote the erroneous idea of passive defense, picture the people as being docile and prettify docility as discipline.

Nothing came out of the "pacification plan" and "negotiations" of the Roxas puppet regime and the old merger party. From the beginning to the end, Roxas would not be satisfied with anything less than the "total extermination of

communists", including the Lavas and Tarucs. Only when their own lives were already in clear danger did the Lavas and Tarucs take the posture of leading the revolutionary masses in armed struggle. They had to fall back on the people whom they had readily slandered as "willing to accept the peace of slaves".

As soon as Quirino became the puppet chieftain in 1948 following the untimely death of Roxas, he sent out feelers to Luis Taruc and his kind that they could enter into a negotiation and an agreement on "surrender and amnesty" with him. Incurable capitulationists that they were, the Lavas and Tarucs were too willing to fall into Quirino's political trap despite the people's clamor for revolutionary armed struggle. Taruc took the limelight as a fool for once more agreeing to the "surrender and registration" of HUKBALAHAP fighters.

Taruc and his kind once more recognized the authority and the "superior" political position of the enemy. Once more they agreed to updating the blacklists of the enemy. They were required to order the surrender and registration of the HUKBALAHAP fighters. They had not learned the lesson of principle and practice from the submission of Huk rosters to the US Veterans Administration or from the "pacification plan" of the Roxas puppet regime.

Taruc tries to lessen his counter-revolutionary crime by confessing: "We made two serious mistakes in our negotiations with Quirino. We allowed ourselves to be put in the position of accepting an amnesty proclamation from him without challenging its implication that we were the guilty party. Secondly, we kept too much in the background the basic consideration of struggle against US imperialism. "

A true revolutionary would not even raise the question of guilt under the rules of the enemy. It is because the revolutionary cause is just and must always be pursued towards its triumph. Everything is prejudiced when the enemy is made out to appear as indulgent and kind by the same persons who pose as the leaders of the revolution.

Taruc rails: "Peace depended entirely upon Quirino's implementation of his promises, which failed to develop. During the period of truce the PCs and civilian guards continued to raid and terrorize, and ambushed our soldiers on several occasions. Huks and PKMs were told directly by civilian guards and the PCs: "Now we know who you are. We will take care of you later." Once more nothing came out of a false peace. The Quirino puppet regime should be

condemned for its sanguinary perfidy. But the Lavas and Tarucs should as well be condemned for their incorrigible capitulationism, for repeatedly leading the people into the slaughterhouse.

In their desire to accommodate their selfish interests and seek rotten compromises with the US imperialists and the reactionaries, the Lavas and Tarucs could easily forget how the Filipino people had been able to gain standing and become a considerable force through the HUKBALAHAP. The scoundrels made it a habit to oppose the truth of Chairman Mao's teaching that "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

It is important to pay close attention to the orientation of Taruc in entering bourgeois electioneering as a candidate for the puppet congress in 1946. He states: I was going to school again. This time it was the school of politics. In our country it has been a special business. People train for it from the time that they are young men. In the universities they make their contacts and become skilled in the game of classroom politics. That is what happens in a colonial country, where politics is usually a doorway to quick wealth through graft and corruption, a system fostered by the dominating foreigners because it enables them to buy politicians, and thus to siphon off the political vigor of the nation. The word "politician" was so debased that it meant "cheater" and "demagogue" to the masses.

What a self-revealing statement from a "student!"

Pomeroy's Apologia for Soviet Revisionism

First published in Ang Bayan, Special Issue, November 30, 1971

Half a Century of Socialism (Soviet Life in the 1960s) unfolds the role of William J. Pomeroy as both an agent of Soviet modern revisionism and US imperialism. This book pretends to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution but in fact it celebrates the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and the all-round restoration of capitalism in the homeland of the great Lenin. It heaps all kinds of empty praises for the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the revisionist Communist Party of the Soviet Union and for the 23rd Congress and the plenary sessions of the CPSU Central Committee from 1965 to 1967 by which Brezhnev and his revisionist gang have outdone Khrushchov in bringing about the all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Speaking from a bourgeois reactionary and idealist viewpoint, Pomeroy disparages dialectical materialism, the law of contradiction and class analysis as “oversimplification.” In no uncertain terms, he rails: “A revolutionary who is prone to see everything in two-toned contrasts is disconcerted in meeting a capitalist who might be a decent person or a fellow revolutionary who might be unscrupulous.” What a counterrevolutionary way of summing up reality! His sinister purpose sticks out: it is to attack the revolutionary proletariat and praise the counterrevolutionary bourgeoisie to the heavens.

Himself involved in the class struggle on the side of the bourgeoisie, he dishes up his own “two-toned contrasts” in a revisionist manner well-echoed from his Soviet revisionist masters. He raves: “The hammer and sickle were an apt symbol in the time of Lenin.” And he hastens to counterpoise: “Today’s symbols are the computer, the transistor and the atomic ring.” He slanders Lenin and Stalin as the paragons of “backwardness” and vents his spite on the dictatorship

of the proletariat. He pays high tribute to his current revisionist renegade masters Brezhnev and Kosygin as the paragons of “technical progress” and describes in the most glowing terms the fascist dictatorship of the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie.

Pomeroy prates that the difference between what he calls the past (the time of Lenin and Stalin) and the present (the time of his Soviet revisionist masters) lies in the “advance of techniques.” This is to cover up the betrayal of Leninism and the peaceful evolution of the proletarian dictatorship into a bourgeois dictatorship through the machinations of such usurpers as Khrushchov and Brezhnev who is Khrushchov the second. In the process, he also manages to throw in a flimsily disguised praise for the international big bourgeoisie. He states: “People in the developed countries are fully aware of the differences in their present lives and outlooks from those of their forebears at the turn of the century or in the 1920s. They look back with superior smiles at what are considered to be rather primitive times. If this can be true under capitalism, which tends to resist change, it is much more true under socialism which has transformed the conditions of living in a much more rapid and thoroughgoing manner.”

The trick in Pomeroy’s sophistry is simple. He puts technique ahead of politics, and compares socialism with capitalism mainly on the basis of techniques. People in the capitalist countries are made out to appear as enjoying the bounties of technical progress in the same manner that people in the Soviet Union are supposed to be enjoying the same things now. The end of this line of misrepresentation is to “look back with superior smiles” at the “primitive times” of Lenin and Stalin. But can Soviet revisionist renegades really do this? It is most interesting to look at how rotten Soviet society has become after the betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Pomeroy opposes to its very core the October Revolution and impugns its historical necessity in the advance of the world proletarian revolution. He goes so far as to state that “it would be wrong to say that socialist revolutions elsewhere would have been impossible without the prior existence of the Soviet Union.” The October Revolution of 1917 is a historical fact and no genuine revolutionary ever doubts its necessary value to all succeeding socialist revolutions. It verified and brought to reality the theory of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, and became the cornerstone of the world proletarian revolution. Its salvos brought Marxism-Leninism to the people of the world.

Therefore, it is idle historical idealism for Pomeroy to prate that socialist revolution would be possible even without the October Revolution.

I. On the proletarian dictatorship

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

Under the guidance of Marxism and on the basis of the great practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, Lenin clearly pointed out: “The transition from capitalism to communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration. “

In this regard, therefore he repeatedly stressed: “The dictatorship of the proletariat is essential.”

Under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism and on the basis of the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and abroad, Chairman Mao has stated even more explicitly: “Socialist society covers a considerably long historical period. In the historical period of socialism, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration. Our instruments of dictatorship must be strengthened, not weakened. “

Learning from the historical experiences of the Soviet Union and other revisionist countries, Chairman Mao has put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. These recent theoretical and practical contributions of Chairman Mao signaled by his famous work *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People* as far back as 1957 have brought the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism to a completely new and higher stage. All these are in keeping with the Marxist-Leninist view that in a socialist society, lasting for an entire historical epoch, classes, class contradictions and class struggle persist.

What does Pomeroy say in opposition to the kernel of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, which is the dictatorship of the proletariat? He says:

“opposing classes have ceased to exist in the Soviet Union and that what prevails is a “state of the whole people.” In other words, the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer thought of as the instrument to suppress counterrevolutionary tendencies within the country, but as an instrument directed solely against enemies from outside.” This is unadulterated Khrushchovism and Brezhnevism.

Long before the blatant counterrevolutionary coup d’etat launched by Khrushchov, the capitalist roaders in the Soviet Union had insisted that there were no more classes, class contradictions and class struggle. (Comrade Stalin himself expressed too early in 1936 the view that there was no more class struggle in the Soviet Union but he rectified this wrong view in 1952.) It has turned out that to stop or obscure the waging of revolutionary class struggle is to allow the representatives of the bourgeoisie to sneak into the state and party of the proletariat, usurp leadership and restore capitalism. Not to put proletarian politics in command of everything consciously and vigorously is to allow bourgeois politics to take over in a socialist society. There are vestigial, latent and hidden agents of the big bourgeoisie (egged on by the imperialist policy of peaceful evolution) who are ready to spring into counterrevolutionary action under the cover of techniquism and economism wherever the proletarian dictatorship lets down its vigilance and its determination to continue the revolution. After the restoration of capitalism through peaceful evolution, the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist openly flaunt the theory of “state of the whole people” and “party of the whole people” in order to denote the dissolution of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the party of the proletariat, respectively. A dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie such as those of Khrushchov and Brezhnev is set up. It is no surprise, therefore, that the anti-communist scoundrel Pomeroy now admits that his Soviet revisionist masters no longer think of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the instrument for suppressing counterrevolutionary tendencies within the country. State power for them is itself the instrument for counterrevolution.

Throughout Pomeroy’s book, it is clear that the kind of “people” who are now living it up in capitalist style in the Soviet Union belong to the bourgeoisie. They converted the socialist economy into state monopoly capitalism. They rob the state treasury centrally and in various enterprises and farms, live in a kind of luxury imitative of the bourgeoisie in the West, squander the social wealth accumulated for decades through the hard work of the Soviet laboring people and intensify oppression and exploitation in order to raise their profits. A monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie lords over the state and Party, operates the

means of production as capitalist enterprises and poisons education and culture to suit capitalist ends. The Soviet neo-bourgeoisie rides roughshod over the Soviet proletariat, the people of various nationalities and the people of various countries, especially a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic.¹⁴ Pomeroy refers to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as an instrument "solely against enemies from outside." However, it is noteworthy that he does not make a single attack, not even a sham one, against US imperialism in his concluding chapter which is his most concentrated way of presenting the revisionist view of the transition from socialism to communism. On the other hand his vicious but futile diatribes are without letup against Chairman Mao, the Chinese Communist Party the Chinese proletariat and people, and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Indeed, Pomeroy reflects very well the evil designs of the Soviet fascist and social imperialist state against China, communism, the people, and revolution. He projects very well also such acts of aggression as the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, mischievously called "international dictatorship. Beware of the arms expansion and war preparations being carried out by Soviet social imperialism in its mad quest for world hegemony. The revisionist Pomeroy regards the question of political power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a mere short spell and as a mere preliminary after which it is all economic construction that counts. So he chatters: If a communist cadre is asked about the romanticism of what he is doing, he will most likely reply that the exciting struggle for power was only the initial struggle, the beginning of problems after which the hard weary work begins.... We say that the struggle for power does not cease after the seizure of power, that economic construction does not make the struggle for power a thing of the past. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie continues in the entire historical epoch of socialism. It is imperative for the proletariat to continue the revolution, take command of everything and consolidate its class dictatorship. Pomeroy falls deeper into self-contradiction in the following prattle: After decades of a highly centralized dictatorship of the proletariat that was necessary to push through and to protect socialist construction, there is now the problem of broadening democratic participation in all phases of life.... He seems to recognize here the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat in pushing through and protecting socialist construction. But his main interest now is to make this dictatorship appear as the straitjacket of democracy. He denies the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat, while suppressing the people's enemies, created during the time of Lenin and Stalin the broadest democracy among the workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals. He exposes his antagonism to genuine democracy when he degrades the revolutionary mass

movement as less effective than economic work and argues that economic work by itself is automatically revolutionary. He prates: “An efficiently-run socialist enterprise may possess much greater revolutionary potential than the largest of demonstrations....” Only a counterrevolutionary will lay aside proletarian politics or subordinate it to economic work. Chairman Mao teaches us: “Political work is the lifeblood of all economic work.” The 20th Congress of the CPSU is ecstatically hailed by Pomeroy as the starting point of “democracy” in the Soviet Union. This was the black congress in 1956 in which the modern revisionists launched a surprise attack, a counterrevolutionary coup, against the dictatorship of the proletariat and which tried to spread throughout the world the poisonous revisionist ideas of “parliamentary road,” “peaceful transition” and class collaboration with US imperialism. Khrushchov worked out his revisionist purposes under the cover of “combating the personality cult of Stalin.”

Chairman Mao made a timely criticism of the Soviet revisionist renegades, when he sharply pointed out:

I think that there are two “swords”: One is Lenin and the other Stalin. The sword of Stalin has now been abandoned by the Russians. ... As for the sword of Lenin, has it too now been abandoned to a certain extent by some leaders of the Soviet Union? In my view, it has been abandoned to a considerable extent. Is the October Revolution still valid? Can it still be the example for all countries? Khrushchov's report at the 20th Congress of the CPSU says it is possible to gain political power by the parliamentary road, that is to say, it is no longer necessary for all countries to learn from the October Revolution. Once this gate is opened, Leninism by and large is thrown out.

In keeping with the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist stand of the 20th Congress, Pomeroy takes any act or attitude having the character of “combating the personality cult of Stalin” as “democratic.” The entire historical epoch preceding the counterrevolution of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique is completely negated by him through the simple trick of heaping all blame on Comrade Stalin, the leading representative of the proletariat after Lenin and before the usurpation of power by the revisionist rascals. Like his Soviet revisionist masters, he does not have the least respect for the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes, masses, parties, and leaders. The complete negation of Comrade Stalin is nothing but a vicious attack on the great leader of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the international communist movement for nearly thirty years. The logic of the revisionist renegades would subject even Lenin to the filthiest calumny for being

the great and venerated leader of the Soviet and world proletariat and for having ruthlessly combated the counterrevolutionaries.

What Pomeroy considers “democracy” is the bourgeois coup d’etat executed by his Soviet revisionist masters, the widespread fascist purges carried out in all the Party and government organizations, from the higher to the lower echelons, and the replacement of proletarian cadres in leading positions by the bourgeois intelligentsia and the worst dregs of Soviet society. Nearly 70 percent of the CPSU Central Committee members elected at the 19th Congress in 1952 were purged at the top reflected the bigger purges below. The 22nd Congress systematized the Khrushchov revisionist program of “three peacefuls” (“peaceful coexistence,” “peaceful competition,” and “peaceful transition”) and “two wholes” (“party of the whole people” and “state of the whole people”). By the time of the 23rd congress in 1966, nearly 60 percent of the CPSU Central Committee members elected in the 20th congress were purged. The 23rd Congress sanctified the “new system” or “economic reform” which was first approved in the September 1965 plenum of the Brezhnev-led CPSU Central Committee and which further pushed the full-scale restoration of capitalism.

Pomeroy considers it “impressive” that all kinds of ogres have crept out of their hole in the Soviet Union. He is extremely elated that in Soviet elections the revisionist-dominated Communist Party has lost prestige and out-and-out counterrevolutionaries are being voted into office; that bourgeois managers are in control over the means of production and are skimming the cream of the social wealth with their high salaries and allowances, big bonuses and other special privileges; and that a bourgeois intelligentsia is imitating the most decadent elements of bourgeois culture under the guise of “internationalism.” He hails the entire rigmarole as “liberal atmosphere” and as the “broadening of democracy.”

In pursuit of what Pomeroy calls “socialist legality,” the Soviet revisionist renegades have sent genuine Communists in great numbers to mental hospitals, prisons and concentration camps since the liquidation of the proletarian dictatorship by Khrushchov. Outright assassinations are perpetrated. Tanks and armored cars have been dispatched to suppress the resistance of the revolutionary masses of various nationalities against the oppressive revisionist rule. The Soviet army has been indoctrinated with revisionist ideology and revolutionary elements within have been purged. Fascist laws and decrees such as the “regulations on the work of people’s control,” “law on the basic principles

of the corrective-labor legislation” and “regulations on preliminary detention” have proliferated. The police and spies have greatly increased in number and have run berserk. The army, the police, the prisons and courts are relentlessly used to enforce the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie against the Soviet people. Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, social-fascism, social-militarism and Great-Russian chauvinism have become even more vicious than during the time of Khrushchov.

Pomeroy actually equates “democracy” with bureaucratism and pictures it as a “guided process” “through channels” designed by the revisionist renegade clique. The revolutionary mass movement is anathema to him. Thus, he states: “The overcoming of Stalinism and the expansion of democracy have been astonishing. The implication of the present economic reform, with its predicted effects on bureaucratic tendencies, is that it will lead to extensive changes. Such processes have not been reflected in mass struggles among the Soviet people.” Pomeroy admits that the anti-Stalin campaign of vilification and the “economic reform” have never been reflected in mass struggles but merely imposed on the masses.

Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, Soviet social-imperialism has fully emerged to invade the territory of other countries and abuse other peoples. It has exacerbated its new tsarist and colonial rule over a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People’s Republic. It has invaded Czechoslovakia and abused the people there. It cannot tolerate the slightest difference of opinion with the leadership of other revisionist countries and is wont to using the Warsaw Pact and the COMECON¹⁵ to threaten and blackmail other countries. Also, it has not relented in its efforts to sabotage and subvert the People’s Republic of Albania. It has repeatedly made aggressive incursions on Chinese territory and has tried to outdo the old tsars. In various other parts of the world, especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America, it has always tried to collude with or outbid US imperialism in exploiting and oppressing the people.

II. On the all-round restoration of capitalism

The great Lenin said: “Politics cannot but have precedence over economics. To argue differently means forgetting the ABC of Marxism.” And Chairman Mao reiterates this Marxist-Leninist view: “Ideology and politics are the commander, the soul of everything. Economic and technical work are bound to go wrong if we in the least slacken our ideological and political work.” In a socialist society,

therefore, all proletarian revolutionaries are duty-bound to follow his teaching: “Grasp revolution, promote production.”

It is utterly wrong to make production take the place of revolution or put the former in command of the latter. Thus, it is a desecration for Pomeroy and his Soviet revisionist masters to “celebrate” the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution in the following spirit: “There are red banners and mass demonstrations on occasion, but mainly for the holiday; they are not for making demands but for celebrating progress measured in the organizational report, the statistical table, the computer. ... Today’s revolution goes on in the workshop and laboratory.” This is bourgeois philistinism, pure and simple!

It is in this spirit that Pomeroy claims the Soviet Union to be the “most advanced socialist country” and to be “on a level higher, more complex and further developed than those reached by its brothers of the new society.” What he considers as the “greatest significance” of the 50th year of the Soviet Union is that “a new communist society of abundance for all is on the immediate program of the present generation” and that “industry is now gearing itself to pour out the abundance that can satisfy the increasingly sophisticated wants and desires of the people.” All because of “new techniques,” he boasts that there is already “superabundance” in the Soviet Union. He prates: What typically troubles people in the Soviet Union now is not where to find the next pound of potatoes but where to find the newest model television, while the line for trousers is in the process of being replaced by the waiting list for an automobile. But is this the truth?

Within his own book Pomeroy fails to be consistent with his lies and slaps his own face repeatedly. He reports that in his land of “superabundance” he saw several street beggars and these are not supposed to shake his faith in the socialist label tacked by his Soviet revisionist masters on their system. While he argues for the putting of principal stress on private ownership of cars as a material incentive, he reports that the public transport system is gravely inadequate and inefficient throughout the Soviet Union. While he argues for putting principal stress on private ownership of flats and villas as material incentive, he reports that there are long waiting lists for accommodation in public tenements, that residents in overcrowded tenements are grouchy, that there are those who collect high rent privately and that black marketing of construction materials is spawned by private construction. While he argues for the expansion of private plots and personal subsidiary husbandry, he cites

specific data proving that these have been attended to at the expense of the collective farms. While he boasts that there has been no shortage in basic commodities such as potatoes and trousers, he reports that Khrushchov was cast away by his successors on account of agricultural shortages that included potato and cotton. He also testifies that there are long queues and bitter wranglings over scarce goods at department stores in such show window cities as Moscow and Leningrad.

There is certainly no superabundance for the Soviet People. Those who enjoy the “superabundance” touted by Pomeroy belong to the privileged bourgeois stratum. They are the “managers,” “experts” and “professionals” who plunder the social wealth of the Soviet Union. They have high incomes that are ten, a hundred or even a thousand times more than the income of the average worker. As Pomeroy himself confesses, they are the ones who can afford to buy the automobiles manufactured by Fiat and Renault and also to buy their own flats so that they can be saved from the “inconveniences” suffered by the masses.

Under the present circumstances in the Soviet Union, it is simply preposterous for Pomeroy and his revisionist masters to peddle the hope that within ten years (1967-77) passenger transport will be free and rent will no longer be collected. Big promises are made by the Brezhnev revisionist clique obviously in order to blame failure later on their signboard of socialism and further justify the brazen restoration of capitalism. Khrushchov in his own time made big promises about “building the material and technical foundation of communism.” When he failed to fulfil these promises, his successors went on to accelerate the restoration of capitalism in the style of further drinking poison to quench thirst.

Let us sample the rotten and selfish bourgeois arguments of Pomeroy. Regarding the private ownership of cars: “anyone who has been embedded in the rush-hour Moscow metro crowds can appreciate the urge to buy a car on the part of a commuting resident in a remote district.” Regarding the private ownership of flats: “One of the advantages in owning a flat is that it can be remodeled or partitioned to the owner’s liking, whereas in government housing permission for this must be obtained from the authorities. The greatest impulse in buying a lot, however, is that new living space can be obtained faster in this way; normally people wait for a long period on a list for new public housing.” Is it not clear that the privileged Soviet bourgeois stratum lives it up at the expense of the Soviet people?

The “increasingly sophisticated wants and desires” of the privileged bourgeois stratum, as Pomeroy himself picturesquely describes them, include the adoption of the miniskirt, the imitation of American jazz in the youth cafés and the approximation of the latest styles and colors in London and New York by the House of Modes in Moscow. Of course, these quiddities of the West are mere indicators of the gross luxury and decadence that characterize the high living enjoyed by the privileged bourgeois stratum. Pomeroy calls these “progress.”

In an attempt to distort the Marxist-Leninist criticism that the Privileged Soviet bourgeois stratum exploits the Soviet working people, Pomeroy claims that it is the “increase in living standards and in material well-being” that is being “denigrated” as capitalism by Marxist-Leninists. Childishly, he tries to counter Chairman Mao’s criticism of the restoration of capitalism by referring to the fact that he ate sumptuous food at the residence of a friend of his who obviously belongs to the privileged bourgeois stratum. The profits of capitalism are, indeed, enjoyed by this privileged bourgeois stratum. The Soviet masses, on the other hand, suffer increasing impoverishment, unemployment, rising prices, shortages of supplies, shoddy goods and the like.

What the Soviet modern revisionists mean by “merging personal interest and public interest” is all too clear. It is the imposition of the personal interests of a few, the privileged bourgeois stratum, on the interest of the people.

Pomeroy actually makes a brazen attack on Marxism-Leninism, particularly dialectical materialism, when he pontificates: “The contrasting of personal and social interests, attempts to treat the personal interest as something incompatible with the ideals of the revolution, all this is opposed to the principles of socialism.” There is a contradiction between self-interest and public interest. To deny this contradiction is to cover up self-interest and push modern revisionism forward.

Thus, it is important to always remember that as we serve the people, we must fight self and repudiate revisionism. True Communists are unselfish and their concern is always to serve the people. They will always see to it that the people are first assured of their basic necessities and the general level of livelihood is constantly raised, with no wide gaps between the cadre and the average worker. Centralized planning by the proletariat is used in a socialist society essentially to see to it that the general level of well-being among the people is raised as production is raised. In the People’s Republic of China, today, the people’s

livelihood is better assured and is far better than in the Soviet Union despite the latter's claims of "technical superiority."

Let us go into the concrete meaning of a certain statement made by Brezhnev at the 23rd Congress of the CPSU: "The slow development of agriculture was due to a violation of the economic laws of production, neglect of the material incentives and of the correct combination of public and personal interests."

Khrushchov is hereby blamed by his successor for not expanding the private plots fast enough and for not developing the private economy in agriculture fast enough. In this regard, Pomeroy reports: During the premiership of Khrushchov (who has been criticized for disregard of the economic sciences) there were severe restrictions on cultivation of private plots by those belonging to collective farms. The restrictions were eliminated after the ouster of Khrushchov. Pomeroy also faults the collectivization carried out by the great proletarian founders of the first socialist state. He rails: "Backwardness" in agriculture is not wholly due to the willful neglect of economic laws. The great difficulty in the collectivization that began almost four decades ago was that the mechanization essential to the process was not sufficiently available, while the peasantry, still rooted in the age-old backwardness of smallholding cultivation, was not technologically prepared for the new system.

The modern revisionists put mechanization and technique ahead of politics and cooperation and collectivization. They adhere to the theory of "productive forces"—the theory of fostering capitalism on the pretext of waiting for machines. And yet even as they boast of a high technological level now, they rapidly revert to a kulak economy in agriculture and destroy the basis of socialist agriculture. They attack the establishment of Chinese communes in the same spirit that they have wrecked socialist agriculture in the Soviet Union. It is well to remember that there would have been no basis for rapid industrialization in China had there been no firm and consistent raising of the levels of agricultural cooperation and had there been no effective repudiation of Liu Shaoqi's own adherence to the theory of "productive forces."

Soviet modern revisionism has brought down the living standards and reduced the material well-being of the Soviet people. Disastrous economic results followed Khrushchov's treacherous act of raising to a state policy the imitation of the techniques of capitalist management in the United States. But, instead of discarding that rotten policy, the Brezhnev revisionist clique has blamed

Khrushchov only for not outdoing himself in elaborating on and implementing the capitalist techniques of management. The revisionist program of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU is a common ground for the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades. Its essence is the restoration of capitalism. That is what the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique calls “following the scientific laws of economics.” And in this regard, Pomeroy arrogantly repeats a reactionary statement from Pravda: “But the fact that a law may lead to consequences undesirable to us does not stop its being a law and a law cannot be declared ineffective, just because people ignore it.” This is a bourgeois metaphysical statement which runs counter to the Marxist-Leninist law that the people are the motive force of history. What impudence!

The Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique gets the most lavish praise from Pomeroy for making a “profound adjustment” in the Soviet economic system since 1965. This is the “new economic system,” otherwise called “economic reform” which establishes in a legal form the capitalist principle of profit for the benefit of the oligarchy of the big monopoly bureaucrats and the privileged bourgeois stratum, all at the expense of the Soviet working people. Its new feature is supposed to be the provision of material incentives, such as bonuses and other pay increases, for profitable management in an enterprise. It dictates the practice of capitalist management in all fields of the Soviet economy and it sanctifies the bonus as a “moral stimulus.” It involves the complete disruption of the socialist relations of production and the thorough breaking up of the socialist economic base. The socialist economic system of unified economic planning by the state is abolished in favor of the anarchy of enterprises and farms operated on the basis of profit-seeking.

In this regard, Pomeroy gloats: “Planning and distribution in the previous condition of scarcity is not the same as planning and distribution in a growing condition of abundance.” He blathers: “It is at the level of the industrial enterprise that material incentives are being given their greatest emphasis. Hard economic facts have shown that centralized planning and the quota system of production at this stage of development do not enable the fullest efficient use of plant and equipment. These aims, it is felt, can be more completely achieved by linking the personal interest of the worker with what he is producing, i.e., by tying added income to efficient and good work.”

This statement is in line with Kosygin’s statement in 1965: “The present-day scientific and technical revolution advances to the fore such problems as

technical standards, quality, reliability of goods and their effective use. It is precisely these factors that are today the focus of peaceful economic competition between socialist and capitalist countries.”

Pomeroy gives the following as “the two main steps that comprise the heart of economic reform”: “giving of a much greater degree of responsibility to the individual enterprise for planning, for production, for the introduction of new technology, for the accumulation and use of profits, and for arranging the sale of its products;” and “greater emphasis on material incentives for workers in order to increase their efficiency and their output.”

“Much greater degree of responsibility to the individual enterprises” actually means further disintegrating and fragmenting the Soviet economy and reinforcing the overlord position of bourgeois managers and directors in individual enterprises. “Greater emphasis on material incentives for workers” actually means allowing the bourgeois managers and directors to treat the workers as wage slaves and get for themselves the profits of the enterprises. Pomeroy himself observes: The expansion of the enterprises’ rights and the strengthening of economic stimulation can give rise to parochial tendencies, to setting the interests of the enterprise against the interests of society, and even to money-grubbing.... Pomeroy also quotes Soviet “expert” Oleg Yun, who states: The new system of industrial management and planning substantially extends the right of factory managers ... in the sphere of planning, capital construction and repairs, introduction of more advanced technology and up-to-date techniques, material and technical supplies, marketing of finished goods, finance, labor and wages, etc. The “new economic system” gives the enterprises the authority to “own, use and dispose of” all property; to sell “surplus” equipment, means of transport, raw materials, materials and fuel; to let the premises, warehouses, equipment and means of transport which are “temporarily not in use;” to use “funds at their disposal” for capital construction that is “outside the plan.” There is a wide ground for nefarious manipulation of assets. Managers even sell for profit such means of production as machine tools, hoists, generators, locomotives and seamless tubes which are supposed to be state property. Soviet enterprises make profits on each other. Means of production and raw materials are also finding their way into private enterprises.

The managers are given the power to fix or change the wages, grades and bonuses for the workers and staff, to recruit or lay off workers and mete out punishment to them, and to decide at will the structure and personnel of the

enterprises. The ensuing result is the emergence of a grave problem of unemployment in the Soviet Union. Unemployment has developed on a large scale for two reasons: an enterprise goes bankrupt and is dissolved or workers are laid off or classified as apprentices to allow the managers and directors to claim bigger profits for themselves. In short, the enterprises of socialist ownership have been turned into capitalist undertakings by the privileged bourgeois stratum, and broad sections of working people in industry and agriculture have been turned into wage slaves who have to sell their labor power. In the face of the grave problem of unemployment in the Soviet Union, Pomeroy can only shamelessly make the false claim that there is even labor shortage there.

Class polarization has been aggravated as a result of the “economic reform.” The leaders of industrial enterprises, “state farms” and commercial establishments draw high pay and bonuses which are scandalously several times more than those of the workers; enjoy high allowances and other special privileges; and indulge in unlawful practices such as manipulation of accounts, speculation, black marketing and underground enterprises. They grossly abuse their power, and exploit and oppress the working people.

The enterprises are willing to produce only what they individually deem to be profitable, thus causing economic dislocation and gross disproportion in the overall development of the economy and shortages in basic commodities, raw materials and spare parts. Enterprises engaged in the same line of production compete with each other. To exact high profits, they keep on raising prices. They also raise profits covertly by using inferior materials, thus turning out goods of very poor quality.

Though there is anarchy in the relationship of Soviet enterprises due to capitalist competition, there is inevitably the trend towards accumulation and concentration. Small and weak enterprises are drawn by big and strong enterprises into large-scale amalgamations in order to bring the principle of profit into full play and give maximum profits to the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie. The amalgamations become independent business accounting units and become real monopolies. The “new economic system” harps on the autonomy of individual business enterprises only because it aims to destroy the principle of unified socialist planning and build up the kind of centralization demanded by state monopoly capitalism. An example of a huge monopoly enterprise in the Soviet Union today is the Ministry of Investments and Automation Tools, an independent business accounting ministry.

“Economic reform” in the countryside has brought about a private economy—a kulak economy. Socialist restrictions on private plots and private livestock have been removed. Pomeroy himself unwittingly provides us some 1966 data (though these are watered down, they are still very revealing), which show the anti-socialist course in agriculture. According to him “personal subsidiary husbandry” involved only “three percent” of the country’s cultivated land yet it accounted for about “17 percent” of the national agricultural production. Within this total figure are: 60 percent of the national potato crop, 40 percent of the national crop of green vegetables, 40 percent of the national production of dressed meat, 39 percent of the national milk production and 68 percent of the national egg production. With his twisted anti-socialist logic, Pomeroy argues that the private plots and private livestock should be enlarged because they have produced so much. This is supposed to be in compliance with the “scientific laws of economics.” He completely disregards the fact that the collective and state farms have been neglected in favor of the private plots.

Every household is ordinarily allowed a private plot of one-half hectare and to own cattle and other livestock. Collective farms are allowed to provide machinery to individual members to till their private plots, transport facilities to market their products, pastures for their private livestock and loans for purchasing more livestock. While it appears that the private tillers and owners of livestock stand to gain much, they are eventually manipulated by a few private merchants in the course of free competition. The leaders of state and collective farms easily assure themselves of the status of kulaks and merchants by allotting larger private plots to themselves, employing hired laborers to till them and resorting to every trick within their power.

Going farther, the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique has turned over state and collective farms to “field teams” composed of only one to three households which arrange production independently, employ hired laborers and do their own accounting. Nationalized lands have also been distributed to “teams” for long-term lease and private cultivation. Those state and collective farms which still formally present themselves as such have been completely put on a capitalist basis. The leaders of these farms have a free hand in production, marketing, competition, hiring of laborers and appropriating profits for themselves. As the state demands an ever increasing quota of produce (especially grain) to be sold to itself, the leaders always manage to pass on the burden to the peasant masses and farm workers.

To support what actually amount to private ownership of agricultural land, the Soviet revisionist renegades have lifted all restrictions on the prices of agricultural produce and livestock products in the free markets. Capitalist free markets have been created on a large scale and free competition operates rampantly to the satisfaction of big private merchants. Large free markets with modern facilities and hotels for private merchants have been constructed at huge costs. Industrial products and even means of production are also peddled in these free markets. Agricultural and industrial commodities not available in the “state stores” could be bought at the free markets at high prices. Commodities produced by underground factories are also sold here. The “state stores” have also turned to profit-seeking and free competition. A state of confusion reigns in the entire commercial sector at the expense of the people.

To build “communism,” the soviet revisionist renegades have turned to seeking aid from foreign monopoly groups. Brezhnev has turned into reality Khrushchov’s wish “to accept credits from the devil himself.” It has gotten loans from American, French, Italian and Japanese monopoly capitalist combines. It has begged for loans from West Germany by bartering away the sovereign interests of the German Democratic Republic. It has invited Japan into Siberia and has sold out Soviet natural resources in the process. It is shockingly shameless for a country that claims to be “socialist” to beg for loans from entities defeated during World War II. According to Pomeroy himself, the Soviet Union puts “considerable emphasis” on the importation of consumer goods from the imperialist countries despite its claims to superabundance.

On the basis of the all-round restoration of capitalism, the Soviet Union has become social-imperialist, exploiting and reducing a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People’s Republic into its colonies. These colonies have been turned by Soviet social-imperialism into orchards, subsidiary processing shops, sources of raw materials, fields of investment and dumping ground for Soviet industrial products. Brezhnev has aggravated Khrushchov’s policy of “international division of labor” which dictates to the members of the COMECON to serve the needs of Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalism.

The claws of Soviet social-imperialism have also extended far into other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It pretends to extend long-term loans at a nominal interest rate of two-and-a-half percent. But in fact it delivers shoddy goods that are overpriced. Soviet social-imperialism is also a big munitions merchant, which arbitrarily prices the arms and ammunition it sells to

various countries and thereby extracts huge profits. To India and the United Arab Republic, it delivers weapons of better quality than those it has delivered to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam simply because these countries pay hard currency or pay in kind with local commodities that are greatly underpriced.

In line with its social-imperialist and social-fascist character, the Soviet Union has steadily engaged in social-militarism. Its economic activity is more and more geared to arms expansion and war preparations. It would rather produce guns than butter. The 1970 military budget of the Soviet Union is 100 percent higher than its 1966 military budget. Though the income of the Soviet people is only 60 percent of the income of the American people, the Soviet Union spends annually for its war machine an amount comparable to the annual US military expenditures.

The overall economic situation in the Soviet Union was bad enough in 1967, when Pomeroy wrote his book. But it has become even worse in succeeding years as a result of the “new economic system” or “economic reform” pushed by the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique. Under the leadership of Stalin, Soviet industry used to develop at a high speed. Taking for example the 1950-53 period, the average annual rate of growth of Soviet industry stood at 16 percent. But this dropped to 9.6 percent during the nine years following the 20th congress of the CPSU in 1956 under Khrushchov. This further dropped to 8.5 percent during the five years since Brezhnev assumed power in 1965. Despite the boastful claims of Pomeroy and his Soviet revisionist masters about the “higher level of techniques” today, the growth rates of labor productivity have consistently gone down in the Soviet Union.

The shortage of industrial products has become more and more acute because of the disproportionate development of production in various branches. The Soviet revisionist renegades admit that the variety of steel products in 1970 could meet only half of the actual needs and that many departments in need of steel products could not get them. Great difficulties also attended the supply of fuel for public utilities and domestic use. Nearly all the union republics suffered from a shortage of building materials and spare parts. Work came to a standstill in many factories for lack of raw materials.

Brezhnev has done worse than Khrushchov in the field of agriculture. Based on the doctored statistics officially released by the revisionist renegades themselves, the per capita grain output in the Soviet Union in the 1965-69 period was 16

kilograms less than that in 1964, the year of Khrushchov's downfall; the per capita output of potatoes, vegetables, etc. seriously fell. The situation in animal husbandry was even worse. The per capita head of oxen, pigs and sheep went down sharply at the end of 1969 as compared with that at the end of 1915. Without enough supply of vegetables and beef, Brezhnev certainly cannot make "goulash" communism as Khrushchov before him could not.

The 1966-70 "five-year economic plan" of the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique fell far below its already low targets. Instead of raising the living standards of the people, it has merely raised their costs of living. Basic commodities, including bread, salt and matchsticks, are in short supply, of poor quality and are highly priced in the Soviet Union. It is absolutely foolish for Pomeroy to imagine "superabundance" or hope for it with the use of capitalist methods by his Soviet revisionist masters. The Soviet working people are suffering heavily; and the root of their suffering is the all-round restoration of capitalism by the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades.

III. On the question of the superstructure

Chairman Mao Zedong is the Lenin of the present era. He has inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism with genius, creatively and comprehensively, and has brought it to a higher and completely new stage of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. To him we owe the invincible ideological weapon for advancing towards the total collapse of imperialism and the worldwide victory of socialism.

With the rise of modern revisionism and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the imperialists and their running dogs were gleeful and congratulated themselves for their view that a dictatorship of the proletariat can be peacefully eroded through a number of generations. But Chairman Mao has come forward to provide the key to solving the problem of capitalist restoration in a socialist society after analyzing and summing up the historical experience of socialist countries. He has put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and has successfully put it into practice through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a great revolutionary mass movement under the leadership of the proletariat for seizing the superstructure

and making it conform to the socialist economic base. It has resulted in the overthrow of Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road, consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and tempered the People's Republic of China to become the strongest bulwark of socialism today. In the process of this unprecedented epoch-making revolution, successors of the revolution have come forward to frustrate the hopes of the imperialists and the social-imperialists to restore capitalism in China.

For all these reasons, the Soviet revisionist renegades and their hack Pomeroy hate Chairman Mao and everything that he stands for. Thus, Pomeroy describes the Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution as “based on an effort to build socialism and communism on ‘a very low level’.” They describe modern revisionism, the restoration of capitalism and putting material incentives in command of everything as being “on a higher level.”

Pomeroy further tries to misrepresent the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution: “The occurrence, during the proletarian cultural revolution, of indiscriminately rejecting and even destroying the literature, art and other cultural forms of the past, caused one of the most disturbed reactions among the Soviet people I met, who ascribed the behavior to extreme nationalism. It was generally asserted to me that the Red guards, who carried this out had seriously damaged the image of socialism and of communist behavior in the eyes of the world.”

The main current and outcome of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution were excellent. The ghosts and monsters were swept away from positions of dominance in the superstructure. But in the main there was no “indiscriminate rejection and destruction” of the literature, art and cultural forms of the past. Traditional and foreign forms that can serve the present revolutionary needs of China and the proletariat were given correct revolutionary content, as splendidly evident in the literary and art models that emerged in the course of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Even those things of the past that are definitely not proletarian in character were preserved in their isolated places to serve as negative examples. With regard to the Red Guards, they constitute a great mass movement that has heightened the revolutionary spirit of serving the people among the youth, that has tempered the youth in revolutionary struggles under the leadership of the proletariat and that has trained hundreds of millions of youth as successors in the revolution. The imperialists and social-imperialists have been most disappointed with the Red Guards because their emergence has served to explode the sinister hope that modern revisionism would take over

China as it has the Soviet Union upon the coming of the “third or fourth generation.”

As fools who never discard their wornout tricks, the Soviet revisionist renegades wish through Pomeroy to discredit Chairman Mao and everything that he stands for in the same manner that they have tried to discredit the Great Marxist-Leninist Comrade Stalin. They harp on what they call the “personality cult” and “the harmful effects of Stalinism.”

The revisionist renegades are as absurd as “mayflies plotting to topple a giant tree” as they try to picture the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as a mere expression of “nationalist outlook.” This theory encompasses the new democratic revolution and socialist revolution and guarantees the transition of socialism to communism. In taking the great contributions of Chairman Mao to the stage of Leninism alone, no genuine revolutionary would ever fail to give him due respect as a great leader of the world proletariat.

Much as he would want to present in his book a culture “on a higher level” in the present system dominated by the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalists, Pomeroy merely succeeds in presenting a degenerate bourgeois culture whose best claims in Pomeroy’s own terms are to “liberalism,” “Western influence,” and even to “mysticism.” He misrepresents this as the fruit of a “50-year cultural revolution.” Thus, he slanders the October Revolution even as he pretends to commemorate it with his book.

He is extremely happy to observe that “the trend to liberalism has been set” and hails the Pravda editorial (January 27, 1967) “indicating that the forces for liberalization were gradually prevailing.” Swaggering with his bourgeois ideology, he raves: “An emotional, or romantic, acceptance of Marxism ... had contributed to the blindness that had enabled the phenomenon of Stalinism to go uncorrected for so long.” Here it is clear that the “anti-Stalinism” of the Soviet revisionist renegades is actually a pretext for their anti-Marxism and anti-Leninism.

These anti-communist scoundrels often pretend to honor Lenin and to invoke his name. But as Lenin once said: It has always been the case in history that after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular among the oppressed classes, their enemies have attempted to appropriate their names so as to deceive the

oppressed classes. In essence, the revisionist renegades use Lenin's name only to attack Lenin and refer to Leninism only to attack Leninism.

Pomeroy refers to such bourgeois degenerates as Boris Pasternak, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, Anatoly Zhigulin, Bulat Okujave, Andrei Voznesensky and the like as the cream of Soviet literature in what he calls a "50-year cultural revolution."¹⁶ He considers as their principal qualification their being "anti-Stalinist." And he trumpets at the same time the theory of literature for literature's sake. He raves: "He who is ready to criticize must also be ready for the give and take of the process, although it should be expected that criticism of literature be kept within the literary framework."

"Criticism of literature within the literary framework" denies the political character of every literary work. Chairman Mao teaches us: "In the world today all culture, all literature and art belong to definite classes and are geared to definite political lines. There is no such thing as art for art's sake, art that stands above classes, art that is detached from or independent of politics. Proletarian literature and art are part of the whole proletarian revolutionary cause; they are, as Lenin said, cogs and wheels in the whole revolutionary machine."

Pomeroy pays the highest tribute to Andrei Voznesensky whom he touts as "the best poet to emerge from the current literary ferment." He reports that they agreed in their talk that the 20th Congress "had contributed to a great release of expression." The revisionist scoundrel Pomeroy at the same time endorses what Voznesensky calls a "resurgence of the age-old mysticism in the Russian soul that is found in much of our literature."

He is glad that the Sinyavsky-Daniel case has become a rallying point within the Soviet Writers' Union for further "liberalization." He considers as "conservative" the lip service given by Brezhnev to the "principle of partisanship in art and literature and the class approach in assessing all matters in the cultural field."

Twisting Lenin's statement that "Marxism is an example of how communism arose out of the sum total of human knowledge," Pomeroy seeks to equate it with Brezhnev's statement that "the tasks of the Komsomol is to help the younger generation ... to enrich their memory with the knowledge of all the values created by mankind." And in this regard, he praises the revisionist elements among the Soviet youth for having "never a contradiction to what the

young people loved in their own.” In whom are they interested most in Western literature? Hemingway, Salinger, John Updike, Kafka, Beckett and Ionesco! Pomeroy tries to pass off bourgeois cosmopolitanism for proletarian internationalism.

He is happy to report that Shelley and Byron are being quoted and interpreted “solely in the light of being defenders of the British working class” in Soviet secondary schools. He approves of Hemingway as the favorite author of the revisionist elements among the Soviet youth and lauds this bourgeois defeatist author for “the courage of his heroes, his preoccupation with good and noble impulses in people” and “the moral tone of his distinctions.”

He also approves of John Steinbeck as another “favorite author.” He praises John Steinbeck’s *Grapes of Wrath* and *Winter of Our Discontent* for “preaching protest against violence.” A true Marxist-Leninist can easily see the essence of Steinbeck as bourgeois literary pessimist, at most interested in exposure but terrified by revolutionary violence. There is no surprise at all that this anti-communist scoundrel today rabidly supports the US war of aggression in Vietnam. One who is against revolutionary violence easily turns into one supporting counterrevolutionary violence.

By way of countering any argument that Soviet revisionist intellectuals are too much engrossed in Western bourgeois literature, Pomeroy makes a defense that merely exposes further the counterrevolutionary character of his Soviet revisionist colleagues as well as his own. He states: A fierce respect for the great figures of Russian literature and art is to be found among the Soviet intellectuals, and this is in a sense one of the best defenses against Western subversion. Pushkin, Tolstoy, Gogol, Chekhov, even Dostoevsky, are turned to for cultural sustenance.

Pomeroy completely neglects to pay even lip service to the great proletarian revolutionary writer, Maxim Gorky. It is condemnable that he and his fellow revisionist renegades can turn for succor and sustenance only to bourgeois-feudal masters of art and literature. These anti-Marxists and anti-Leninist find nothing noteworthy or praiseworthy about the cultural achievements of the Soviet proletariat. They can only appreciate those things in the superstructure that denigrate the dictatorship of the proletariat and that support the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. Thus, such bourgeois degenerates as Ilya Ehrenburg and Mikhail Sholokhov have officially become literary favorites of

the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades as well as of US imperialism.

Though at certain points Pomeroy seems to deny that the Soviet revisionist renegades are under the heavy influence of Western bourgeois culture, he cannot avoid citing even the grossest manifestations of such influence, as the black marketing youth who asks him if he has foreign goods to sell or the youth who shows interest in dope. He is glad that what he regards as the cream of the Soviet youth, in fancy Western-style getup, twist to the tune of American jazz in the Kremlin Palace of Congress. He raves: The best Soviet jazz orchestras, like the Jazz '64 and the Jazz '65 groups, are superb musicians who have distilled the very best in Western jazz and are applying it to Russian folk strains. He states: "Young people see their interest in such cultural aspects as being in line with their internationalism, and not as an anti-Soviet attitude. They feel that any restrictions on such interests are a departure from the internationalism their organizations advocate."

Modern revisionism has arisen in the Soviet Union as a result of the failure to seize the superstructure from the bourgeoisie and also as a result of vigorous attempts of imperialism to push in its ideological influence. Because culture is the concentrated expression or reflection of politics and economics, Soviet culture—as Pomeroy himself reports and praises—is a testimony to the all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

It is clear that before the all-round restoration of capitalism the counterrevolutionaries bred their ranks within the superstructure. They did not immediately seize political power by force of arms or openly privatize the socialized means of production. What they did was to sneak into the Party, the government, the army and various spheres of culture and gradually turn these into their instruments. Concentrating on ideological work, they worked from within until conditions were ripe. In this regard, Chairman Mao has pointed out: "To overthrow a political power, it is always necessary first of all to create public opinion, to do work in the ideological sphere. This is true for the revolutionary class as well as for the counterrevolutionary class."

Regarding the question of struggle in the superstructure in a socialist society, Chairman Mao has pointed out: "We have won basic victory in transforming the ownership of the means of production, but we have not yet won complete victory on the political and ideological fronts. In the ideological field, the question of who will win in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has not

been really settled yet. We still have to wage a protracted struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology. It is wrong not to understand this and to give up ideological struggle. All erroneous ideas, all poisonous weeds, all ghosts and monsters, must be subjected to criticism; in no circumstance should they be allowed to spread unchecked. It will take a fairly long period of time to decide the issue in the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism. The reason is that the influence of the bourgeoisie and of the intellectuals who come from the old society will remain in our country for a long time to come, and so will their class ideology. If this is not sufficiently understood, or is not understood at all, the gravest mistakes will be made and the necessity of waging the struggle in the ideological field will be ignored.”

IV. On “peaceful coexistence” and social-imperialism

From Khrushchov to Brezhnev, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has reflected the all-round restoration of capitalism. Though the Soviet revisionist rulers pay lip service to proletarian internationalism, they actually betray the interests of the world proletariat and all oppressed peoples for the benefit of the international bourgeoisie, particularly of the Soviet monopoly bourgeoisie. Since the 1960s, a full-blown Soviet social-imperialism (with state monopoly capitalism as its base) has joined US imperialism to become one of the two main enemies of the world proletarian revolution. It has become the principal accomplice of US imperialism in counterrevolution and has always tried to outdo US imperialism in counterrevolution.

The anti-Stalin campaign launched by Khrushchov formally marked the inception of a bourgeois foreign policy by the Soviet Union. In itself the campaign had the motive and effect of causing a serious disruption and split within the international communist movement. Under the banner of anti-Stalinism, the modern revisionist and right opportunists crept out of their holes in all communist parties and in socialist states and acted to seize control over these, succeeding in quite a lot of cases. The sudden complete negation of Comrade Stalin constituted a surprise attack on the international communist movement, which had always held him in high esteem as a great leader and teacher of the Soviet people and world proletariat. Refusing to be taken in by the anti-communist stand taken by Khrushchov, the Chinese Communist Party, the Albanian Party of Labour and other Marxist-Leninist parties stood their ground.

Putting forward the line of “peaceful transition” and the “parliamentary road,”

the 20th congress of the CPSU opposed the Marxist-Leninist theory on the state and revolution. The Soviet betrayers of Lenin and Stalin loudly proclaimed that the transition from capitalism to socialism had become peaceful and the aggressive nature of US imperialism was already changing and becoming tractable; and that communist parties in countries dominated by reactionary regimes could get to power through elections and the parliamentary road. The historical experience and lessons of the world proletariat were covered up by the modern revisionists. The old merger party of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party for one was taken in by the revisionist line through the instrumentality of the Lava revisionist renegades who promptly heeded the call for betrayal made by Khrushchov.

Absolutely contradicting the principle of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet revisionist renegades gave way on matters of principle to the US imperialists. A short while before his visit to Eisenhower in 1959, Khrushchov arbitrarily tore up the Chinese-Soviet agreement on nuclear cooperation and took sides with the Indian reactionaries who provoked an armed conflict with China and belligerently encroached on Chinese territory. While in the United States, he made buffoonish counterrevolutionary statements like “even capitalists can join the communist movement” and “communism is beef plus goulash.” After his US visit, he went to China and asked the Chinese leadership to accept the US “two China” policy and the US occupation of Taiwan, to release US agents and spies who had been arrested during the Korean War and to change attitude towards Eisenhower because of his supposed peaceful nature.

China rebuffed all these ridiculous demands of Khrushchov even as he resorted to economic blackmail. After completely failing to get what he wanted, he eventually tried to sabotage the Great Leap Forward and take advantage of the imperialist blockade and natural calamities that had created difficulties in China. Without prior consultations with the Chinese leaders, he ordered the sudden total withdrawal of Soviet experts in clear violation of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Aid and paid no heed to China’s demands that the cases be reconsidered and the experts be returned. But Pomeroy now wishes to depict this as “gradual withdrawal” resulting from “differences over the observance of economic laws.” He prates: “Differences over the observance of economic laws appear to have been the cause of the gradual withdrawal from China of Soviet technicians whose recommendations were ignored or overruled.”

The real cause was that Khrushchov was so maddened by the refusal of the

Chinese Communist Party to follow the revisionist line that he pounded on, his great-power chauvinist dictates, his capitulation to US imperialism and his scheme to turn China into a political and economic appendage of the Soviet Union. After the withdrawal of Soviet “aid,” the Chinese authorities discovered to the great relief of the Chinese people that the grossly-designed Soviet goods and Soviet technical services were extremely overpriced and payments in the form of Chinese products were in effect underpriced. They also discovered that the Soviet Union had relabeled and resold West German goods to China at great profit.

It is utterly ridiculous, therefore, for Pomeroy to rave that “the Chinese people would not have deprived themselves of the prime necessities, as was earlier the case of the Soviet people, to carry out economic construction, had the leaders of China conducted a policy of all-round cooperation within the framework of the socialist community.” Despite all attempts at sabotage by the Soviet revisionist renegades and their Chinese agents like Liu Xiaoji., the Great Leap Forward triumphed in the end and proved correct Chairman Mao’s line of “going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism” and of “maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts.”

What “socialist community” is Pomeroy talking about? The Soviet Union imposes fetter upon fetter on its so-called fraternal countries. Under the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, it uses its overlord position to force these countries to have their national economies serve as the markets, subsidiary workshops, orchards, vegetable gardens and ranches for the making of super profits by the Soviet revisionist renegades. Under the Warsaw Treaty Organization, it employs the most brutal methods and stations massive numbers of troops to keep other member countries under control. The “socialist community” is nothing but the colonial empire of Soviet social-imperialism.

The Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique has pursued basically Khrushchov’s foreign policy and carried it to the extreme through the most brazen acts of aggression against its colonial dependencies as well as against the People’s Republic of China. It has invaded Czechoslovakia with hundreds of thousands of foreign troops under its command and put up a puppet government at bayonet point. It has stationed several Soviet divisions in the Mongolian People’s Republic and has moved millions of troops to the Sino-Soviet borders. It has repeatedly made nuclear threats against China and has encroached upon Chinese

territory such as Zhenbao island and the Tiehlikti area. It is overstretching itself on a scale even larger than what the old tsars aspired to.

It is under the exponents and practitioners of Khrushchovism without Khrushchov that Soviet modern revisionism has emerged full-blown as social-imperialism. Lenin defined this social-imperialism as “socialism in words, imperialism in deeds, the growth of opportunism into imperialism.” Once the political power of the proletariat is usurped by a revisionist clique, a socialist state either turns into social-imperialism, as in the case of the Soviet Union, or is reduced into a dependency or colony, as in the case of Czechoslovakia, the Mongolian People’s Republic and other revisionist countries. In having state power in their hands, the modern revisionists of the Khrushchov-Brezhnev type are far more dangerous and vicious than the classical revisionists of the Kautsky-Bernstein type. These sham anti-imperialists but real imperialists of today can resort to the most brutal measures and deceptive tricks against the people.

Under the banner of social-imperialism, the Soviet revisionist renegades have laid out a number of “theories” to make the “Brezhnev doctrine.”

First, there is the theory of “limited sovereignty.” It means that the Soviet Union holds the “supreme sovereignty” which is “unlimited” while the sovereignty of other countries is “limited.” The so-called interests of socialism that are to be safeguarded are nothing but the interests of Soviet social-imperialism.

Second, the theory of “international dictatorship.” It means that the Soviet Union can engage in military intervention in or military occupation of a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People’s Republic. The Warsaw Pact is nothing but a bludgeon of Soviet social-imperialism; the signboard of “aid to a fraternal country” is raised merely to ensure a puppet government as in Czechoslovakia.

Third, the theory of “socialist community.” It means the colonial empire with the Soviet Union as the metropolitan state and the lesser revisionist countries as colonies. The metropolitan state and its colonies are supposed to be “inseparable.”

Fourth, the theory of “international division of labor.” It means that a number of countries in East Europe Asia, Africa and Latin America should specialize in “traditional export commodities” that suit the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is

supposed to expand its neocolonial spheres of influence in order to get raw materials from backward countries at great profit for itself.

Fifth, the theory that “our interests are involved.” It means that since the Soviet Union is a “superpower” it is entitled to meddle in the affairs of every other country and make bargains with the other superpower, US imperialism, against the people. The Soviet social-imperialists have repeatedly embarked on “gunboat diplomacy” under this theory.

In its relations with countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, Soviet social-imperialism has always sought to exercise political control and extort super profits through its “aid.” It pretends to extend loans at low interest rates but overprices the goods and technical services that it gives. Payment for these is made mainly in the form of raw materials which are in effect greatly underpriced. The Soviet Union also acts as a munitions merchant and sets an arbitrary price for the military material that it delivers. It is very instructive to study closely how the Soviet Union has taken advantage of India, Egypt, Indonesia and other countries.

Completely opposing the principle of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet Union has extended far more military aid to the Indian reactionaries than the United States has done. The arms supplied to India have been repeatedly used in chauvinist and expansionist acts of aggression against China and Pakistan. The Soviet Union also continues its economic and military “aid” for the Indonesian fascists who have butchered at least one million of the Indonesian people, including hundreds of thousands of Communists. Because it has more interest than the United States in the opening of the Suez Canal, it strikes bargains with US imperialism and Israeli Zionism and ceaselessly maneuvers for a “political settlement” behind the backs of the Palestinian and Arab peoples.

Pomeroy tries to create a picture of all-out support by the Soviet revisionist renegades for the Vietnamese people’s revolutionary struggle for national liberation and national salvation against US imperialism. He conveniently forgets to cite the fact that Khrushchov never wanted to support the Vietnamese revolutionary struggle. But what Pomeroy wants to impress on others now is that the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique is giving billions of rubles worth of “aid.” It needs to be pointed out that the Soviet revisionist renegades have always had the bad habit of drawing up bloated and falsified figures to deceive the Soviet people concerning “aid” to Vietnam.

The Soviet revisionist policy on Vietnam is one of sham support and real betrayal. In fact, the Soviet Union has given more “aid,” including more powerful military equipment, to certain governments. The real purpose of Soviet “aid” to Vietnam is only to be able to make use of the Vietnam War as a leverage for cheap bargains with US imperialism and as a medium for introducing intrigues among revolutionary forces. At one stage, the Soviet Union even had the temerity to demand that China allow the Soviets revisionists to have their own air corridors and military bases in China under the pretext of wanting to transport their “aid” to Vietnam. Of course, China rebuffed this demand inasmuch as Soviet “aid” to Vietnam had always passed unimpeded through China. After the rebuff, the Soviet revisionist renegades whipped up the rumor that China did not want Soviet “aid” to pass through China.

The Brezhnev revisionist renegades have repeatedly raised the slogan of “united action” and “united anti-imperialist struggle” against the US war of aggression in Vietnam. But their aim is merely to shake off their isolation from the revolutionary forces that act to isolate them for their counterrevolutionary actions and slander. If their aim were really to support Vietnam, they can always make use of bilateral agreements. But their aim is to make trouble among the revolutionary forces and to put into question the undeniable fact that China is the closest, strongest and most reliable rear not only of the Vietnamese people but also of the entire Indochinese people. As the US war of aggression has spread throughout Indochina, China has emerged as the most powerful supporter of the revolutionary struggle of the Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian peoples; and the Soviet Union as the most sham supporter, always angling for an opportunity to strike a bargain with US imperialism.

There is both collusion and contention in the relationship between Soviet social-imperialism and US imperialism. These are two “superpowers” agreed on opposing revolution, the people, China and communism. At the same time, it is in their imperialist nature to struggle for a redivision of the world. Each has its own hegemonic schemes. The only difference between them is that one covers up its imperialist nature by spouting slogans of anti-imperialism, as sufficiently manifested by Pomeroy’s own posturings.

It is important and necessary to study thoroughly Soviet social-imperialism and every attempt of the local revisionist renegades to promote modern revisionism in the Philippines. Therefore, William J. Pomeroy’s *Half a Century of Socialism*

should not pass unnoticed. Our study should sharpen our understanding of Marxism-Leninism and revolutionary politics; improve our current work and style in fighting for people's democracy; and provide us with a clear understanding of the future—socialism.

Chairman Mao has provided us with the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and has shown us in practice how to prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. An antidote to opportunism at its worst and to social-imperialism has been developed. That is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the revolutionary theory of the proletariat in the present era.

Within the Soviet Union, the revisionist renegades are doomed to failure. Chairman Mao has pointed out: "The Soviet Union was the first socialist state and the communist party of the Soviet Union was created by Lenin. Although the leadership of the Soviet party and state has now been usurped by revisionists, I would advise comrades to remain firm in the conviction that the masses of the Soviet people and of Party members and cadres are good, that they desire revolution and that revisionist rule will not last long."

Chairman Mao has also pointed out: "Working hand in glove, Soviet revisionism and US imperialism have done so many foul and evil things that the revolutionary people the world over will not let them go unpunished. The people of all countries are rising. A new historical period of struggle against US imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism has begun."

The counterrevolutionary collusion between US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism against the people, communism and China has its own limits. In the deepening crisis of world imperialism, the struggle among imperialist powers for redividing the world will intensify and hasten their own doom. Like US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism is overextending itself. As it overstretches, its crisis at home will inevitably worsen. In due time, the Soviet proletariat and people of various nationalities will rise to overthrow the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie and its entire retinue of revisionist renegades. Social-imperialism is nothing but a passing phase in the downward course of imperialism.

Chairman Mao has urged us: "People of the world, unite and oppose the war of aggression launched by any imperialism or social-imperialism, especially one in

which atom bombs are used as weapons! If such a war breaks out, the people of the world should use revolutionary war to eliminate the war of aggression, and preparations should be made right now!”

Apologia for US Imperialism

First published in Ang Bayan, Special Issue of December 15, 1971 under the title "Pomeroy's Apologia for US Imperialism."

American Neocolonialism is an attempt to confuse readers about the nature and development of US imperialism with wornout social-democratic arguments. This book is an apologia for US imperialism, particularly for the direct US colonial rule in the Philippines from 1899 to 1946. It is an incontrovertible proof of the author's role as an agent of US imperialism.

Pomeroy's thesis is that the colonial possession of the Philippines was unnecessary and unprofitable for US imperialism. In maintaining this thesis, he employs the method of jumbling sham anti-imperialist statements, wishful thinking and prevarication against historical facts to futilely impugn Lenin's theory on imperialism and whitewash the exploitation and oppression inflicted by US imperialism on the people.

Despite its title, the book does not go at length into any direct discussion of neocolonialism. As a matter of fact, it deals mainly with the beginnings of US direct colonial rule in the Philippines and with the differences of opinion in US imperialist circles regarding the Philippine colony. It is only towards the end of the book that Pomeroy leaps over to 1970 with certain generalizations derived from an empiricist and lopsided view of events at the turn of the century. He presents the Philippines as an example of a country, colonized and unprofitable for a time, and then semi-colonized to become profitable for an indefinite period of time for US imperialism.

The revisionist scoundrel observes that US imperialism has consistently fashioned "nonaggressive neocolonial techniques" which prove to be more profitable than direct colonial domination. He maliciously equates the term "neocolonialism" to Kautsky's "supra-imperialism" a "phase when wars shall cease," "a phase of the joint exploitation of the world by internationally united finance capital."

The book strains to show the background of this "neocolonialism" by tracing the

contradictions in the ranks of the US imperialists themselves: between the "aggressive expansionists" and the "reluctant expansionists" or between "military authority" and "civil authority." the purpose of the revisionist scoundrel is not to expose and oppose the counter-revolutionary dual tactics of an inherently aggressive and bloodsucking imperialist power. It is to peddle the false idea that contradictions other contradictions and that all international developments result the struggle between revolution and counter-revolution nor between aggression and counter aggression. It is to peddle the false idea that US imperialism ultimately becomes peaceful due to the "sensiblyness" of certain imperialists and that aggression and colonial rule are merely the "preferred policy" of some imperialists which is "reluctantly" adopted at certain periods.

What is deliberately slurred over is the fact that it is in the nature of US monopoly capitalism to seize colonies, spheres of influence, sources of raw materials, markets and fields of investments as much as it can. As did Kautsky, Pomeroy substitutes the question of form for the question of substance in his ridiculous posture of seeking light from the imperialists themselves, particularly from the "reluctant" and non-militarist" ones like Jacob Schurman or Andrew Carnegie. On the basis of his obscurantist presumptions, he claims: There is reason to believe that if the policy advocated by Jacob Schurman and others early in 1899 had been followed, the tragedy of a cruel war of suppression that extended over the better part of a decade might have been avoided.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "The only ones who crave war and do not want peace are certain monopoly capitalist groups in a handful of capitalist countries which depend on aggression for their profits."

The great Lenin said: "Domination, and the violence that is associated with it, such are the relationships that are typical of the "latest phase of capitalist development;" that is what inevitably had to result, and has resulted, from the formation of all-powerful economic monopolies."

"To lose sight of the aggressive and bloodsucking nature of US imperialism is to fall for its wiles. It is to deny the unremitting colonial ambitions of US imperialism during the last seven decades and the intensified imperialist wars of aggression in the present epoch when the imperialist powers do not only wrangle among themselves for economic advantage but also have to face the tidal wave of socialist and new democratic revolutions that deprive them of areas for exploitation."

Chairman Mao has pointed out: “Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again... till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law. When we say "imperialism is ferocious," we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialists will never change, that the imperialists will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, till their doom.

“Fight, fail, fight again, fail again, fight again...till their victory; that is the logic of the people, and they too will never go against this logic. This is another Marxist law. The Russian people's revolution followed this law, and so has the Chinese people's revolution.”

I. On the seizure and retention of the Philippines as a US colony

In giving the briefest possible definition of imperialism, the great Lenin called it the monopoly stage of capitalism. What he considered as most important in such a definition is on one hand that finance capital is the bank capital of a few very big monopolist banks, merged with the capital of the monopolist combines of the industrialists; and, on the other hand, that the division of the world is the transition from a colonial policy which has extended without hindrance to territory unseized by any capitalist power, to a colonial policy of monopolistic possession of the territory of the world which has been completely divided up. The development of pre-monopoly capitalism, in which free competition was predominant, reached its limits in the 1860s and 1870 after this period, the tremendous "boom" in colonial conquests began and the struggle for the territorial division of the world became necessary for the imperialist powers. Lenin pointed out: “There was inevitably ushered in the era of monopoly possession of colonies and, consequently, of particularly intense struggle for the division and redivision of the world.”

The Spanish-American War 1898 was the first imperialist war with the objective of redividing the world. The seizure of the Philippines as a colony was part and parcel of the drive of a rapidly developing imperialist power to expand its economic territory. the revisionists of Pomeroy's type peddle today the false idea that US imperialism basically does not want colonies. But Lenin pointed out a long time ago that imperialism does not shirk from seizing colonies. It is an incontrovertible fact of history that the Philippines was seized as a colony together with others by US imperialism. He said: “To the numerous "old"

motives of colonial policy, finance capital has added the struggle for the sources of raw materials, for the export of capital, for spheres of influence, i.e., for spheres for profitable deals, concessions, monopoly profits and so, economic territory in general.”

But Pomeroy denies in a roundabout way the purposes of US imperialism. he snidely describes "the contention that the home market and the home investment field within the United States were becoming saturated and that the only outlet for American products and accumulated capital lay overseas" as "one of the main arguments of the apologists for imperialist expansion." Here he contention and the monopoly-capitalists' own statement of interest. however, the two may coincide with respect to reflecting the objective reality of imperialism.

He seeks to repudiate the Marxist-Leninist contention that the capitalist crisis of overproduction has resulted in imperialist expansionism by the monopolies by simply calling it as "one of the main arguments of the apologists for imperialist expansion." he argues that US imperialism at the turn of the century could have even foregone actions that brought it out of its home grounds, especially such an action as the conquest and retention of the Philippines as a colony. he insists that the US monopolies were capable of unlimited internal expansion inasmuch as, according to him, the US home market and investment fields prospered and expanded as time passed, due to advances in technology and opening new fields of production as well as due to "structural reforms" in the capitalist system, particularly the "antitrust" measures and the use of a high tariff policy.

He blabbers: Its (US imperialism) internal market and investment field, capable of great expansion, tempered its drive into foreign markets; the use of a high tariff wall to protect that home market played a more salient role than the acquisition of colonies, colonial markets and resources. Lenin pointed out: Bourgeois scholars and publicists usually come out in defense of imperialism in a somewhat veiled form; they obscure its complete domination and its deep-going roots, strive to push specific and secondary details into the forefront and do their very best to distract attention from essentials by means of absolutely ridiculous schemes for "reform," such as police supervision of the trusts or banks, etc. Pomeroy takes after Kautsky in arguing that "reforms" took place to counteract monopoly practices and to "increase the consuming capacity of the people." What a fond apology for US imperialism!

It is instructive to recall that Pomeroy's knight in shining armor, the sham anti-

imperialist Andrew Carnegie, moved out of the Anti-Imperialist League because of his compelling interests in the US Steel Corporation, a giant trust. This trust used its accumulated capital for drawing a high rate of profit abroad, especially in colonies and semicolonies. Profit is the rule and the logic of the trusts and the imperialist state. And the US imperialists will always try to be where they can make higher profits. Advances in technology, opening new fields of production and "structural reforms: are to the imperialists more conditions for further exploiting and oppressing the people at home and abroad, than for restraining imperialist greed and violence. It is silly of Pomeroy to think otherwise.

Lenin also pointed out: "Of course, the bourgeois reformists, and among the particularly the present-day adherents of Kautsky, try to belittle the importance of facts... by arguing that raw materials "could be" obtained in the open market without a "costly and dangerous" colonial policy; and that the supply of raw materials "could be" increased enormously by "simply" improving conditions in agriculture in general. But such arguments become an apology for imperialism, an attempt to paint it in bright colors, because they ignore the principal nature of the latest stage of capitalism: monopolies."

Pomeroy minimizes the actual role of the dominant US monopolies behind the conquest and retention of the Philippines as a colony and constantly maximizes the role of domestic US agricultural interests (especially beet sugar, tobacco and dairy) in opposing the acquisition or retention of colonies. He underrates the US monopolies and overrates the domestic US agricultural interests. For instance, he easily reaches the absurd point of making the US sugar beet interests appear more powerful than the US sugar trust that was expansively interested in Philippine sugar. In the relationship between the industrial monopolies and agricultural interests in general, the latter has been subordinated to the former.

Throughout the book, Pomeroy is preoccupied with creating the illusion that the US imperialists were never totally and firmly interested in seizing and holding on to the Philippines as a colony. He believed that the "distinctive feature" of US imperialism is that it would rather not have colonies. And in this regard, he falls into a self-contradicting statement: The reason why the Philippines was retained for nearly fifty years despite the relatively early rejection of traditional colonialism in theory was the fact of continuing strength and pressure of the colonialist forces.

The root cause of Pomeroy's dilemma is his failure to relate the economics of US

imperialism to its politics. he denies the profitability of colonies and thus cannot give full account for the fact of extended colonial domination. In effect, he makes a claim that US imperialism is not what it is.

Lenin said of Kautsky: "The essence of the matter in that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy "preferred" by finance capital, and opposes to it another bourgeois policy which, he alleges, is possible on this very same basis of finance capital. It follows then, that monopolies in economics are compatible with nonmonopolistic, nonviolent, nonannexationist methods in politics. It follows then that the territorial division of the world, which was completed precisely during the epoch of finance capital, and which constitutes the basis of the present peculiar forms of rivalry between the biggest capitalist states, is compatible with a nonimperialist policy. The result is a slurring over and a blunting of the most profound contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism, instead of an exposure of their depth; the result is reformism instead of Marxism."

By sheer prevarication, Pomeroy praises US imperialism for having risen to be the No. 1 imperialist power through two interimperialist wars "with only a minimum of participation in outright seizure of colonies" and for "escaping entangling alliances in Europe and Asia." He even states emphatically: The issue of the American colonial system was settled, and the continuation of the Philippine colony during that time (1916) was an anachronism in American imperialist policy. In the opinion of many, the 30 years¹ between the passage of the Jones Act and the final grant of independence was an unnecessary period of delay.

Pomeroy deliberately obscures the fact that US capitalism relieved itself of the crisis of overproduction during the early decades of the twentieth century through its expansionist activities. In the familiar fashion of imperialist apologists, he minimizes total US investments abroad then as having been no more than one-tenth of US gross national product. to rub in the lie that US imperialism was never so dependent on its overseas investments and trade, he compares these to those of British imperialism at its peak on 1914 when a quarter of its health was in foreign investments and its foreign trade approximated a quarter of its gross national product.

To minimize the imperialist role of the United States in Asia, he states that the US monopolies had far more trade and investments in Europe, Canada, and Latin

America. Finally coming to the Philippines, he dismisses US trade and investments here as nothing but a minor part (about thirty percent) of those in the whole of Asia, with Japan alone absorbing half of the total.

The twisted logic behind Pomeroy's statistical references in that since US trade and investments in the Philippines comprised a small and "negligible" part of far bigger international totals it followed that US monopolies were not so much of imperialists in the Philippines. Pomeroy is like the landlord who believes that the more tenants he exploits the less he exploits each tenant and that the more methods of exploitation he employs the less exploitative does each method become.

It is foolish to belittle US trade and investments in the Philippines by stating that US imperialism did more "colonizing" in Europe. such sophistry can only be worthy of a dolt. Within the Philippines, US imperialism raked in superposition in trade and investments and thoroughly subjected the Filipino people to colonial domination. With regard to US investments in Europe, it is relevant to recall the words of Lenin: "...1) the fact that the world is already divided up obliges those contemplating a redivision to reach out for every kind of territory, and 2) an essential feature of imperialism is the rivalry between several great powers in striving for hegemony, i.e., for the conquest of territory, not so much directly for themselves as to weaken the adversary and undermine his hegemony. Lenin warned against the empiricist method of studying imperialism: Simply to compare colonies with noncolonies, one imperialism with another imperialism, one semicolon or colony with all other countries, is to evade and to obscure the very essence of the question.

World War I and World War II were all preceded by rapacious maneuverings of the imperialist powers to get into each other's homegrounds, aside from wrangling over their respective colonial and semicolonial areas of exploitation and oppression. the two world wars occurred to redivide the world by force of arms precisely because the imperialist powers could not settle their differences through peaceful methods. As an integral part of world capitalism, US imperialism always became involved in these areas. After each war, the division of economic territory changed with US imperialism consistently expanding its own economic territory.

Lenin said: "The epoch of the latest stage of capitalism shows us that certain relations between capitalist combines grow up, based on the economic division

of the world; while parallel to and in connection with it, certain relations grow up between political combines, between states, on the basis of the territorial division of the world, of the struggle for colonies, of the "struggle for economic territory."

The Philippines had been seized by the United States in order to turn the Pacific Ocean into an "American lake" and to have a base for its latecomer "open-door" policy on China, a policy of trying to have a share of a vast economic territory to which other imperialist powers had prior claims.¹ But Pomeroy denies the strategic value of the Philippines in the US imperialist scheme; he goes as far as to say that the colonial possession of the Philippines was more of a liability than an asset in Asia for US imperialism. he calls it an "aggravation" of a policy of "weakness." he considers the "open-door policy" a policy of "weakness" rather than a convenient shibboleth for a rising imperialist power in its vigorous attempt to cut into China and Asia in general.

Pomeroy depicts US imperialism as much frustrated weakling that could easily be bullied by Japan even during the first two decades of the twentieth century. He completely obscures the close alliance of British and US imperialism in Asia and the fact that Japan was a debtor-nation to the United States. it was with the indulgence of US and British imperialism that Japan seized Korea and spheres of influence in China. But Pomeroy insists that even as early as 1916 US imperialism was already so terrified by the Japanese victory over the Russians in 1905 and also by the Japanese seizure of all the special privileges of Germany in China during World War I that it was eager to withdraw from its Philippine colony or maintain "unprovocative" presence there. In the entire book, Pomeroy actually gives more weight to the pressure of Japan on the United States than to the unceasing demands of the Filipino people for independence as a factor for compelling the United States to pledge sham independence for the Philippines.

He states: "As usual, the display of power by Japan had its effect on American attitudes towards the Philippines. It undoubtedly hastened the moves to make a promise of independence to the Philippines, on grounds that it showed nonaggressive intent by the United States in Asia, thus removing an excuse for Japan to adopt any hostile posture towards US presence in the Philippines."

Pomeroy states further: "The reasons for the failure of American imperialist forces to follow through on their initial plunge into Asia lay in at least two aspects of their situation. One was the unwillingness to mobilize sufficient

capital to throw into China to compete with and wrest market and investment areas from the other imperialist powers on the scene; other easier areas of penetration of a less openly colonial nature were available. The other was the fact that the American government and its machinery was not yet prepared to serve imperialist aims by contending with powerful rivals in Asia in the sphere of force.”

It is preposterous for one to expect US imperialism to export surplus capital evenly and regularly throughout the world and then to claim when it does otherwise that it is not yet prepared to serve imperialist aims. It is in the nature of modern imperialism to make the most uneven and spasmodic kind of development at home and abroad. Lenin said: The capitalists divide the world, not out of any particular malice, but because the degree of concentration which has been reached forces them to adopt this method in order to obtain profits. and they divide it "in proportion to capital," in "proportion to strength," because there cannot be any other method of division under commodity production and capitalism. But strength varies with the degree of economic and political development. In order to understand what is taking place, it is necessary to know what questions are settled by the changes in strength. Pomeroy, the revisionist scoundrel, would say anything to whitewash the colonial record of US imperialism in Asia. He tries to muddle up what is already clear history. Only a fool and traitor will write an entire book only to maintain the preposterous thesis that US imperialism was unwilling to seize market and investment areas in the Philippines and China and that its government was not prepared to serve imperialist aims at the turn of the century.

II. A false balance sheet of US imperialism in the Philippines

Referring to colonies, the great Lenin unequivocally stated: “In these backyard countries, profits are usually high, for capital is scarce, the price of land is relatively low, wages are low, raw materials are cheap.” He also said: “Of course, finance capital finds most "convenient," and is able to extract the greatest profit from such a subjection as involves the loss of the political independence of the subjected countries and peoples.”

Colonial possessions alone gives the monopolies complete guarantee against all contingencies in the struggle with competitors, including the contingency that the latter will defend themselves by means of a law establishing a state monopoly. The more capitalism is developed, the more strongly the shortage of

raw materials is felt, the more intense the competition and the hunt for sources of raw materials throughout the whole world, the more desperate is the struggle for the acquisition of colonies.

He also pointed out that finance capital is interested not only in the already discovered sources of raw materials but also in potential sources, because present-day technical development is extremely rapid, and land which is useless today may be improved tomorrow. This also applies to prospecting for minerals, to new methods of processing of and utilizing raw materials, etc., etc. Hence the inevitable striving of finance capital to enlarge its spheres of influence and even its actual territory.

It is utterly ridiculous to expect as did Kautsky that imperialism would rely on the "open market" for its raw materials. Certainly, it became more advantageous than during the Spanish colonial era for US imperialism to hold the Philippines as its own colony and get the raw materials without having to comply with Spanish laws. The US imperialists would have laughed at Kautsky's pontification that "peaceful democracy," rather than military occupation, would have opened Egypt more rapidly to British trade had it been uttered when Dewey sailed into Manila Bay.

To draw a picture of US traders not getting anywhere in the Philippine colony, Pomeroy deals at length with the initial advantages of the British in the import of cotton goods, export of hemp and shipping during the ten-year period of transition (1899-1909) under the Treaty of Paris. He deliberately obscures the unquestioned commercial and investment supremacy of US companies following the Payne-Aldrich Act of 1909 which instituted "free trade" between the Philippines and the United States and allowed the latter to manipulate the tariffs against foreign competitors. It is well to recall that even before the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, US commercial houses had already had a considerable share of Philippine trade, especially in sugar. yet Pomeroy makes it appear that only after the US conquest of the Philippines could the American booze dealers make money in the Philippines, not on the colonized people but on the US troops themselves.

Contrary to what Lenin has shown as the self-interest of imperialism, Pomeroy pictures the Philippine colony as having been more of a "major headache" for US imperialism than the object of economic plunder. He emphatically claims that the US monopolists were "reluctant clients," hesitant on investing in the

Philippines and failing to invest as much as had been expected of them, because of supposed difficulties. He regards the Organic Act of 1902 as consisting of "anti-monopoly restrictions" rather than as a legal instrument by which the US colonial government could start to grant franchise, recognize mining claims and sell or lease land to the Yankee plunderers.

Pomeroy misrepresents a short period of initial US investments (1902 and thereabouts) as representing the entire period of direct US colonial rule. He considers it too discouraging as it was "expensive" for the US imperialists to engage in the improvement of public works and communications. He does not consider that these were not only favorable for US business and military operations in the Philippines but were also paid for by taxes exacted from the colonized people.¹ Bond holding for provincial and municipal improvements fetched huge profits for US bondholders. US companies exacted huge profits from supply and engineering contracts. Yet Pomeroy arbitrarily cites the "losses" suffered by the operation of railroads in Cebu and Panay as a major cause for "diminished interest" in the Philippine colony. He does not consider that the US monopolies made profits on the building of these particular railroads and he covers up the tremendously profitable US takeover, expansion and operation of the Manila Railroad Company.

The counter-revolutionary idea of Pomeroy that runs through his entire book is that colonization of the Philippines merely caused economic "difficulties" instead of advantages for US imperialism and that such "difficulties" always pressed on US imperialism to leave the Philippines to a "stable government" of Filipino puppets. In his own particular way, he preaches Kautsky's idea of "peaceful development."

1. In Senate Document 331, p. 878 United States, 57th Congress, 1st Session, General Arthur MacArthur made the following frank statement: "One of my purposes was to improve roads for strategic purposes entirely. I got \$1 million gold for the purpose. Whatever incidental advantage arose to the community was, of course, in consequence of the military necessity. My view was to make passable roads during all seasons, so that by assembling troops at central points and connecting the outpost by wire, we could rapidly move from the rendezvous to the extremities, and thereby avoid the necessity of scattering into so many small posts..."

Since the exploitation of the Philippine colony involved the development of the

import-export trade and investment principally in the extractive industries, it required the development of roads and railroads.

But the money to build these was raised by taxing the Filipinos, for it had earlier been decided that the insular government was to be supported entirely by taxes levied on the population. democracy" as a better method for the capitalist countries to gain economic advantage. He maliciously puts aside the irrepressible demands of the Filipino people for national independence and democracy which the US imperialists and the local puppet demagogues always tried to preempt in their shady compromises on "Philippine independence."

To cover up the extent of exploitation by US imperialism in the Philippines, Pomeroy turns himself into an accounting cheat and trots out a false balance sheet. He estimates that military costs of conquest, suppression, fortification and garrison maintenance totaled at least \$500 million by the time the Tydings-McDuffie Act was passed by the US Congress in 1934. He prates that this amount does not include what he calls the "incalculable" expenditure in reconquering the islands and "rehabilitating" them as a result of World War II. He argues that such military costs were not exceeded by profits in US trade and investments in the Philippines.

He claims that if a 20% rate of profit is conceded to US goods, as forecast by merchants in advance of the Payne-Aldrich Act, US manufacturers and merchants earned \$160 million¹ from the US-Philippine trade during the first three decades of US colonial rule. He calls it a "generous estimate" for them to have earned \$200 million during the said period, even if such invisible as insurance and freight charges were included. He bewails that Philippine export to the United States exceeded imports of US goods by nearly \$400 million² (up to 1927, \$1.2 billion as against \$900.1 million). he regrets that on the overall US profits were "more than overbalanced by far" by the amount of duties waived on Philippine products entering the United States under the "free trade" terms of the Payne-Aldrich Act. On the basis of his inane and erratic computations, Pomeroy concludes that the US imperialists incurred losses rather than profits in the US-Philippine trade. Yet, he states that "to some extent," which he does not care to spell out in figures, earnings from Philippine exports went to US investment interests in the islands, in the refining of raw sugar, in manufacture of coconut products and in commercial handling. He claims, however, that the greater amount represented a payment by American taxpayers to "Filipino producers" well in excess of US trade profits.

Pomeroy contends that the total amount of profit remitted from all investments over the period of direct US colonial rule could hardly have made up the trade gap, let alone repaid the military costs. He regards the level of US investments as low, a little more than \$200 million at the time of the Tydings-McDuffie Law. According to him, a considerable part of the amount was accounted for by savings and reinvestment of profits. Though Pomeroy admits that huge returns were made on original investments, he insists that the total amount of profits remitted did not counterbalance the "imbalance of military expenditure and trade."

In looking at the military costs of seizing and holding on to the Philippines, Pomeroy completely obscures the fact that such were not at all borne by the US monopolies. On the other hand, the US monopolies profited immediately and in a long-term way from the colonial conquest of the Philippines. The costs of US military aggression were imposed on the American people as well as on the people that were the victim of aggression and colonial compelled to pay the taxes necessary to defray US military expenditures and to maintain the Philippines as colony. With regard to US military expenditures incurred in World War II, it is obvious that the US monopolies profited tremendously and unprecedentedly from military production and was consequently able to assume the position of No. 1 imperialist power through aggression, intervention and subversion in various countries.

It is extremely shallow and absurd for Pomeroy to assume that the US traders could make profits only on US goods imported into the Philippines. They handled directly a considerable part of Philippine export crops. It is certainly not enough to compare the declared values of imports and exports to measure the profits derived by the US imperialists. And to claim that the US traders had a measly 20% rate of profit on imports is not important in weighing how much the US imperialists (not only the US traders) profited from US-Philippine trade is to consider that cheap raw materials were exchanged for US finished products and were destined to be processed by US industries. The US imperialists and the comprador-landlords in essence exploited the Filipino toiling masses by making them produce raw materials at extremely low wage rates and by making them buy US finished products at extremely high prices. As a result, the Philippines remained a narrow colonial and agrarian economy, unable to freely take the road of self-reliance and industrialization and always subject to manipulation by US imperialism.

The records of the Bureau of Census and Statistics show that the book value of

US private investments in the Philippines before the outbreak of World War II amounted to \$537 million or \$268.5 million. Book value in the records of the colonial government cannot tell the whole story. But Pomeroy overdoes his role as an apologist of US imperialism by calling this level of US investments "low" and then leaping to the conclusion that these did not make much profit or were not enough to exceed military expenditures and "loses" in trade. We need to stress the fact that even with so little capital invested in colonies and semicolonies tremendous profits could be made and remitted annually to US stockholders. But like his US imperialist masters, Pomeroy would not divulge figures regarding this. the rate of profit for US subsidiaries in colonies and semicolonies is several times higher than in the United States and other capitalist countries. Only a very tiny part of annual earnings is reinvested and accumulated from year to year. It is superficial for one to pay attention only to the Magnitude of US investments in the Philippines and then consider it as inconsequential because it is so much less than US investments in Western Europe or Canada. US investments in other capitalist countries are huge because it takes that much to squeeze into a relatively constricted field and to have a significant say on economic and political policies of those countries. What Pomeroy belittles as "small" US investments is within the Philippines big and strategic capital capable of drawing super profits and controlling the entire economy.

In the case of Meralco, for instance, its original capitalization in 1901 was only \$2.0 million. Sixty years later, the majority stocks would be sold to a Philippine combine for \$50 million. the growth of the investment is striking enough. But what would be more striking is the tremendous amount of dividends remitted to US stockholders in sixty years. Pomeroy conveniently does not divulge this. This is not even to reckon with the profits made on Meralco by its mother and aunt companies on various accounts. general Electric Corporation, the US oil interests, the US banks and other related US businesses doing the same on this Philippine enterprise.

Referring to the monopolists capitalist countries, Lenin observed: "The export of capital, one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism, still more completely isolates the rentiers from production and sets the seal of parasitism on the whole country that lives by exploiting the labor of several overseas countries and colonies."

By insisting that the colonial possession of the Philippines by US imperialism was "not a paying" venture, Pomeroy actually whitewashes US imperialism and

denies its bloodsucking activities. It is our view that US imperialism profited greatly from its colonial possession of the Philippines. It is to argue against historical truth and to prettify US imperialism to maintain the thesis that it successfully colonized the Philippines only to suffer business losses. Totally discounting the US monopolies behind the US colonial regime in the Philippines, Pomeroy goes as far as to state: US business interests, including prominent industrial circles, were unwilling to share the tax and inflationary burden arising from military and administrative costs in acquiring, maintaining and defending a colonial empire.

Though he refers to a "relative minority of overseas traders and investors" as the beneficiary of the colonial regime, he does not qualify these as the top US monopolies that determine US policies. It is one-sided and inane to imply that the tax and inflationary burden in imperialist ventures is shouldered solely or mainly by the "US business interests, including prominent industrial circles." It is shouldered by the American people, mainly the proletariat. Besides, the Filipino people under the US colonial government had to shoulder the military and administrative costs in the absence of continuously effective revolutionary resistance.

An agent of US imperialism through and through, Pomeroy finds one more occasion to praise the political system in the United States when he claims that "even the more aggressive commercial and investment groups that had favored seizure of colonies had reason to doubt the practicality of colonial possessions" and were in favor of abandoning the Philippine colony because "they had to contend with the fact of the US Congress having authority over affairs and laws in colonies." "[C]orporations and individuals desiring to exploit such areas found their activities subject to the pressures and investigations of a variety of domestic influences, reformist and protectionist," he adds. He pontificates:

Congressional prerogatives were less when it came to noncolonial areas of investment and trade; operations of a neocolonialism were far less apt to come under scrutiny.

What Pomeroy would like others to believe is that the US Congress and the colonial laws were not at all in favor of the US monopolies over and above the debates that transpire from time to time in any bourgeois talking shop.

Knowing no bounds for his sinister role, Pomeroy presents the US Congress as a

positive channel for the Filipino people. He chatters: "The post-independence events in the Philippines following 1946...the brutal suppression with American assistance of the Huk national liberation movement and its popular support, the wholesale corruption of Filipino politics, the unbridled looting of the "independent" economy, the evasion of the one-time strictly-watched land laws, the crimes committed by US military base personnel, the moral decay of Philippine society arising from frustrated development would have all produced major scandals and investigations if occurring under direct American rule."

Mr. Pomeroy should be told to his face that US congressional investigations over US activities abroad are still frequently carried on and such are done as before not to lessen or curtail imperialist interests but to give support to them. As before, the US Congress is still a chamber of the US monopolies.

American Neocolonialism is a bourgeois reformist defense of the US colonial record in the Philippines and of what Pomeroy calls "welfare state at home" and "neocolonialism abroad," both of which he refers to as "twin supports of the contemporary imperialist framework." Rather than present the continuity and increasing virulence of the aggressive, expansionist, and exploitative character of US imperialism, it tries vainly to resuscitate the old fallacious claims of US imperialism to "isolationism" and to "altruism" or "benevolence." While it strains to show the "anti-colonial side" of US imperialism and the "economic losses" of the US monopolies in maintaining a colony, it obscures the oppressed and exploited condition of the Filipino people and the revolutionary tradition and role that they have carried on against colonial domination.

The annexation of the Philippines was an essential manifestation of US imperialism. This was necessary for US imperialism to satisfy its inherent cravings for super profits and expansion, to impose its power and influence not only in the Philippines but also in China and the whole of Asia. Now as before, US imperialism (including puppetry to it) a truly losing proposition in the Philippines through the revolutionary struggle for national liberation and people's democracy. Lenin laid bare the moribund and decadent character of imperialism a long time ago.

Pomeroy deliberately refuses to give full weight to the more deceptive yet more violent depredations of US imperialism after World War II as an outgrowth of its earlier depredations and as a further unfolding of its unchanging aggressive and bloodsucking nature. He goes to every length to show that after the colonial

conquest of the Philippines, US imperialism steadily moved away from "traditional colonialism", particularly the seizure of colonies. Thus, he is at a loss when confronted with the increase of US military bases and colonies (South Korea, South Vietnam, Okinawa, Taiwan and others) and with such US wars of aggression as in Korea and currently in Indochina in what he prefers to call the "neocolonial" stage of US imperialism. What Lenin said of Kautsky could be said of Pomeroy: "Instead of showing the living connection between periods of imperialist peace and periods of imperialist war, Kautsky presents the workers with a lifeless abstraction in order to reconcile them to their lifeless leaders."

In looking at the contemporary period, Pomeroy cannot look beyond a "repetition" of debates within imperialist ranks. He states: "When an analysis of the contemporary period is made, it will bear a marked resemblance to the period of debate over imperialist policy following the Spanish-American War." (Clashes between military and civil concepts of policy, authority and administration have also occurred in a repeated pattern, the MacArthur-Truman dispute in the Korean War, the "hawk" and "dove" antagonism in the Vietnam War, and the frequent Pentagon-State Department rifts being much like echoes of the Otis-Schumann and MacArthur-Taft differences during the Philippine conquest.)

The optimism of Pomeroy is an opportunist one and it lies in placing hopes mainly on the "peace-lovers" among the US imperialist policy-makers. It means falling for the more aggressive and more deceptive "Nixon doctrine" of today, for instance.

What Pomeroy construes as a "new feature" of "neocolonialism" is nothing but what Lenin had called usury imperialism, an old method for dominating other countries, exporting surplus capital, extorting super profits and securing new materials. Inasmuch as the Philippines has become a semicolony since 1946, its nature as a debtor-nation has indeed become increasingly evident. Pomeroy chooses to call usury capitalism as "nonaggressive neocolonial technique" and arbitrarily sets aside the fact that this has been made possible by the aggressive nature of US imperialism and the historical imperialist domination of the Philippines. It is also certain that US imperialism will never allow its practice of usury on the Philippines to stop without the victory of revolutionary armed struggle against its persistent military bases and armed puppets.

While the conclusion of Pomeroy is that US imperialism will continue to put "re-

emphasis on indirect neocolonial methods" and to fashion "more subtle techniques of neocolonialism" to prolong its life without any foreseeable and we busy ourselves with raising the ideological and political consciousness and organized strength of the Filipino people in order to deal deadly blows against US imperialism and all its running dogs.

In this regard, we make a criticism and repudiation of Pomeroy's American neocolonialism in line with Lenin's dictum: "...The fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism."

Chairman Mao teaches us: ...Imperialism and all reactionaries, looked at in essence, from a long-term point of view, from a strategic point of view, must be seen for what they are...paper tigers. On this we should build our strategic thinking. On the other hand, they are also living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers which can devour people. On this we should build our tactical thinking. Imperialism will not last long because it always does evil things. It persists in grooming and supporting reactionaries in all countries who are against the people, it has forcibly seized many colonies and semicolonies and many military bases, and it threatens the peace with atomic war. Thus, forced by imperialism to do so, more than 90 percent of the people of the world are rising or will rise up in struggle against it. Yet imperialism is still alive, still running amuck in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the West, imperialism is still oppressing the people at home. This situation must change. It is the task of the people of the whole world to put an end to the aggression and oppression perpetrated by imperialism, and chiefly by US imperialism.

Lavaites Are Anti-Marxist and Anti-Leninist Obscurantists and Chauvinists

Taking the air of false superiority, the Lava revisionist renegades brazenly express contempt for Comrade Mao Zedong and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. They always take pains to create the impression that Marxism has stopped to develop beyond the stage of Leninism.

These sham Marxists impose their deliberate distortion of Marxism as some kind of sophistication. They try to render Marxism-Leninism static and dead by denying the fact that it has developed to the completely new and higher stage of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

Genuine Marxists in the Philippines and the world over recognize that the universal revolutionary theory of the proletariat has passed three major stages. Marx and Engels developed Marxism as the first stage in advancing the theory of scientific socialism as against utopian socialism in the era of pre-monopoly capitalism. Lenin and Stalin developed Marxism to the new and higher stage of Marxism-Leninism in advancing the theory and practice of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship in the era of imperialism and in establishing and consolidating the first socialist state in the Soviet Union. Mao Zedong also made significant contributions to the second stage with the victories of the Chinese revolution before the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

Mao Zedong has developed Marxism-Leninism to the completely new and higher stage of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in advancing the theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and in leading the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. This third stage encompasses the present epoch when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward world victory. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought has brought forward the world proletarian revolution and has brought about greater unity, strength and militancy among the revolutionary people despite the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the revisionist ruling clique, the neo-bourgeoisie, of the Soviet Union.

The Lava revisionist renegades deny the fact that the Soviet Union has become neo capitalist or revisionist, social-fascist and social-imperialist. As incorrigible bourgeois idealists, they at certain times hypocritically express wishes to have Marxism-Leninism "united" with modern revisionism but they never fail to make attacks against Chairman Mao, the Lenin of the present era; against the great, glorious and correct Chinese Communist Party; against the People's Republic of China, the bulwark of socialism; and against the several hundreds of millions of Chinese people. In the Philippines, they are out to promote the interests of the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie and hope that with its help, including that of US imperialism and the Marcos fascist puppet clique, they can enhance their own bureaucratic ambitions.

Using the notorious Lavaite method of misrepresentation, "Mario Frunze" in the bulletin of anti-communism tries to attribute words to Chairman Amado Guerrero. Here is the fabrication: "He (Chairman Guerrero) argued that it is now the fashion throughout the world for Communist Parties to split and for several Parties to exist in each country."

Messrs. Revisionists, the revolutionary struggles of genuine Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism is not just a fashion as you yourselves choose to call it in your fabrication. Modern revisionism is splittism. Even the entire Communist Party of the Philippines ceases to be communist or Marxist-Leninist when it becomes revisionist, an instrument of imperialism. Your clique is a bogus communist party because it is revisionist. Furthermore, Marxism-Leninism does not permit two genuine Communist Parties in one country.

You cannot attribute words to us as you please. Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party, which is the Party's document of rectification, is clear and can be read by you and by anyone else. The demarcation line between genuine Marxist-Leninists and sham Marxist-Leninists is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. We have repudiated your clique as a counterrevolutionary revisionist group. The Communist Party of the Philippines as it has been re-established is now guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and is conducting a living study and application of it in the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution.

The spokesman of the Lava revisionist renegades babbles further: "We shall leave it to the masses to decide whether... maligning the Soviet Union and other socialist states...are the distinctive marks of a true revolutionary."

These Lavaites talk as if the masses have not already decided against them. The whole series of Lava leadership, the entire dynasty, during the last more than three decades has been judged. Now that the Lavaites wish to impose Soviet modern revisionism and social-imperialism and their revisionist puppetry, the masses will surely punish them even more thoroughly until their doom. We oppose the social-imperialist and social-fascist rule in the Soviet Union and other countries especially in a number of Eastern European countries and in the People's Republic of Mongolia. It is our revolutionary duty to support the Soviet and other peoples who are oppressed and exploited by the revisionist betrayers of Lenin.

The Lava revisionist renegades can seek no comfort in making such a pious statement in Ang Gabay as that "it has been proven, not only in the history of the Philippines but of the whole world, that a revolutionary party of the proletariat can never be destroyed by reactionary elements." The fact is that the Communist Party of the Philippines established in 1930 has been infiltrated and secretly sabotaged from within by the Lava revisionist renegades since 1935 even as the enemy from without sought to destroy it.

Even as the revolutionary party of the proletariat is re-established on the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the barefaced enemy and his special agents, the Lava revisionist renegades, seek to destroy it. If we are not alert and thoroughgoing in fighting modern revisionism, the Communist Party of the Philippines can once more be taken over or destroyed from within or from without. Even a revolutionary party of the proletariat in a socialist society can become the victim of modern revisionists and other counterrevolutionary conspirators. Class struggle persists within the Communist Party reflecting the class struggle outside. Look at how the Party of Lenin has been taken over and sabotaged from within by the modern revisionists. But we now have the Marxist-Leninist theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a powerful weapon for combating the ideas of the bourgeoisie, preventing the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society and for ensuring the victory of the world proletariat over imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction.

The Lavaites hate Mao Zedong, the Lenin of the present era, but they honor Bertrand Russell to high heavens. The mouthpiece of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (Phil.), Inc., *Struggle* (January 1971), expresses most aptly the emptiness of the Lavaites' intellectual pretensions. This Lavaite publication says:

“They [referring to the Party and the mass organizations] are so busy studying the thoughts of Mao Zedong and issuing statements denigrating the Soviet Union as "social-imperialists," whatever that means...”

Already familiar are the charges of "revisionist renegades" and "bureaucrats" hurled repeatedly against MPKP, its fraternal groups and their leaders.

So fond of quoting Lenin to oppose Lenin, the Lavaites pretend to know so much but suddenly they fail to recognize such Leninist critical terms as social-imperialism, revisionism and bureaucratism.

Social-imperialism means socialism in words but imperialism in deeds, the growth of opportunism into imperialism. It means the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie. It means concretely the oppression and exploitation by the neo capitalist ruling clique in Moscow of the various nationalities in the Soviet Union, the peoples in a number of countries in Eastern Europe and in the People's Republic of Mongolia, and the peoples of a certain number of Asian, African and Latin American countries. It means the imperialist and fascist invasion of Czechoslovakia and repeated acts of new-tsarist aggression against China. It means supplying arms and giving all-out support to fascist butchers in Indonesia and India for purposes which include the suppression of local revolutionaries and aggression against China. Need we say more? The Lavaites feign ignorance of our sustained propaganda against Soviet social-imperialism.

In his Half a Century of Socialism, William J. Pomeroy echoes his Soviet revisionist masters by stating that opposing classes have ceased to exist in the Soviet Union and that what prevails is a "state of the whole people." In other words, the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer thought of as the instrument to suppress counterrevolutionary tendencies within the country, but as an instrument directed solely against enemies from outside.

He also disparages the great red banner of the proletariat by railing that the "hammer and sickle were an apt symbol in the time of Lenin" and that "today's symbols are the computer, the transistor and the atomic ring." These Lavaite statements are revisionist and counterrevolutionary.

Within the Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the proletariat was gradually corroded for decades by capitalist-roaders or revisionists under such erroneous

ideas as that there is no more class struggle in a socialist society and progress is a matter of advancing techniques. It was in the 20th Congress of the CPSU that the revisionists headed by Khrushchov sanctified a full-grown dictatorship of the bourgeoisie under cover of "combating the personality cult of Stalin." Such lines as the "parliamentary road" and "peaceful transition" were also broadcast to sabotage the world proletarian revolution. From the time of Khrushchov, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie has been employed to oppress genuine Communists and the broad masses of the Soviet people. This is the meaning of Pomeroy's statement that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer thought of as the instrument to suppress counterrevolutionary tendencies within the country."

Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, all basic revisionist policies of Khrushchov have been pushed further to their social-imperialist culmination. The restoration of capitalism has been accelerated with the adoption of the "new economic system" which puts profit in command of everything and authorizes managers and directors to operate individual enterprises and farms as independent capitalist entities. Khrushchov's theory of the "international division of labor" was also pushed further to convert a number of countries in Eastern Europe and the People's Republic of Mongolia into out-and-out colonies...as markets, subsidiary processing workshops, orchards, vegetable gardens and ranches. Moved by its own revisionist renegade character and also wanting to maneuver itself out of the clutches of the Soviet revisionist renegades, the Dubcek revisionist renegade clique in Czechoslovakia wanted to secure loans from US imperialism and the West German revanchists. Allowing no differences with its colonies, the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique unleashed the social-imperialist and social-fascist invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. This is a clear realization of what Pomeroy means by the statement that a "dictatorship of the proletariat" exists in the Soviet Union only insofar as it is supposed to be "an instrument directed solely against enemies from the outside."

The Soviet social-imperialist attack on Czechoslovakia and the Czechoslovak people deserves considerable attention here because of the following statement of Ang Gabay: Like for example Czechoslovakia. This country is with other socialist countries in an economic organization called COMECON and the product that she contributes to this organization are armaments because these are her primary products. Because the primary source of socialist countries are weapons for their Armed Forces and of the countries waging revolution against the might of Imperialism is Czechoslovakia, the NATO and the CIA in west

Germany attempted to seize power from the Czechoslovak workers through a counterrevolution led by students. The liberal adventurist and romanticist students were influenced by the revanchists in North Germany (sic) or by the adherents of Hitler that are now reviving his dreams to avenge the ignominy they have incurred in the eyes of mankind. Now, the adherents of American Imperialism are using the events in Czechoslovakia to undermine the Soviet Union and broadcast to the whole world that this is concrete evidence of the Soviet Union's social-imperialism at present.

Because of their genuine concern for the people's interest, all Marxist-Leninists have denounced and opposed all counterrevolutionary policies and actions of Soviet social-imperialism. US imperialism also attacks Soviet social-imperialism but for reasons basically different from those of Marxist-Leninists. US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism collude and contend with each other and the former always tries to discredit communism by referring to the imperialist abuses of social-imperialists who masquerade as communists. With regard to West Germany, Soviet social-imperialism does not allow its puppet revisionist renegade cliques like the Dubcek revisionist renegade clique in 1968 to beg directly for loans from West Germany. But the Soviet social-imperialists themselves have begged for and gotten loans from the West German revanchists in exchange for the Soviet sell-out of the sovereign interests of the German people.

Now that the Lava revisionist renegades are all excited about diplomatic and trade relations between the Philippine reactionary government and Soviet social-imperialism, it is pertinent to quote an unwitting confession made by William J. Pomeroy in *World Outlook*: "It (trade with Soviet social-imperialism) can reduce the need for the nationalist bourgeoisie to struggle for the home market against imperialist competition; it makes it less essential to forge united fronts with popular movements. For landlord export groups it reduces the need to shift from agriculture to industry. Even for the imperialists, who have caused an enormously unfavorable Philippine balance of payments position that forces the country towards exchange controls, it would ease the crisis and ensure their uninterrupted remittance of profits; hence they do not oppose it as rigidly as before, but seek to limit it and to divert it from public projects."

The Lava revisionist renegades are happy about the prospect that Soviet social-imperialism, in collusion and in competition with US imperialism and Japanese imperialism, shall be able to apply its theory of "international division of labor"

on the Philippines and compel it to further remain a mere supplier of raw materials, a mere market for shoddy Soviet products and a client-state for deceptive and onerous Soviet loan capital. Of course, the Lava revisionist renegades will say that their "socialist" country, Soviet social-imperialism, will extend aid in the form of capital goods. But we know how gross are the designs of Soviet machines, how high is the overprice exacted, how huge profits and interest rates are exacted by getting payments in the form of undervalued local products, and how expensive are Soviet technical services. We know the experience of China, India, Indonesia and other countries with regard to Soviet "trade and aid."

The Lavaites, like their social-imperialist masters, are revisionist renegades and their ringleaders are shameless bureaucrats within their own clique as well as in the reactionary government which they serve. Their ideological outlook, political line, organization and fascist activities are opposed to the revolutionary mass movement and support US imperialism, modern revisionism and local reaction.

Under the pretext of attacking "dogmatism," the anti-communist "Frunze" prates: Guerrero's dogmatism is even more absurd because the formulas he preaches are drawn from the experience of another country and he does not consider the relevance of that experience to the realities we have been through since 1950. Instead, he arbitrarily selects facts and figures from different sources and fits all these into the Chinese schema.

What the Lava revisionist renegades oppose is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and the spirit of proletarian internationalism. What they support is the cosmopolitanism of the international big bourgeoisie and certainly they are anti-Chinese chauvinists. We do not have any Chinese schema and formulas as fixed by Lavaite nonsense. What we are trying to do in the Philippines is to propagate the living study and application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in concrete conditions.

Also, the Lava revisionist renegades should never suggest that we are treading the old path of "Left" opportunism of the Jose Lava leadership or that the Jose Lava leadership failed in 1950 because it followed Chairman Mao's theory of people's war. Jose Lava was "Left" opportunist in 1950 and he violated Marxism-Leninism through and through with his purely military viewpoint and putschist shallowness. He is a revisionist just like the rest of the Lavaites and has left for Canada to seek self-comfort. We have no use for such rubbish except as a

negative example. The Lavaites are casting Jose Lava away because there is a split among them; because the faction of Mallari, Briones, Narciso, Nemenzo, Castro and Macapagal has vented its anger at him because of some old debts. There is an excellent revolutionary situation today but we are not poised to launch a strategic offensive now in the cities as the Lavaites tried in 1950; we are still in the stage of strategic defensive of a protracted people's war in a semicolonial and semifeudal country. Our urban policy is to carry on and develop the strike movement and the new democratic cultural revolution.

The Lavaites have no reason to accuse us of dogmatism. We have made concrete analysis of Philippine society and revolution. We have exerted vigorous efforts to give Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought a national form. The Lavaites seem to be unaware of the widely circulated Philippine Society and Revolution and the Guide for Cadres and Members of the Communist Party of the Philippines and fail to quote a single sentence of these to misrepresent. They are the ones guilty of dogmatism and stereotyped learning. They rely on foreign bourgeois and revisionist books and have not made any analysis of the Philippine situation which is any better than their occasional scab propaganda and their slapdash manifestos.

The article of "Emil Banaag" in the July 4, 1971 issue of Ang Gabay shows that the Lava revisionist renegades deliberately try to confuse the meaning of such terms as dogmatism and revisionism in order to get away with their counterrevolutionary ideas. They define dogmatism as "limiting oneself to only one form of struggle" and nothing more. In a silly gesture, they try to simply throw back the term "revisionism" to Marxist-Leninists. Chairman Mao teaches us: "Both dogmatism and revisionism run counter to Marxism. Marxism must certainly advance; it must develop along with the development of practice and cannot stand still. It would become lifeless if it remained stagnant and stereotyped. However, the basic principles of Marxism must never be violated, or otherwise mistakes will be made. It is dogmatism to approach Marxism from a metaphysical point of view and to regard it as something rigid. It is revisionism to negate the basic principles of Marxism and to negate its universal truth. Revisionism is one form of bourgeois ideology. The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line. In present circumstances, revisionism is more pernicious than dogmatism. One of our current important tasks on the ideological front is to unfold criticism of revisionism."

The Lava revisionist renegades have turned the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism into a vehicle for the most repulsive chauvinism. Sang-ayon sa MAN (February 15, 1971) editorially states: There is one more example of what can be the result of pontification. This is the use and repetition of some clichés which clearly emanate from Mao Zedong which are not even fully understood by those who utter these. Those are the charges of pro-Chinese against Russia which undeniably is the very first socialist country in the world. Now it is being accused by them as "revisionist," "traitors" and other charges that are repulsive to hear. It seems that from their view everything that China does is all correct and what other countries and persons do are always wrong. But this is not what is important. In our loyalty to our aspiration to unite the Filipino people, will the open support to any country, whether China, Russia or America give to our people full unity and understanding? (The reader should refer to the Tagalog original to confirm the illogic and literary incompetence of the Lavaite author or authors of this passage.)

The Lava revisionist renegades need to be told that the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism is not the struggle between the "pro-Chinese" and "anti-Chinese." It is chauvinist and irrational for them to play up the distinction of China from "other countries and persons as some kind of antagonism. They should not imagine that their ignorance is the ignorance of others. Those who assail Soviet modern revisionism and social-imperialism understand what the Lavaites prefer to disparage as "clichés" and "repulsive" charges. What really attracts the Lavaites most is the language of the bourgeoisie and modern revisionism. In the same issue of Sang-ayon sa MAN where they feign to be unconcerned about the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism, they brandish the book of the British revisionist scoundrel Jack Woddis against China, communism, the people and revolution and take the occasion to make their own chauvinist attacks and antidemocratic references to the militant leaders of patriotic and revolutionary mass organizations.

While they attack Comrades Mao and Stalin, the Lava revisionist renegades praise the long-discredited revisionist buffoon Khrushchov and endorse everything rotten that he says about the "personality cult." They introduce and spread such poisonous expressions as the "cult of Mao." They use these in common with their reactionary allies like Marcos, Lacsina and the clerico-fascists. They turn the history of the Chinese revolution upside down in their fantasies. They regret that the traitor, renegade and scab Liu Shaochi and his gang of capitalist roaders have failed to do what the Soviet revisionist renegades

have succeeded to do in the Soviet Union. They have so much hatred for the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution because it has consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat. They abuse the Ninth Party Congress of the Communist Party of China because it was a congress of unity, victory and vitality.

They want the restoration of capitalism in China as in the Soviet Union. That is why they hate Chairman Mao, the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people. They hate socialist China because it has become the strongest bulwark of socialism and is today the center of world revolution against imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction.

Going to every length to spite China, the Lava revisionist renegades praise former House Speaker Jose B. Laurel and Majority Floor Leader Jose M. Aldeguer for supporting the US-inspired "two-China" policy. They stick hardheadedly to the inane view expressed previously by Jesus Lava in "Paglilinaw sa `Philippine Crisis'" that Taiwan is a "nation-state" (bansa). At a time that US imperialism and the Chiang bandit gang are extremely isolated, they busy themselves with making slanderous claims against the People's Republic of China.

In the June 12th issue of Sang-ayon sa MAN, it is obvious that the Lava revisionist renegades want to combine counterrevolutionary chauvinism with antinational and antidemocratic slander against mass organizations that have repudiated them. In the guise of misrepresenting only one person, they raise the stupid question rhetorically, "Are his fellow Filipinos his principal enemies rather than Americans and Chinese?" Here they are chauvinists not only against the Chinese people but also against the American people.

In the same publication, they arrogantly misrepresent the new type of national democratic cultural revolution now raging in the streets of Manila and elsewhere: The truth is, in the view of so many, especially those who have some knowledge, such acts are blind and infantile imitation of what is called "wall posters" which became prevalent in China during the so-called cultural revolution which in fact was a purge in China which only tarnished and further destroyed the good image of a previously admired Red China.

They can talk their heads off against the new type of national democratic cultural revolution. It is rapidly isolating them and their imperialist masters. That is how

real and powerful it is as a revolutionary force and as a local creation of the masses. Public opinion is being prepared for harder hammer blows to fall on their heads. We have gained a revolutionary lesson and adopted from the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution a method for isolating US imperialism, feudalism, bureaucrat capitalism and Soviet social-imperialism. The Lava revisionist renegades are the ones who are blind and infantile, who pretend not to see that the revolutionary mass movement has already put them off their feet.

In their futile attempt to parry the blows against their US imperialist, Soviet social-imperialist and local reactionary masters, the Lava revisionist renegades rail in the following manner: We will submit ourselves only to the good of the Filipino masses and to the cause of driving away the foreign imperialists from our soil whether it be American imperialism, Russian imperialism, Chinese imperialism or Japanese imperialism and others.

Such a trick as "attacking the many" to save the real few is a worn-out trick of imperialist propaganda. The Lavaites have completely degenerated into chauvinist demagogues and cheap tools of US imperialism. What do they mean by Chinese imperialism?

They have completely abandoned all pretensions to understanding the meaning of imperialism as clearly defined by the great Lenin. The Chiang bandit gang, which they adore, is nothing but a puppet and tool of US imperialism.

At one point, the Lava revisionist renegades piously preach that Sang-ayon sa MAN or the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism is "nobody's" instrument and has no ax to grind against the Communist Party. But let us quote the official publication of MAN, Sang-ayon sa MAN: According to Guerrero himself, the united front of progressives is a sine qua non of the progressive movement, in the face of the imperialist enemy. If we accept this to be correct and we believe it how can we also accept as correct what he did by also setting up a new Party?

The Lavaites presume too much and they make use of the MAN to peddle their presumptions. As a matter of fact, their bogus communist party monopolizes what they consider as the "united front." Revisionist renegades are not progressive. They sabotage and subvert the revolutionary mass movement. They are reactionary and the people see through their pretenses.

Protesting gratuitously that MAN is not Marxist-Leninist, they take the license of using it to attack the re-established Communist Party of the Philippines. First, they attack the Communist Party of China for having "continued further to depart from and to repudiate Marxism-Leninism."

Then they shift to the following: From the former young Mao Zedong) whom he (Chairman Amado Guerrero) now worships like a god, a progressive must know what is called contradiction or opposition, if it is antagonistic or non-antagonistic? Does he consider as antagonistic contradictions the petty differences in the ranks of the progressive movement so that he considers these as enemies more than the foreign imperialists? If he has knowledge of the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, is he not like the churches whose preachings are very different from what they do?

These Lavaites presume themselves to be clever and to be able to confuse people. They only succeed in exposing their own confusion. The contradictions between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism are no "petty differences." These are big and serious differences, so big and serious that the Lava revisionist renegades have not hesitated in committing so many fascist crimes against us as well as against the national democratic mass organizations and their leaders. Their main task is to attack us and they have admitted this so many times. Our contradictions are therefore antagonistic. When we fight the Lava revisionist renegades, we also fight their imperialist masters. The Lava revisionist renegades are subverters and saboteurs of the revolutionary struggle for people's democracy against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

I. Lavaites are not only careerists but super-careerists, conspirators and double-dealers

The Lava revisionist renegades have subverted the old merger party and turned it into a revisionist party. They have consistently opposed any criticism of their subjectivism and opportunism and have resorted to conspiratorial methods and spiteful campaigns of slander against those critical of them. As early as January 1967, it was clear that they were resorting to all kinds of tricks to impugn the integrity of proletarian revolutionaries in a futile attempt to oppose criticism and frustrate rectification within the old merger party.

The undeniable proof today of the utter ideological and political bankruptcy of the Lava revisionist renegades is their strained attempt to misrepresent by

various malicious tricks the proletarian revolutionary line and arguments so clearly laid down in the document of rectification, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party" and other basic Party documents. They employ such dishonest tricks as inventing stories and statements calculated to get the assistance of the reactionary state in repressing democratic personalities and mass organizations.

The main line of argument that runs through their written propaganda and rumormongering is that they have the authority to determine what makes the Communist Party of the Philippines and what makes the revolutionary mass movement. They fancy such authority to proceed from their theory of "noble lineage" or "hereditary privilege." Suffering from the "megalomania" that they try to tack on others, they also imagine themselves to be Jesus Christ and his faithful apostles and thus they speak of "youthful Judases" who are against them.

The Lavaites employ the filthiest and clumsiest epithets drawn from the trash can of bourgeois psychology which only fall on their own heads and make them absurd before Marxist-Leninists and the broad masses of the people. The publications that they have put out are mere indicators of their capacity for reckless gossip in the clownish attempt to claim authority. Their written propaganda is bad enough but their unwritten and other cheap Trotskyite tricks are even worse.

But still they flatter themselves in the following manner in their bulletin of anti-communism: Knowing that his opponents are restrained by a sense of responsibility to safeguard the clandestine apparatus of an illegal Party, he takes the liberty of distorting and fabricating malicious charges which they could answer only by exposing certain confidential matters to the enemy. This expressed pretension for being discreet is thrown overboard in the same issue of the same publication of anti-communism, which is widely distributed for "multiplier effect" and is a mere part of a campaign of slander participated in by all Lavaite outfits like MAN, MASAKA, MPKP, BRPF, KILUSAN, CTUP, AKSIUN and their respective publications.

What immediately calls our attention is that while the Lava revisionist renegades openly confirm their supposed involvement in the underground they are not subjected to violent repression by the state. On the other hand, their irresponsible attacks against democratic leaders and mass organizations as having something to do with the Communist Party of the Philippines (that has been re-established on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought) have

already been followed directly by a number of fascist crimes against those whom they attack.

The claims of the Lavaites to being discreet is entirely false even if one would simply base that conclusion on a compilation of local and foreign revisionist publications. The license that they enjoy in talking about themselves in the open about their "authority" in the "underground" and about their "clandestine apparatus" is well taken up and well demonstrated in the memorandum dated May 18, 1971 by a certain Miss Liwayway T. Reyes to the Movement for a Democratic Philippines. This memorandum carries the names of just about all the "central committeemen" of the Lava revisionist renegade clique and is a clear testimony to the anti-communist philistinism and vulgarity of the Lava revisionist renegades. Miss Reyes has properly warned the people and the national democratic mass organizations and leaders against the criminal collusion between the Lavaite traitors and the US-Marcos clique.

If we go over the history of inner struggles in the old merger party, we cannot fail to see immediately that the Lavaites characteristically put down those who oppose their opportunist line by grossly violating the principle of democratic centralism and simply beating down their critics as "careerists" or even as "enemy agents." But this kind of trick will no longer do at this stage of the Philippine revolutionary movement. The heyday of such rascals as the Lavas and Tarucs is long past.

One would certainly be a careerist if he were to keep silent or simply let the modern revisionists and enemy agents use the old merger party to subvert and sabotage the revolutionary mass movement simply because he does not want to lose his membership in the highest leading organ of that party. Being docile to and accepting the counter-revolutionary wishes of the modern revisionists is a crime among true Marxist-Leninists.

In principle, the old merger party ceased to be entitled to the glorious name of Communist Party and to have any claim to democratic centralism when it was completely poisoned by modern revisionism and when it was completely overrun by revisionist scoundrels and notorious enemy agents. This occurred sometime in April 1967. No amount of invocation to democratic centralism and discipline can ever be enough to sanctify this utter degeneration. It is those few who love the empty titles of being members of the Lava revisionist renegade clique, especially of its bogus political bureau and central committee, who are

careerists.

But the Lava chieftains themselves, the series of four general secretaries (Vicente, Jose, Jesus and Francisco, Jr.) from the Lava clan, are guilty not only of careerism but of super-careerism. They are in a way a unique phenomenon in the entire history of the international communist movement. But this is nothing but a reflection of the bourgeois and feudal politics instituted within the old merger party. The Lavas have systematically cultivated a myth about themselves being the "geniuses" of the Philippine revolution and have always calculatingly kept "trustworthy" men around themselves to do their bidding as in the fashion of big and petty dynasties within the reactionary political parties. There is not much difference between the Lava clan within the old merger party and, say, the Laurel clan of the Nacionalista Party or the Roxas clan in the Liberal Party.

In 1942, Vicente Lava as general secretary of the old merger party maneuvered to have his brother Jose become the head of the organization department despite the fact that the latter was a new party member. After World War II, the Lavas had their Right opportunist pawns take over formal leadership over the old merger party and Vicente Lava became "adviser" of the HUKBALAHAP to be able to hold it down. At that time, the Lavas and Lavaites were mainly interested in gaining seats in the reactionary government. Only when they were frustrated in their bureaucratic ambitions did they pretend to respond to the mass clamor for revolutionary armed struggle. Jose and Jesus Lava subsequently concocted the theory of "parallel leadership" (the Politburo-In and Politburo-Out) so that one Lava could be the reserve of the other Lava in perpetuating a dynastic rule. They also put up Federico Maclang, a close kin of theirs and an overseer of their private lands in Bulacan, as the head of the organization department and appointed other close kinsmen of theirs to leading positions in the regional commands surrounding Manila in their vain hope of seizing and monopolizing power soon. The absurdity of this Lavaite super-careerism was extremely obvious when in 1963 Jesus Lava appointed two close kinsmen of his to what was then the leading body on no other basis than their personal "trustworthiness" to him.

The Lava revisionist renegades are fond of invoking rules of organization and correct procedure, without reference to the ideological substance of centralism. But let us test the validity of their claims to being the legitimate continuers of the old merger party. Let us proceed by asking them questions

1) On what basis and by what method did Jesus Lava in 1963 choose the five-man "executive committee" (considered the leading core of what was then intended to be the central committee in the future)? Was it not sheer nepotism and clear disregard of a number of other capable cadres of the old merger party that mere kinsmen of his were appointed by him without due regard to their ideological, political and organizational achievements and capabilities? For instance, what qualified Francisco Lava, Jr. to become a member of that "executive committee"?

2) Why was it that Pedro Taruc was all along a mere name in that "executive committee" (sometimes called the "provisional higher organ" then) despite the fact that he was supposed to have been the general secretary after the "capture" of Jesus Lava in 1964 and was the only member who was then in the countryside? Why was every attempt of some members of the "executive committee" to pave the way for a meeting with Pedro Taruc frustrated even before he became a completely rotten tool of the criminal gangster Sumulong? What was behind all this double-dealing? 3) How did it ever occur that come April 1967 Francisco Lava, Jr. (out of five members of the "executive committee") took it upon himself alone to convene a meeting to form a "provisional political bureau"? Why did he convene persons of dubious character and of his own choosing? What made him think that he could constitute himself into a "majority of one"?

All of the above questions can be reduced to one. Who gave Francisco Lava, Jr. the authority to collect a number of scoundrels as the "provisional political bureau" and then as "central committee"? The 1963 "executive committee" was never properly dissolved. Did the humble non-careerist and literary giant of sorts, the fifth-rate lawyer-bureaucrat and criminal trickster Francisco Lava, Jr. dissolve the body all by himself? Or is it true that Jose and Jesus Lava gave some special orders from prison through Francisco Lava, Sr. as claimed by his junior? But Messrs. Revisionists, three members of that "executive committee" represented the main body of whatever vestigial and new members there were of the old merger party. Francisco Lava, Jr., who had no experience in the revolutionary mass movement and who could hardly sustain sense in a paragraph, could be excluded from that body and that body could still stand then.

Who is Francisco Lava, Jr.? By what process of alchemy has he become a leading revolutionary? Until his recent leave of absence from the staff of the Court of Appeals, he was a full-time deputy clerk there with a tiny marginal time

for anything else. Before his strange appointment by his uncle to membership in the "highest organ" of the old merger party, he had never had any organizational experience except that of being a minor member of a college fraternity during his school days and of being a bureaucrat in the reactionary government. What could he have contributed to the revolutionary mass movement? To build up his own son in the Lavaite circle, Francisco Lava, Sr. used to intrude upon meetings of the "executive committee" only to brag that he and his junior made researches and wrote speeches for the late Senator Recto and Senator Tanada. We cannot be taken in by such presumptuous claims that only petty hacks will make. We simply must inquire what the humbug Francisco Lava, Jr. has written in his own name or in his alias that is of any revolutionary value. Nothing! Even the other Lavaite ringleader, Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., cannot help but express publicly his low regard for Lava Junior's theoretical and literary competence.

In the main we merely raise questions here about the old merger party and the usurpers of authority therein. That is because there is no more point in talking about "legitimacy" in terms of the outmoded 1946 constitution of the old merger party or even in terms of the appointments made by Jesus Lava alone in 1963. Our differences are now as clear as the fundamental differences between Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and Lava revisionist fascism. We do not consider these as "petty differences" or a matter of mere "fashion." These are life-and-death questions between genuine revolutionaries and counterrevolutionaries who masquerade as revolutionaries in their evil scheme to subvert and sabotage the revolutionary mass movement. The Lava revisionist fascists have already incurred blood debts on us.

Let us refer to the other ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegade clique: Godofredo Mallari, Alejandro Briones, Gorgonio Narciso, Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., Merlin M. Magallona, Antonio Santos, Domingo Castro, Felicisimo Macapagal, Cipriano Robielos and Ching Maramag. Mallari is a highly-paid enemy agent, a wealthy businessman in Malabon and a notorious 1948 expelled of the old merger party. Briones is a petty reactionary politician in Tarlac and is a direct mastermind of the criminal activities of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang which is a partner-in-crime of the "Monkees." Narciso is a former town politician who is now a bureaucrat in the reactionary government. Nemenzo was admitted member of the old merger party in 1965 and was soon elevated to his high rank despite his social-democratic views and unremolded character as a bourgeois professor of political science. Magallona is employed with a reactionary government agency engaged in counter-revolutionary propaganda

and previously with an agency of the US government. Santos is an old-time lumpen-proletarian valet of the Lavas and an incorrigible petty swindler and enemy informer. Castro and Macapagal are notorious surrenderers who now receive honoraria from the Land Authority in their capacity as MASAKA organizers. Robielos is the Comelec registrar of Malolos, Bulacan and is a liaison man of the PC Counter-Intelligence Unit. Maramag is the promotions manager of the Manila Times. Is this collection of scoundrels and full-time bourgeois bureaucrats capable of the pompous presumptions that Lavaite publications brag about? It is important and necessary to expose them thoroughly to the revolutionary mass movement so as to frustrate their counter-revolutionary activities. Their secret deals with the US-Marcos clique will not save them from the wrath of the masses.

The Lava revisionist renegades may resort to the hullabaloo about making "expulsions" from the old merger party. If they were not only given to misrepresentation, they would recall that they were told the following a long time ago while they were busy conspiring, double-dealing and vilifying other people: "Your makeshift group is no party. If you call it a party, then we call it a party of modern revisionism. You have had yourselves expelled from the Marxist-Leninist party." This was a brief note that was cordially delivered to Francisco Lava, Jr. and his group through Francisco Nemenzo, Jr. and his wife before their bogus plenum of May 1967.

There could not have been any fruitful discussion with the Lavaites after April 1967. The criminal gangsters among them were already plotting to murder those who opposed the revisionist renegade line. The "internal" bulletin of anti-communism now reveals that the Lavaite ringleaders are recriminating each other for having taken wrongly a "lenient policy" and for having placed "so high a value on past friendship" regarding those who opposed their line within the old merger party. The Lavaites never learn from their old mistakes, that of resorting to assassination and coercion to silence those who oppose their erroneous line, their conspiratorial methods and their super-careerism. Chairman Amado Guerrero was already aware of the evil schemes of the Lavas as early as January 1967 because of certain revelations from Ignacio P. Lacsina.

The Lava revisionist renegades may do all the bragging about the ninety percent "proletarian and peasant" composition of their bogus central committee and bogus communist party. Such boasting has only invited non-communist people like Miss Liwayway T. Reyes, once misled into one of the Lavaite outfits, into

exposing publicly what has been carelessly told her by the Lava revisionists themselves in their short-sighted and narrow-minded campaign of slander against revolutionary leaders and the revolutionary mass movement. Her list of the Lavaite "central committeemen" reveals that they are unremolded bourgeois elements.

The Lava revisionist renegade clique has been increasingly in the grip of the reactionary armed forces. The surrender of Jesus Lava in 1964 was arranged by Francisco Lava, Jr. and Sr. through one of the Lavaite "central committeemen," Cipriano "Connie" Robielos who made use of his brother Cid, an agent of the PC Counter-Intelligence Unit. This was in coordination with efforts of Francisco Lava, Sr. to get assurances of "royal treatment" for his brother from Macapagal through the Social Security System medical officer and the late executive secretary Rufino Hechanova.

Godofredo Mallari and his clique within the MASAKA have been directly responsible for spying and informing on the remaining units of the old people's army on behalf of the reactionary government; for extorting and swindling the poor peasants under the cover of the MASAKA and in the name of the Communist Party of the Philippines since 1964 and even in the name of the New People's Army since early 1970 and for arranging with special murder units of the reactionary government like the "Monkees" under ex-Mayor Federico Taruc of San Luis, Pampanga in committing crimes of bloody intrigue.

The Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang, previously calling itself "Armeng Bayan" and now openly calling itself "Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan" after the disintegration of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, has been responsible for such wanton crimes as the massacres of innocent civilians in Angeles City on May 21, 1969; Porac, Pampanga on November 17, 1969; and in Bo. Sinipit, Bamban, Tarlac in February 1970. This criminal gang has lately extended its operations to Greater Manila and has participated in an increasing number of provocative acts, such as kidnapping, murder, demonstration-breaking, vandalism and mauling incidents. It is relevant here to refer to the criminal background of Briones, Diwa and Pasion. Briones is now a direct henchman of the vice-mayor of Victoria, Tarlac, Ed Rigor, a "retired" officer of the National Intelligence Coordinating Agency. Diwa was once a gangster agent of Sumulong and later earned the latter's ire in 1967 for not turning over funds mulcted from jeepney drivers in Angeles City. Pasion was a branch manager of a US company, was fired for personally appropriating 60,000 and then was accused of

murdering the company supervisor who discovered his anomalies in 1967. These three are old-time gangsters who provide goons for reactionary politicians in Central Luzon. These goons are drawn from putschist elements of yesteryears under the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership.

The Lava revisionist renegades cast a lot of invectives against the young Party members and concoct such stories as those concerning someone "separating the young from the old." Such puerile fabrications have only evoked derision for the fabricators. The rebuilding of the Communist Party of the Philippines is not merely a question of chronological age. Rejuvenation is not a question of cutting off the aged from the young but of new ideas and new forces replacing old worn-out ideas and forces. We follow Chairman Mao's teaching on the building and consolidation of a proletarian party: "A human being has arteries and veins through which the heart makes the blood circulate, and he breathes with his lungs, exhaling carbon dioxide and inhaling fresh oxygen, that is, getting rid of the stale and taking in the fresh. A proletarian party must also get rid of the stale and take in the fresh, for only thus can it be full of vitality. Without eliminating waste matter and absorbing fresh blood, the Party has no vigor."

Rejuvenation is also misrepresented by the Lava revisionist renegades as accommodating merely the "petty bourgeois students." It is beyond their knowledge today that there are in the re-established Communist Party of the Philippines a majority of youthful members of worker and peasant background. The upsurges of the revolutionary mass movement in both cities and countryside would not have been possible without these members, together with militant Party members of urban petty-bourgeois origin. There are also elderly Party members, many of whom came from the old merger party. It is gratifying to us for the Lava revisionist renegades to claim that there are "less than a dozen Party members" in the re-established Party. This means that they really do not know much about us and they can only make wild guesses about us. But being equally unknowledgeable about our Party, the US-Marcos clique has taken Lavaite propaganda for the truth and has taken punitive measures against targets of Lavaite false testimony.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippines includes a comrade who is in his late sixties and has been engaged in every phase of the armed struggle since the antifascist war of resistance. It also includes members who are youthful and who are middle-aged. They are of worker, peasant or urban petty-bourgeois origin. All Party members within and outside the Central

Committee are arduously remolding and tempering themselves as proletarian fighters through the living study and application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

The Lava revisionist renegades blame anyone and anything but themselves for the utter isolation and desperation that they have been driven to. The bulletin of anti-communism claims: The Mao Thought party claims to have been founded on December 26, 1968. However, its real origin can be traced a few years back. Fresh from Indonesia and ostensibly acting on orders from external elements, the original Amado Guerrero began his campaign for control of the Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas with the avowed purpose of converting it into a puppet of another Party. But he found no supporters among the veteran comrades to whom bitter experiences in the 1950s had taught valuable lessons about the danger of Left adventurism and subservience to external elements.

The Communist Party of Indonesia is being attacked here by these revisionist scoundrels. But inadvertently they imply that the criticism of their ideological, political and organizational line has gone on for quite some time. Then here comes their international revisionist spokesman William J. Pomeroy who takes occasion to slander the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China: "Unity was disrupted in 1967 onwards when a young leader of the Kabataang Makabayan, Jose M. Sison, developed a Maoist outlook, reinforced by several trips to People's China, following which he endeavored aggressively to swing the whole growing movement to a line of sharp confrontation and of armed struggle."

All Lavaite publications boast of having conducted "criticism and self-criticism and rectification." They refer to having as early as 1966 a document of rectification, the so-called "Thesis on the National Situation." There never was such a thing. But even if there was, assuming that the Lava revisionist renegades kept it to themselves, the best proof that there never had been any genuine criticism and self-criticism or rectification is that the Lavaites have remained basically counter-revolutionary Rightists and have even become since 1969 brazenly revisionist fascists.

It was within the five-man "executive committee" of the old merger party that a memorandum was being prepared, with three sections encompassing the international, national and Party situation as early as 1965. The drafts of the sections on the international and national situation were finished and presented

but the section on the Party situation was never presented before the "executive committee." Though a definite committee member was appointed by the "executive committee" to make a draft of the entire memorandum, Francisco Lava, Jr. suddenly "volunteered" to write the section on the Party situation only to sit on it, sabotage the completion of the entire memorandum and carried out unprincipled bickering with members of the "executive committee" preparatory to his completely disregarding the entire "executive committee" in his mad desire to convene his faction of modern revisionists and out-and-out enemy agents.

Now that the Lavaites realize that the name Lava no longer amounts to so much as political capital, the bulletin of anti-communism makes the gratuitous claim that the Lavaite "general secretary" is no longer a Lava. It prates: "Contrary to the oft-repeated charges of Guerrero and his minions, the present PKP Secretary-General is not a city-based intellectual but a comrade who comes from the working classes. He is the highest and most powerful official of our Party. Although we view family affiliation neither as an asset or liability, it can be stated as a matter of fact that he is not a Lava and he is not even remotely related to the Lava family.

Whether this "general-secretary" is Alejandro Briones, Godofredo Mallari, Antonio Santos, Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., Merlin M. Magallona, Gorgonio Narciso, Domingo Castro, Felicisimo Macapagal or who else since October 1970, there has been no basic change in the ideological, political and organizational line of the Lava revisionist renegade clique; as a matter of fact, this clique has become even more rabidly counter-revolutionary, engaging directly in heinous fascist crimes of vindictiveness. Deception is a notorious characteristic of the Lava revisionist renegades.

The Lava revisionist renegades claim that the "single file" policy of Jesus Lava was in the final analysis a good thing. They admit: "It is true, as Guerrero says, that for many years the lines of communication between the Secretary-General and the rank and file were ruptured." Then they argue like shysters: "That was a reality imposed upon the Party by conditions over which we have lost control and not, as he claims, the result of deliberate policy to 'liquidate' the Party organization." Blame the stars and not the noble motives of Jesus Lava! Finally, the revisionist scoundrels' resort to outright prevarication to support their contention that the "single file" policy was even a good thing. They conclude: "The present Central Committee (the Lavaite ringleaders) is critical of single

file, but it should also be noted that single file was no meant to be inflexible. In fact, several organs in the rural areas never ceased to function."

Then, going on with what they call self-criticism and rectification, the Lava revisionist renegades turn to abusing others about the "single file" policy: "This ambitious rattlesnake who spouts venom at Comrade Jesus Lava was in fact the most avid practitioner of single file to shield his protégés from contacts with older comrades, thereby cultivating their personal allegiance." But in BRPF's Struggle (January 1971), the Lava revisionist renegades contradict themselves by claiming to have opposed the "opening up of the movement leaving its doors wide open for infiltration by the enemy." The "enemy" that they refer to here is the youth in the revolutionary mass movement. We state that the best proof for the bankruptcy of the "single file" policy is the fact that in 1960 there was no longer any extant branch of the old merger party. Party life had been liquidated on a large scale by Jesus Lava. Even in Central Luzon, particularly in what was formerly Regional Command No. 2, there were only a few squads and half-squads of the old people's army. These were cut off from Jesus Lava and not one among them attended to party building. When the "executive committee" was formed in 1963, Jesus Lava had no shame in appointing two kinsmen of his who were isolated from the revolutionary mass movement and in using the name of Pedro Taruc to embellish the committee.

The Lava revisionist renegades boast of having broken from their isolation and of moving forward. But in fact they have become more notorious for opposing by deceit and by violence the revolutionary mass movement in cities and in the countryside. They rely on stale and worn-out elements who specialize in opposing the present revolutionary upsurges created by the new revolutionary forces. When we speak of new forces, we mean basically the revolutionary masses aroused and mobilized by proletarian revolutionary cadres inspired by and implementing the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in the concrete practice of the people's democratic revolution.

II. Lavaite putschists of yesteryears are new revisionist fascists

The Lava revisionist renegades have gone far in their degeneration. They have gone to the extent of committing the crimes of systematic informing, kidnapping, murder, killing rampages, extortion in the name of the Party and the people's army, organizing BSDUs, cattle-rustling, breaking-up of strikes and demonstrations, acts of vandalism and various other provocations in collusion

with the US-Marcos clique in their vile and rabid opposition to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and to the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army.

There is more than enough basis to assert the fact that the Lava revisionist renegades have become fascist agents of the US-Marcos clique. When they say that they also engage in "armed struggle" which is "secondary" to their parliamentary struggle, they actually mean criminally opposing the Communist Party, the New People's Army and the people and engaging in fascist activities consonant with their propaganda of supporting the US-Marcos clique against the national democratic movement. The Lava revisionist renegades have become agents of the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class.

There must be an explanation for this degeneration of ideological revisionism into fascist gangsterism. We have long recognized the class essence, social roots and varied manifestations of Lavaite revisionism in "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," in other basic Party documents and in critical comments carried by Ang Bayan. But for the first time we shall here present comprehensively the historical links of Lavaite revisionism and Right opportunism with the present phenomenon of Lavaite fascist gangsterism. It is not enough to speak of the inevitable growth of Khrushchovite social-pacifism into Brezhnevite social-imperialism and social-fascism; it is necessary to present the internal degeneration of the Lava revisionist renegade clique itself which now enjoys support from its social-imperialist masters and the US-Marcos clique.

In reaction to the revolutionary armed struggle being waged by the New People's Army under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the Lava revisionist renegades have formally declared that while their main form of struggle is parliamentary, they are also waging armed struggle as a secondary form. They have been compelled to draw their line in this manner in the face of the fact that they are losing ideological, political and organizational initiative everywhere, whether it be in the countryside or in the cities. They imagine that they can bluff people, but they are merely acknowledging that they have a small collection of ruffians whom they employ to carry out their counterrevolutionary line of violence against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the broad masses of the people.

Who are these ruffians and where do they come from? To answer this question fully, it is necessary to see through the seeming repudiation by present-day

Lavaites of the previous "Left" opportunist line carried out by Jose and Jesus Lava between 1948 and 1955. The Lavaites have not actually repudiated this "Left" opportunism but have put it into the service of their Rightism. What they have done is to reintegrate into their present organization a number of those putschist and lumpen proletarian elements that were the hatchet men of the Jose-Jesus Lava clique of yesteryears. These are the fascist gangsters of today who would commit any kind of heinous crime to support the counterrevolutionary revisionist line of the Lavaites. Such revisionist bureaucrats as Francisco Lava, Jr., Godofredo Mallari, Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., Gorgonio Narciso, Merlin M. Magallona and others sit on their asses dictating their Rightist line but they have such lumpen proletarian putschist elements as those of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang to perpetrate fascist crimes for them.

In their violent and malicious opposition to the national democratic mass organizations, there is nothing gained by them in informing on Carlos B. del Rosario or in actually kidnapping and murdering Francisco C. Sison and his driver Elpidio Morales. There is nothing gained by them in colluding with the fascist gangsters of the US-Marcos clique in the perpetration of the shooting rampages that resulted in the killing and wounding of scores of innocent civilians in Angeles City; Porac, Pampanga; and Barrio Sinipit, Bamban, Tarlac. The Lavaites have gained nothing but the more intense hatred of the broad masses of the people. No one has been cowed by a handful of fascist gangsters resorting to old putschist acts.

The Jose-Jesus Lava leadership of 1948-55 took the putschist and purely military viewpoint. It failed to give the correct ideological and political guidance to the old people's army and the revolutionary mass movement. In empty arrogance, it expressly opposed Chairman Mao's theory and practice of people's war in a semicolonial and semifeudal country though in mere form it usurped the phrase "new democracy." It did not care for painstaking mass work and propaganda, building the Party, building organs of political power and mass organizations, and conducting land reform and production.

The Jose-Jesus Lava leadership was wont to employ what is called "liquidation squads" to murder or coerce good cadres and members of the old merger party who questioned its line. Always arrogant, it always accused those who opposed it of the very careerism and conspiratorial methods of which it was guilty. It fabricated evidence or looked for the flimsiest excuse to impose the most severe punishment, including death, against Party cadres seriously critical of it. To

support itself mainly, it concocted the theory of "economic struggle." Under this fake theory, robbery and extortion, including the hold-up of ordinary bus and train passengers, were employed to "support" the revolution "so as not to increase the barrio people's burden." To implement this gangster theory, Jose and Jesus Lava raised such notorious gangsters as Nick Pamintuan, Boy Bulacan, Danny Pascual, Sumulong and Diwa to the level of "cadres" and "commanders."

Because of its putschist line based on the wrong analysis that it was already time in 1950 to launch a strategic offensive, the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership prematurely created large military formations and over-extended them in the most adventurist manner. It never entertained the idea that a genuine people's war would have to pass through the strategic phases of the defensive and stalemate before the strategic offensive. It flaunted and glorified the lumpen-proletarian and gangster style and carried it over into the rural areas on a large scale. It did not carry out revolutionary political work among the masses to prepare conditions for advance in the military field. It was obsessed with the erroneous idea of being able to seize political power in Manila within two years.

Even now, the Lava revisionist renegades consider as a "mere farce" of their past follies the step-by-step growth of the New People's Army and the great emphasis laid on the development of powerful mass support. They openly cheer the enemy campaigns of "encirclement and suppression" against the New People's Army and imagine to no end that the people have no more fighting force. They close their eyes to the fact that Task Force Lawin and the various PC commands are getting nowhere in their fascist campaign not only in Central Luzon but also in Northern Luzon. They refuse to recognize that guerrilla bases and guerrilla zones are also gradually emerging elsewhere.

During the time of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership, the people in entire barrios were considered enemy whenever the real enemy succeeded through coercion and deception in setting up "civilian guard units," the forerunners of the present BSDUs. Because the people's army was under instruction to seize nationwide victory within two years' time, so many armed units adopted the method of rushing the people and having no patience with what they considered "enemy" barrios. Doing the work of the enemy, so many units of the old people's army where command had been usurped by lumpen proletarian elements committed such putschist acts as massacre, arson, rape and robbery. It would be worthwhile to go into a detailed investigation of the excesses committed in the course of military attacks ordered by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership and determine how

large a part putschist abuses took in harming the interests of the broad masses of the people.

Even now, the Lava revisionist renegades are peddling the view that when BSDUs are set up in a barrio, the territory is permanently lost and the people there have become the "enemy" of the New People's Army. They foolishly mock the New People's Army for not making large-scale attacks, for employing the flexible guerrilla tactics of concentration, shifting and dispersion alternately. They refuse to recognize that the Party and the people's army are today isolating and destroying diehard BSDUs, including those set up by the MASAKA and the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang. They refuse to see the entire BSDUs that have justly killed their PC supervisors and gone over to the New People's Army with their arms. The Lava revisionist renegades give all credit to the US-Marcos clique and such scoundrels as Mayor Lino David and other diehard reactionaries.

The basic counterrevolutionary errors of the Lavas and Tarucs, when they were still lording over the people's army, were for some time covered up by the real abuses committed directly by the enemy, the utter rottenness of the entire enemy regime and the excellent objective conditions for making revolution after World War II. The enemy, however, got wise to the putschist weaknesses of the Lavas and Tarucs. After capturing the entire Political Bureau-In and Secretariat in Manila in October 1950, the enemy counterattacked by intensifying his strategic offensive. Among the major tactics he was able to employ was to dress up his troops as "Huks," commit the worst atrocities and blame these on the old merger party and people's army. Revolutionary cadres and members and genuine Red fighters and commanders suffered in effect in the hands of the open enemy and such hidden enemy as the Lavas and Tarucs.

During the debacle of the HMB, when so many heroes died and so many others withstood the assaults of the enemy and a number of units persisted in revolutionary struggle, there were many scoundrels who capitulated, informed on their former comrades and participated in the suppression of the revolutionary mass movement. The prematurely large military formations disintegrated. There came a sudden swing to the uncoordinated movement of roving rebel bands. Units of the old people's army which were not immediately crushed by the enemy were overextended, lacking in correct leadership and already isolated; many of them committed grave abuses just to be able to secure food for themselves and also committed acts of arrogance and vengeance on entire barrios where they were rebuffed. In due time, the people turned against those

who completely departed from the revolutionary path.

In 1954, Luis Taruc escaped from the Lavaite "liquidation squads" and landed on the lap of the enemy. Jesus Lava started to veer towards Luis Taruc's line of "peaceful struggle" in late 1954 but formally adopted parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle only in 1956 under the influence of Khrushchovite revisionism. It was only in limited areas in Central Luzon where armed struggle persisted. Year after year the central leadership of the old merger party increasingly lost contact with the remaining guerrilla units that were led by local cadres. In 1960, Jesus Lava was definitely left all to himself hiding in his small room in Manila.

In 1962, Comrade Hizon who was leading the remaining people's guerrillas of good standing made contact with Jesus Lava but was soon captured. The contact between the two was limited to Jesus Lava passing on his old "political transmissions" and asking for a large amount of money. It was after Comrade Hizon's capture that Sumulong was able to get hold of the senior cadre Pedro Taruc and used him to take over the people's guerrillas and to approve his gangster activities. A struggle emerged between good and bad elements within the old people's army. But Jesus Lava never lifted a finger to oppose Sumulong, save Pedro Taruc and support the good elements. What he did merely was first to include the name of Pedro Taruc as "secretary for peasants" in the 1963 "executive committee" and to appoint him in early 1964 as "general secretary" without the benefit of meeting his fellow members of the "executive committee." Soon in 1964 Jesus Lava surrendered to the enemy.

The conjecture of the professional anti-communist Alfredo Saulo that Jesus Lava "laid the ground work" for the upsurges of the revolutionary mass movement is without basis. Despite his line of parliamentary struggle, Jesus Lava failed to take advantage of the still limited anti-imperialist agitation among sections of the national bourgeoisie and urban petty bourgeoisie which trailed after Senator Claro Mayo Recto during the fifties. Nothing substantial came out of Lavaite efforts to make use of the Nationalist-Citizens Party, which practically disintegrated after the reactionary elections of 1957. And the National Progress Movement was an independent creation of such elements as Blas Ople and known personnel of the National Intelligence Coordinating Agency (NICA) who were close to President Carlos P. Garcia.

The MASAKA was organized in 1964 by certain persons led by Godofredo

Mallari, who either had been expelled from the old merger party during the late forties or surrendered to the reactionary government during the fifties. The organization of the MASAKA was not done under any directive of Jesus Lava. The organizers were merely contacted by Antonio Santos through a small study circle called "Tinig ng Bayan" and put in touch with the "executive committee" through Francisco Lava, Jr. in January 1965 long after Jesus Lava's surrender. Through the MASAKA, expellees and surrenderers were able to creep back into the old merger party. The Bulacan Farmers Association led by Romerico Flores, which had been previously affiliated with the Federation of Free Farmers and then the Philippine Labor Unity Movement, became affiliated with the MASAKA only several months after January 1965.

Since late 1964, the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique by all appearances had the people's guerrilla under its full control. But in 1965 two definite trends emerged to oppose the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique; one was the positive revolutionary trend represented by Comrade Delio and the other was the negative renegade trend represented by Alibasbas. Alibasbas brazenly went over to the side of the enemy and was promptly murdered together with his entire family by the very reactionary faction that had coddled him when another reactionary faction exposed "Huk-coddling" in connection with the 1965 elections. Comrade Delio died in battle before he could accomplish the task of leading the mass repudiation of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique but left behind enough revolutionary influence among the good elements who were later to be led by Comrade Dante against the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. On March 29, 1969, the Red commanders and fighters met to repudiate the clique, and were reconstituted into the New People's Army under the leadership of the re-established Communist Party of the Philippines.

Since 1964, the MASAKA clique masterminded by Godofredo Mallari has systematically established "branches" of the old merger party without the permission and supervision of the "executive committee" and collected into its fold dubious elements, including surrenderers, former agents of Magsaysay and active enemy agents. Some of these the Lava revisionist renegades may now choose to call "their partisan units" that have suddenly become "brave" only after the disintegration of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. In 1965, the persistent enemy role of Mallari and his clique was already evident when they contacted and manipulated Alibasbas through Maximo Lacanilao ostensibly against the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. During the same year, Mallari also dispatched Domingo Castro and Felicisimo Macapagal to the Taruc-Sumulong gangster

clique ostensibly to ask for funds for a "plantation" project in Isabela but actually to double-deal with and spy on this clique.

In 1966, after it felt blessed with authority from the Lavas, the Mallari clique more vigorously set up "branches" of the old merger party through the MASAKA especially in Nueva Ecija. Under the pretext of fighting the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, the Mallari clique brazenly ordered its men to fight the people's guerrillas without making distinction between the good and bad elements, to borrow arms from the Philippine Constabulary and the 10th BCT and enlist as informers in order to "protect" themselves.

When Francisco Lava, Jr. was told about the fact that leading organizers of the MASAKA like Jose Parungao, Ben Catanghal and "Commander" Villamor had been surrenderers-turned-government-informers, he boasted of his own connections with agents of the Counter-Intelligence Unit of the PC and gave further encouragement to the implementation of what he called the policy of "infiltration." The Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism confirms this policy today with the following statement: "Parliamentary struggle does not mean putting up candidates for elective positions in order to transform the nature of the neocolonial government. It simply means laying stress on infiltration of public institutions...."

The Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang eventually became the core of all MASAKA elements who "infiltrated" the reactionary armed forces under the pretext of fighting Sumulong but in fact attacking all the people's guerrillas without distinction. This gang brought together two major types of ruffians: those who had surrendered to the reactionary government and betrayed the revolutionary masses when the 1950 "Left" opportunist policy collapsed and those who had turned to various nefarious activities and enjoyed the protection of such bureaucrat capitalists as Rafael del Rosario of Angeles City. From the very outset, the MASAKA membership card served as a military pass in Central Luzon and served to exempt its bearer from brutal action by the enemy armed forces engaged in campaigns of "encirclement and suppression."

It was only several months after it became publicly known that the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique had been repudiated and the New People's Army had been formed under the leadership of the re-established Communist Party of the Philippines that the Lava revisionist renegades started to boast in whispers of having an "army" of their own for "secondary" purposes, the Armeng Bayan.

The existence of this "pro-Soviet army" was first publicly noted in the Symington Report.

The New People's Army gained a full picture of the role and history of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang only in May 1970 when the MASAKA secretary for the whole province of Tarlac (Bartolome Pasion), the MASAKA secretary of Bamban, Tarlac (who was called "Commander" Villamor) and other criminal agents of the reactionary armed forces and at the same time of the Lava revisionist renegades were discovered to have committed the crimes of bloody intrigue, crimes calculated mainly to slander the New People's Army.

The crimes of bloody intrigue included the shooting rampages in Angeles City on May 21, 1969, in Porac, Pampanga on November 17, 1969 and on a lesser scale in other towns of Pampanga and Nueva Ecija which resulted in the killing and wounding of several scores of innocent civilians including women and children. In these crimes, the ruffian method of "spraying" homes and crowds with automatic gunfire was employed. The senseless killings were mainly attributed to the New People's Army as acts of vengeance against the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique by the rumormongering Lava revisionist renegades, especially the Mallari clique within the MASAKA, and the reactionary military "psywar" experts through the reactionary press.

The senseless killings were committed with the collusion of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang, "Monkees" under ex-Mayor Federico Taruc of San Luis, Pampanga and former policemen under ex-Mayor Rafael del Rosario of Angeles City. It was a collusion between the Lavaite MASAKA and Task Force Lawin, pure and simple. Their common evil purpose was to make it appear that "Dante and Sumulong were destroying each other."

The New People's Army discovered the truth in the course of investigating the murder of two small children and a young girl in Barrio Sinipit of Bamban, Tarlac in February 1970. The homes of the barrio people were sprayed with gunfire by a group of masked armed men. What immediately caught the attention of the investigators of the New People's Army was that the men were masked (indicating that at least someone from the barrio or an adjacent barrio was involved) and that the source of rumormongering to the effect that the culprits were "Sumulong men" was traced to the few MASAKA members in Bamban, Tarlac. Acting on the basis of these and other clues, the New People's Army arrested suspects. Those arrested revealed more than enough about the

criminal activities of the Lava revisionist renegades. From then on, the Party had always spoken of the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-MASAKA (Lava) gang and its crimes of bloody intrigue.

When punishment was justly meted out to "Commander" Villamor, a "cadre" of the Lava revisionist renegades, AFP headquarters posthumously praised him in a press release as a reliable agent of Task Force Lawin and credited him with the murder of seven fighters and the capture of three commanders of the people's army in his lifetime. It is a matter of official record that he surrendered to Magsaysay in 1953 and from then on became a cheap enemy informer. But he became MASAKA secretary of Bamban, Tarlac. There is nothing surprising about this because he is no different from such notorious traitors and surrenderers as Godofredo Mallari, Domingo Castro and Felicísimo Macapagal who are among the ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegade clique.

The bloody crimes of intrigue have been confirmed by the editorial staff of the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism in an oblique way, in the manner of double-talk. Here it is: "It may be noted that despite the violent encounters last year, the PKP maintains good relations with ordinary NPA partisans..." (Underscoring ours.) The Lava revisionist renegades would rather describe as "encounters" with the New People's Army the shooting rampage undertaken by them against innocent civilians; the succeeding punishment of their criminal agents and the ambushes launched against certain BSDUs in Bamban, Tarlac and Mabalacat, Pampanga found to be accomplices of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang.

Party cadres and units of the New People's Army have made a more extensive investigation into the criminal activities of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang and have discovered that this gang has engaged in espionage on the Party and the New People's Army, in outright extortion and collection of "contributions" from the people in the name of the Party and the people's army, especially in Nueva Ecija, eastern Pampanga, northern Bulacan and Bataan. Also, it is engaged in robbery and cattle-rustling in combination with notorious gangsters under the late Ricardo Lim (ex-policeman of Angeles City) and with the "Pitong Gatang" gang. The crimes being committed by the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang are obviously a resurrection of the old Lavaite policy of "economic struggle."

Grossly underestimating its own readers, the bulletin of anti-communism proceeds to dish up another lie about Lavaite magnanimity: "On one occasion, a unit led by Comrade Diwa himself attacked from the rear a contingent of the

puppet army so that an encircled NPA squad may be able to escape." So, it has become one of the "secondary" tasks of the Lava revisionist renegades to help out squads of the New People's Army! These Lavaite scoundrels are shallow tricksters. The truth is that the petty bandit Diwa has his living and sleeping quarters at the headquarters of the 10th BCT and command posts of Task Force Lawin when he is not in Manila under the protection of ex-Mayor Rafael del Rosario or the yellow labor leader Ignacio P. Lacsina who resides in a favorite housing area of reactionary military officers.

But even in their propaganda, the Lavaite revisionist renegades are not consistent. The same issue of the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism echoes a canard from Task Force Lawin: "Arthur Garcia...was liquidated by Dante's followers." The BRPF's Struggle calumniates the entire New People's Army. Its January 1971 issue states: "It would be a secondary task of the revolutionary movement to expose pseudo-revolutionary groups now collaborating with the CIA-managed anti-Marcos camp like...that bunch of surrenderers...the NPA." Its July 1971 issue states: "And now the NPA is reduced to a sorry band which specializes in terrorizing the people of Isabela." Another passage runs along the same line: "It seems that the NPA (more appropriately called the New People's Assassins) finds it more efficient to liquidate those whom they cannot persuade to toe their counter-revolutionary line." The Lavaites have always proven themselves to be the cheap propagandists of Task Force Lawin.

Since the exposure of the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-MASAKA (Lava), the diehard minions of the Lava revisionist renegades who have dared to remain in Central Luzon have become out-and-out and diehard members of BSDUs. Right now, it is clear that a certain number of diehard BSDUs in Angeles City, Mabalacat, San Fernando, Magalang and Arayat of Pampanga and Cabiao and San Antonio of Nueva Ecija belong to the Lavaite MASAKA. These are being used for criminal activities like extortion, robbery, cattle-rustling and kidnapping for ransom by the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang. Godofredo Vergara, a Lavaite "cadre" and hatchet man of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang is the direct organizer of several BSDUs and the most notorious BSDU chieftain in Central Luzon. Among the first BSDUs in Isabela is one organized by a handful of MASAKA and MPKP members in Barrio Bannawag of Jones, Isabela. The principal Lavaite agent in Isabela is a certain Atty. Fernandez who is a corrupt lawyer and a loan shark who is now often seen in the company of PC officers.

The Lava revisionist renegade clique boasts of its "peasant" strength in the

countryside by claiming the membership of MASAKA as its "mass base." It is to the credit of these counterrevolutionary pests that robbery, cattle-rustling, extortion and other crimes against the barrio people prevail in the very same areas where they have a "strong mass base." Professional gangsters that they are, they even brag about such "revolutionary methods" of organizing the people as stealing the people's carabaos and other property and promising to return them if they join the MASAKA; using the name of the New People's Army in areas where they want to gain a foothold and later slandering the Party and the people's army after their preliminary efforts; and threatening with death those who refuse to join their counterrevolutionary antipeople organization.

In Greater Manila, the Lava revisionist renegades have shamelessly participated in the breaking up of demonstrations, marches and strikes. They have colluded openly with the agents of the US-Marcos clique in making various provocations even as they piously talk about peace and proper decorum and slander the militant masses as "adventurists," "petty bourgeois revolutionists," "romanticists" and the like. They commit criminal acts of vandalism against the property of ordinary people and the urban petty bourgeoisie to blame these on national democratic mass organizations. They have resorted to every trick to discredit and disrupt the national democratic movement and prepare the ground for the fascist suppression of national democratic mass organizations. To hear the Lavaites talk and to see them act is to hear echoes from the US-Marcos clique and to see the fascist agents of the US-Marcos clique.

It is part of a fascist conspiracy between the Lava revisionist renegades and the US-Marcos clique that the former have made the outburst of anti-communist publications and articles since the latter part of last year all calculated to implicate legal personalities and legal and non-communist mass organizations with the underground. Jesus Lava was the first to "confirm" Jose Ma. Sison as Amado Guerrero. Then he was followed by the US imperialist agent William J. Pomeroy who wrote the following in the revisionist journal Peace, Freedom and Socialism (December 1970): Jose M. Sison has presumed to usurp the name of the Communist Party of the Philippines ("reorganized")...The Sison group makes use of...Kabataang Makabayan, and has associated itself with an armed group in a small area of Central Luzon, mainly limited to a corner of the Province of Tarlac, which it calls the New People's Army.

One after another the traitor publications of the Lava revisionist renegades were widely circulated in Manila. The January 1971 issue of BRPF's Struggle

declares: Sison proceeded to organize a conspiracy to overthrow the leadership of the Movement, of which he was, by the way, a part. He talked to the masses of KM and Masaka members in the countryside and he thought they were on his side after he conferred with their leaders.

Other passages seek to implicate other non-communist organizations: But then the renegade KM and its allies, especially the infantile SDK subverted this democratic method of exercising leadership and captured it for themselves; and in the process converting the MDP into a dictatorship of the KM, its allies and sympathizers.

KM efforts to paint the MDP as a "united front of all progressive organizations" are fruitless because practically all MDP members are either KM chapters given different names, memberless groups, or KM controlled organizations....

Then the February 1971 issue of the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism states categorically: "...The Party actively assisted him (Jose Ma. Sison) in building Kabataang Makabayan." In this regard, we can see that the Lava revisionist renegades will invent anything to bring down any person or organization to their level. They fancy themselves as the big patrons of revolution but they only succeed in bringing out their true character as mendacious and cheap paid witnesses of the reactionary state.

It is absolutely clear that the Lava revisionist renegades have turned into bloodthirsty revisionist fascists. They would fabricate anything to serve their imperialist and reactionary masters and they flaunt their license given them by the US-Marcos clique to assert their "authority" in their bogus communist party. To Jesus Lava and his kind belong the historical distinction of having pressed for the inclusion of Jose Ma. Sison in the wanted list of the reactionary armed forces and encouraging the reactionary forces to attack the national democratic movement.

What proved fatal to Carlos B. del Rosario, outstanding leader of the Movement for a Democratic Philippines, is the following passage from the BRPF's Struggle: "Sison had managed to create a clique within the movement led by him. Members of this clique included Nilo Tayag, Arthur Garcia, Carlos del Rosario, Jose Luneta and others." In the context of the Lavaite article, "movement" means the old merger party and "clique" means the re-established Communist Party of the Philippines. In a press statement towards the end of January 1971, the labor

aristocrat and Marcos agent Ignacio P. Lacsina "confirmed" the above particular reference to Carlos B. del Rosario by claiming that the latter was a "personal representative" of Jose Ma. Sison in his organization. Lacsina spoke out of spite against the national democratic movement and del Rosario because a number of trade unions had bolted out of his outfit after having discovered Lacsina's counterrevolutionary practices.

What proved fatal to Francisco C. Sison and his driver Elpidio Morales on May 24, 1971 was the following passage in the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism: "A hunted guerrillero can even evade the enemy for a long time by hiding among relatives or a few trusted friends outside of the area of operation." The Lava revisionist renegades obdurately refuse to recognize the fact that Jesus Lava remains today a negative example for his flightism and other errors. They insist: have left the countryside to surround the city from the comfort and safety of their suburban homes. "Makibaka, Huwag Matakot" meant "Huwag kayong matakot, kami lang ang tatakbo."

Under the erroneous belief that the principal object of their spite is somewhere in Manila, they have resorted to a series of fascist crimes in collusion with the US-Marcos clique against those whom they have calculated to have knowledge of his whereabouts.

Francisco, a mere brother of Jose Ma. Sison, had also been previously the object of spite by the BRPF's Struggle although this person had never had any pretensions to being revolutionary unlike the Lava revisionist renegades who themselves hold highly-paid posts in the reactionary government. There are passages in the June 12, 1971 issue of the Lavaite Sang-ayon sa MAN admitting in an oblique manner that the Lava revisionist fascists have been responsible for the dastardly crime of kidnapping and murder. One passage is very revealing: "Lightning is far more clear than thunder which deafens but is empty. Don't be piqued, Sison!" What the Lava revision fascists mean is that their fascist crimes are clearer than the revolutionary propaganda being waged among the people. The revisionist fascist scoundrels do not realize that their total exposure is a preparation for their actual doom in the hands of the revolutionary masses.

The fascist character of the Lava revisionist renegades has become evident in Greater Manila since the first quarter storm of 1970. They have openly displayed their firearms in public and have been desperately trying to provoke leaders and mass activists of the national democratic movement, especially the youth

movement. They brandish cockily the license that they enjoy from the present ruling faction in the reactionary state.

These Lava revisionist fascists have not learned the negative examples of Alibasbas and Sumulong who were eaten up by the very enemy that coddled them as they became isolated and useless in their role as special enemy agents and even before the revolutionary masses could directly punish them. The reactionaries may eat them up as fast as the present ruling faction is replaced by another or even earlier than expected by any reactionary faction. Even within the reactionary armed forces, there are factions trying to eat up each other. No one will be surprised if one of these days any one of these factions eat up the Lava revisionist fascists. Our policy is to intensify anti-imperialist, antirevisionist and antifascist propaganda and thereby hasten the utter isolation and destruction of the Lava revisionist fascists. The main point now is to advance steadily wave upon wave in the countryside and wipe out all agents of fascism, revisionist or otherwise.

The US-Marcos clique should not be too happy about the special service that the Lava revisionist renegades are rendering to it. Both the US-Marcos clique and the Lava revisionist fascists will pay a heavy political price for every crime that they commit and for every victim of their madness. The most important thing is to arouse and mobilize the masses against these traitors. We cannot be deterred by fascist crimes, whether these are committed by the US-Marcos clique directly or through the Lava revisionist fascists. The Party has done well in ridding itself of the Lavaites ideologically, politically and organizationally and is determined to obliterate them.

III. The Lavaite philosophy of "interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena"

The muddle-headedness for which the Lava revisionist renegades have become notorious springs from a bourgeois idealist philosophical outlook. Their philosophy is best expressed in their bulletin of anti-communism in the following pontification: "Dialectics examines concretely the interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena in the total process of development."

There are two inanities in this pontification which prove beyond doubt that the Lavaites are fake communists to the core. First, dialectics is misrepresented as the examination of interconnection, instead of being the struggle of mutually

exclusive opposites or the cognition of such struggle. Second, contradiction is misrepresented as "seeming." Contradiction in things or phenomena is denied. Metaphysics is decked out as materialist dialectics.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "Contradiction exists in the process of development of all things and that in the process of development of each thing a movement of opposites exists from beginning to end." "All things invariably divide into two." "The law of contradiction in things, that is, the law of the unity of opposites, is the basic law of materialist dialectics." (On Contradiction) The great Lenin pointed out: "The splitting of a single whole and the cognition of its contradictory parts is the essence of dialectics." (On the Question of Dialectics) "In brief, dialectics can be defined as the doctrine of the unity of opposites. This embodies the essence of dialectics, but it requires explanation and development." (Conspectus of Hegel's Book The Science of Logic) Chairman Mao teaches us further: The law of the unity of opposites is the fundamental law of the universe. This law operates universally, whether in the natural world, in human society, or in man's thinking. Between the opposites in a contradiction there is at once unity and struggle, and it is this that impels things to move and change. (On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People)

Engels pointed out: Dialectics has proved from the results of our experience of nature so far that all polar opposites in general are determined by the mutual action of the two opposite poles on each other, that the separation and opposition of these poles exists only within their mutual connection and union, and conversely, that their union exists only in their separation and their mutual connection in their opposition. (Dialectics of Nature)

Finally, Chairman Mao teaches us: In society as in nature, every entity invariably breaks up into its different parts, only there are differences in content and form under concrete conditions. (Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work)

Basing ourselves on the great Marxist philosophers themselves, we find the Lavaite philosophy of "interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena" to be an idealist and metaphysical nonsense. The bourgeois idealism expounded by the Lava revisionist renegades is the worst variety of the reactionary philosophy of "combine two into one." It does not only put up the "interconnection," "unity" or "identity" as absolute but also completely goes in an outright manner against the grain of the entire materialist philosophy which is

that contradiction is not seeming but real.

No amount of verbal hocus-pocus can extricate the Lava revisionist renegades from their self-exposure as fake communists. To pound on the true meaning and essence of materialist dialectics, let us repeatedly quote the great Lenin whom they patronizingly call a "competent dialectician" and whose name they often invoke to attack Marxism-Leninism. The great Lenin states: "In its proper meaning, dialectics is the study of contradiction existing in an entity." Reiterating himself, he also stated: "The knowledge that a united thing is divisible into two, one contradicting the other...is the substance of dialectics." "All phenomena and processes have a tendency toward contradiction, opposition and mutual repulsion." All these Leninist statements are diametrically opposed to the Lavaite pontification that: "Dialectics examines concretely the interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena in the total process of development."

Have we made ourselves clear against the fake communists? We are dialectical materialists and we are bound by the revolutionary philosophy of "one divides into two" (a phrase drawn from the great Lenin and elaborated on by Chairman Mao). We hold that the nature of anything is the contradictoriness within it. There is nothing in the world that cannot be separated into its tendencies or aspects. There is no motion that is not contradiction, whether this be physical, chemical, biological, social or cognitive motion. It is the internal contradiction in things that determines their nature and also impels their development.

In the unity of opposites, the struggle of opposites is absolute while the unity or identity is relative and conditional. The fundamental concern of dialectics is the separability of aspects in things. This is true in analysis as well as in synthesis. Analysis is clearly concerned with the different aspects in a thing. Regarding synthesis, however, there are still those confused about it. But holding firmly to the absoluteness of struggle or the universality of contradiction, to the truth that contradiction operates in every process and at every stage of any process, we assert that contradiction is in synthesis, from analysis to synthesis is development which leads to further development. Synthesis involves "one eating up the other" in simple language. Otherwise, we fall into the pit of Hegelian synthesis or idealism. A denial of the universality of contradiction is a denial of development, the contradiction between the new and the old and the replacement of old contradictions with new contradictions.

If we fail to recognize the absolute character of the struggle between opposites, we fail to recognize the motive power for the development of things. External mechanical "integration" would supplant "knowing the source of self-motion." If this fallacy is pursued to the end, it will lead to such Lavaite confusion as attributing every development in the revolutionary mass movement to the "primary power of propulsion" of US imperialism which the Lavaites consider almighty and ever capable of fooling and splitting revolutionaries for its own benefit. It leads to the pit of mysticism, even to the existence of a "deity."

In the editorial of their bulletin of anti-communism, the Lava revisionist renegades complain about the "reduction into simplistic formulas and colorful slogans of the complex laws of revolutionary struggle" by the Communist Party of the Philippines and the national democratic mass organizations. They presume that they are the geniuses upon whom the masses must rely to unravel the "mysteries" of revolutionary struggle. They fancy themselves as the prophets who shall still have to write the scriptures for us to follow. They do not recognize the objective reality of unprecedented mass movements and they have the temerity to call the revolutionary line and slogans against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism as nothing but the work of "Hitler and Goebbels." They seem not to recognize that the great masses of the people are holding up antirevisionist placards, signifying a very high level of political consciousness. They would rather consider their repudiation from the revolutionary mass movement as the work of US imperialism than of genuine revolutionaries who ally themselves with such distinct forces as the semiproletariat and the urban petty bourgeoisie but who fiercely oppose revisionist saboteurs masquerading as communists.

Spiteful of the revolutionary mass movement, the Lava revisionist renegades mix up things in line with their reactionary philosophy of "combine two into one." Claiming to have some "reliable" information from the sanctum sanctorum of the CIA, probably "infiltrated" by the intelligence bureau headed by Antonio Santos, they prate with all the malice that they can command that the national democratic mass organizations and the New People's Army are together with the clerico-fascists and Jesuits in a CIA plot to topple down Marcos, the fascist puppet chieftain of US imperialism. At one time, the Lava revisionist renegades put out a manifesto foretelling January 25, 1971 as the day when the plotters would make a coup d'etat to depose Marcos. It turned out that the Lava revisionist renegades and the clerico-fascists were respectively taking "take-a-leave-of-absence" and "stay-at-home" policy on that date. The New People's

Army did not enter Manila on that date but the national democratic mass organizations consistently braved the enemy and continued to attack US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism in a peaceful demonstration of protest.

The Lava revisionist renegades have a wrong world outlook which affects all their political ideas. Because they are anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist bourgeois idealists, they always talk of "absolute unity" and "absolute identity." They fail to deal with concrete material reality. They characteristically fail to pose a problem, and analyze it, dividing it correctly into its aspects to grasp the solution within the problem. They wish to turn revolutionary struggle into a mystery. To bamboozle people, they always talk of the "complex," "combining various forms" and other such terms. So, when they are compelled to divide things into their aspects, they fail to distinguish correctly the principal aspect from the secondary aspect. When pressed hard on the question of whether armed struggle or parliamentary struggle is the principal form of struggle, they first try to talk in the abstract and in a most circuitous manner about the "interconnection" of the two and then finally they state the revisionist line that parliamentary struggle is the principal form of struggle in the Philippine revolution. Jesus Lava pontificates in his "Paglilinaw sa `Philippine Crisis": "The forms of struggle do not contradict each other; different forms of struggle can exist at the same time and together." [Underscoring ours.] This is a classic statement of stupidity by one who pretends to know his Marxism; he certainly qualifies as the theorist of Camp Crame. It is absolutely wrong to say that different forms of struggle do not contradict each other though it is correct to say that different forms of struggle can exist at the same time and together.

In the notorious revisionist journal, Peace, Freedom and Socialism (December 1970) the US imperialist agent Pomeroy trumpets the line of the bogus communist party of the Lava revisionist renegades in the following manner: Among its present tasks the Communist Party of the Philippines includes: explaining to the Filipino masses that they have no alternative but to respond in better measures to the organized violence of the enemies of the revolution, preparing for and developing the most varied forms of struggle,...

In World Outlook (January 1971) Pomeroy also states: In the Philippines, where the situation is very complex, a combination of many forms of struggle is occurring, both legal and illegal, both peaceful and armed struggle. A fight to gain legality for the Communist-led liberation forces does not contradict the

building of the broadest kind of anti-imperialist unity. Peaceful demonstrations in cities and towns do not contradict armed struggle in parts of the countryside... This passage tries to beg a question but only succeeds in being a clear demonstration of the confusion of the Lava revisionist renegades. They wish to beg for legality for the Communist Party from the reactionary state, to pledge the liquidation of armed struggle, and still think that they can still have armed struggle, too, under present conditions in the Philippines.

The Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism or rather Eduardo Lachica's "well-schooled theoretician educated in England" rails against Chairman Amado Guerrero: Again, the self-appointed champion of ideological purity counterposes two inter-connected aspects of revolutionary strategy. He declares the armed struggle as the only means of liberation and condemns as "revisionist" the use of other forms of struggle.

It is correct to counterpoise the interconnected aspects of armed struggle and parliamentary struggle. If one does not make any counter posing, it would be impossible to determine what is the principal aspect and what is the secondary aspect. To determine the principal aspect in contradictory aspects is not a "scholastic" approach as the Lava revisionist renegades claim. When we speak of armed revolution being the only road or the only means for national and social liberation, we are merely adhering to the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and revolution, recognizing the violent nature of imperialism and all reactionaries and learning the lessons provided by more than one hundred years of proletarian revolutionary struggle.

However, we have never said that we are absolutely against parliamentary struggle. As a matter of fact, it is the re-established Communist Party of the Philippines that is leading the peaceful and legal struggles in cities, provincial capitals and towns today. It is not the Lava revisionist renegades. On the other hand, these scoundrels have made it their major task to "identify" Communists from among the revolutionary masses for the benefit of the reactionary state. What we consider as revisionist is not parliamentary struggle subordinated to and serving armed struggle but parliamentary struggle being the sole or "main" form of struggle in the concrete conditions of the Philippines today and at this stage of world revolution. We shall discuss this more extensively under another section.

The Lavaite revisionist renegades are capable of "splitting" things but only in the

manner of mechanistic itemization serving their reactionary purpose of "combining two into one." William J. Pomeroy in his general introduction to the revisionist compilation *Guerrilla Warfare and Marxism*, states: Force...in their view (that of Marx and Engels) as in the view of outstanding Marxists who have followed them...encompassed the great variety of forms that working class struggles take: mass demonstrations, general strikes, and even the relatively passive boycott, as well as armed uprisings (and in particular, combination of all these.)

The actual purpose in this passage is to obscure armed struggle as being merely "one among so many" and to "combine two into one," combine armed struggle and parliamentary struggle into a mystical unity.

Another passage from Pomeroy runs in the following manner: The prominence of armed struggle in liberation movements in many countries should not obscure the fact that independence from imperialist rule has been gained in a large number of cases by other means, including general strikes, mass demonstrations and political organization and agitation that has made popular sentiment undeniably clear.

Pomeroy wants the liquidation of armed struggle under the pretext and fabrication that genuine independence from imperialist rule can be peacefully achieved.

In his article, "Paglilinaw sa `Philippine Crisis'," Jesus Lava also tries to drown out the significance of feudalism as the social base of imperialism in the Philippines by enumerating so many things which are at any rate mere itemization of the manifestations of US imperialism. Here is the pertinent passage: In the era of neocolonialism, especially in the era of surging new democratic revolution, the imperialists try to supplement or change its basic forces since it is not enough to rely on the force of the feudal landlord. The imperialists try to realize these supplementary forces from various social ranks, from the military rank through "military assistance," "mutual defense," PX, "training in the US," etc.; from the rank of the intellectuals and students, by means of scholarships in the US, "exchange professorships," etc.; from the capitalist comprador, through new "trade preferences," (like sugar); from the bureaucrat capitalists, by means of direct and indirect bribery; from the workers, through labor centers, trade union "aid" from US trade unions, junkets to whatever conferences, etc.; and from the peasants, through land reform, PRRM,

rural development, 4-H clubs, rural credit facilities, etc. The above enumeration is made to support the following conclusion: It is obvious that feudalism is not the social base of imperialism; imperialism can exist even without the so-called social base, and it even actually becomes the fuse endangering imperialist domination of the country.

So the Lava revisionist renegades expect US imperialism to fulfil for the peasant masses the main content of the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines. To serve their merging with US imperialism, the Lava revisionist renegades think wishfully that the US imperialists can "split" the peasant masses from the people's democratic revolution.

The Lava revisionist renegades mix up things. The US imperialists are made out to be antifeudalists. The clerico-fascists and "peace-loving US industrialists" are mixed up with workers, peasants, professionals and local factory owners as being similarly desirous of "no joking" genuine land reform. With its characteristic bluster, the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism imagines that in the succeeding passage it can stack its own cards against Chairman Amado Guerrero: counter poses reform and revolution, as if they are mutually exclusive categories. not equate the struggle for reforms with reformism; neither does he counter pose reform and revolution.

Chairman Amado Guerrero has always sharply counter posed the reformism of the Lava revisionist renegades and the people's democratic revolution being carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines. In Philippine Society and Revolution, he devotes a section to a comprehensive discussion of the kinship of reformism and revisionism. For the sake of argument, let us grant that somewhere our Party chairman counter posed reform and revolution. So now, we state categorically that it is correct to counter pose reform and revolution. The contradiction between the two is real and it is not an "as if." There is certainly a great difference between a mechanical series of reforms and the whole process of revolution. Between the idea of reform and that of revolution, there is a difference and a contradiction. There is also certainly a difference and contradiction between campaigning for the election of delegates to the 1971 constitutional convention and arousing the peasant masses to build local organs of political power.

Lenin does not equate the struggle for reforms and reformism. Certainly, there is a great difference between the struggle for reforms and reformism which is the

use of reforms or even only the idea of reforms to deceive the people and lead them away from revolution. It is to slander Lenin for the Lava revisionist renegades to claim that he does not counter pose reform and revolution; there is still a contradiction between the two even if reform, like wage increases gained through a militant strike, is made to serve the revolutionary awakening and advance of the proletariat. It is wrong to recognize only the identity of things or aspects. It is correct to recognize their contradictoriness in order to grasp their law of motion. In considering reforms, it is necessary to recognize those which can be used to serve the revolution and those which cannot be used and which even harm the revolution. In considering a kind of reform that can be used to serve the revolution, it is also necessary to recognize that it has an aspect that may be used to serve the revolution and another aspect that harms the revolution. It is unmitigated reformism and revisionism for Ang Gabay to proclaim: "To a revolutionary, reform and revolution are interrelated and one cannot be emphasized at the expense of the other." To a revolutionary, a certain reform can be good only when it can be used to serve the revolution. Only a reformist or a revisionist will consider reform coequal to revolution and will refuse to consider revolution superior to any kind of reform.

In concrete reference to the puny Lavaite outfit with the pompous name, Confederation of Trade Unions of the Philippines, it is completely reformist and counter-revolutionary for it to declare in its "The Stand of the Confederation of Trade Unions" published by Sang-ayon sa MAN that "it does not advocate the use of force as the weapon of the working-class struggle." Only a Leo Hubermann or a John Strachey will write such nonsense. Such a line confines the working class to the winning of reforms. As the great Lenin said: "...the Marxists wage a most resolute struggle against the reformists who, directly or indirectly, confine the aims and activities of the working class to the winning of reforms."

Among certain reforms in a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines, there is a basic contradiction between the Agricultural Land Reform Code peddled by the MASAKA under the Lava revisionist renegades and the genuine land reform made possible by the armed political power of the peasantry under the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary party, the Communist Party of the Philippines. The matter of land reform is released from the realm of reformism or of being a mere economic measure and nothing more when it serves and is linked with the revolutionary armed struggle for people's democracy against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The

Lava revisionist renegades are guilty of reformism in making the implementation of the Agricultural Land Reform Code their main activity in the countryside even as they have already acknowledged this code as an instrument of US imperialism.

Always insulting the masses, the Lava revisionist renegades have also tried to peddle the idea that socialist China is no different from Soviet social-imperialism or that there is no conflict between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. They even go to the extent of misrepresenting the diplomatic relations between two states with different social systems or the negotiations concerning Soviet aggression against the Chinese people and territory as the dissolution of fundamental contradictions between Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and modern revisionism.

The Lavaite Sang-ayon sa MAN (February 15) chatters: But now both the Chinese and Russia are beginning to understand each other. In fact, they have exchanged ambassadors. It is not surprising that in the not-too-distant future, these will agree on the view that imperialism is their common die-hard enemy. Supposing that they agree, what will the ardent pro-China say?

The glossier Lavaite Political Review (March 1971) takes up the same theme: It is with optimism that all the anti-imperialists view the current efforts on both sides (China and Soviet Union) to resolve the conflict, as they hope that success towards this end will project with greater clarity once more the need for unity in the struggle against imperialism.

The core of the Lavaite philosophy of "interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena" or "combine two into one" lies in merging contradictions; combining Marxism with revisionism; liquidating revolutionary struggle; mixing up friends with enemies; supporting US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism; making no distinction between socialism on one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other.

Let us pursue the Lavaite notion of combining genuine Marxism and sham Marxism and also socialism and social-imperialism. In the end, what do the Lavaites say when the real contradiction persists against their hypocritical wishes?

The Political Review further states: "This ('Sino-Soviet dispute') gives a hint at

the alienation of one socialist country from another, to the benefit of the imperialist camp..." It also states: "By any measure, the Sino-Soviet dispute is an unfortunate development that has profoundly affected the world-wide struggle against the forces of imperialism and reaction."

Because they refuse to recognize the fundamental contradiction in what they call the Sino-Soviet dispute, the Lavaites are led to the gloomy conclusion that US imperialism has been benefited by the split between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. To this day, in complete opposition to the great theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and in complete opposition to the fact that revolution is the main trend in the world today, the Lavaites consider the split between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism unfortunate. On the other hand, we consider it fortunate. Modern revisionism is what is unfortunate. The advance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is fortunate. Never has the world anti-imperialist struggle been better than now. Only revisionist renegades will sadden in the face of the surging revolutionary mass movements because they have placed themselves on the side of counterrevolution.

The Lava revisionist renegades say that the split between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism is bad. We say that it is good. It is good for China and for the whole world. It is good for the Philippines. Without the ideological and political clarity that it has provided to the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries, the Lava revisionist renegades would have continued undetected to subvert and sabotage the Philippine revolution. They would not have been cleaned out of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the revolutionary mass movement.

The Lava revisionist renegades grossly err in their analysis in the Philippine Review: The imputed contraposition of the various sectors of the progressive forces corresponding to the sides in the Sino-Soviet dispute has forced the entire antiimperialist movement in the Philippines into an arena where the terms of the struggle has changed, from a singular concentration of forces against US imperialism to a vicious campaign against socialist unity, from anti-imperialist solidarity to imperialist unity.

We see through the "various sectors" of progressive forces, the "singular concentration of forces," the "socialist unity" or "anti-imperialist solidarity" of the Lava revisionist renegades. Despite their counter-revolutionary revisionist and fascist character, which indeed parallels that of their Soviet social-

imperialist masters, they wish to include themselves among the anti-imperialists and supporters of socialism. At the same time, they wish us to share with them their despondency over what they consider the rising fortunes of US imperialism. Revealing their counterrevolutionary character, they try to bluff and blackmail us with "imperialist unity" and cover up the fact that US imperialism and all its running dogs are now extremely isolated and disunited.

Before the Lava revisionist renegades were roundly repudiated, they busied themselves with attacking us and even now as they prate about being for "anti-imperialist unity" they continue to attack us with a viciousness that they have never applied on US imperialism. They have committed fascist crimes that can only compete in shamelessness with their kowtows to their imperialist masters. Once upon a time, they gloated over their "victory" in seizing the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism which they promptly converted into an anemic Philippine version of the Kuomintang. But they failed to realize until it was too late for them that we busied ourselves with the re-establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. And they refuse now to recognize that it is their counter-revolutionary revisionism that has isolated them from the masses. While the masses are now aroused and mobilized on an unprecedented scale by the proletarian revolutionary vanguard, they shed crocodile tears over "disunity" in the anti-imperialist movement to cover up their exceedingly malicious attempts to attack the leadership and the very people that are more than ever before united in fighting US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The Lava revisionist renegades abuse the revolutionary mass movement as in the following passage: Recently, a segment of this conglomerate opposed the establishment of diplomatic relations with a socialist country, and no doubt the opposition is based on the fact that the country in question happens to be the Soviet Union. Quite logically from the viewpoint of this conglomerate, such move would be welcome if the socialist country would be China. Thus the basis of its opposition is not the socialist essence of the country but the fact that it is Chinese or Soviet.

We assure the Lava revisionist renegades that we oppose Soviet social-imperialism (not a socialist country) and a Philippine government that is thoroughly a puppet of US imperialism. The Philippine reactionary government and Soviet social-imperialism can have any kind of relationship but we will never stop opposing both and each. We know that Lavaite propaganda and

sinister fascist activities are subsidized by Soviet social-imperialism because these do not have the support of the Filipino masses. The Lava revisionist renegades expect to be able to do more harm to the revolution if there is a Soviet embassy in Manila as the bargaining and coordinating center for US imperialism, modern revisionism and local reaction. Already the Lava revisionist fascists have put themselves in line with the US-Marcos clique in obedience to their Soviet social-imperialist masters.

We consider it as a legitimate right of a socialist country, referring to the People's Republic of China, to have diplomatic relations with any other country with a different social system. This is in line with the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence. What we are against is the Khrushchov general line of peaceful coexistence which violates the fundamental principle of proletarian internationalism. The policy of peaceful coexistence should never be converted into a general line running against the main trend of revolution in the world today and of capitulation to US imperialism. The proletarian foreign policy of the People's Republic of China has always been clear and consistent. It is: to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation with socialist countries on the principle of proletarian internationalism; to support and assist the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed people and nations; and to strive for peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems on the basis of the Five Principles of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual nonaggression, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence and to oppose the imperialist policy of aggression and war. As a genuine socialist country, the People's Republic of China will never interfere and dictate on the Philippine revolutionary mass movement to stop fighting the people's enemies. Diplomatic relations or the prospect of such between a socialist country and a reactionary government are always subordinate to the cause of world proletarian revolution and to the cause of the people's democratic revolution. China has vowed never to be a superpower like US imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism which has arrogated unto itself the prerogative to decide the destiny of other peoples in its shady deals. After all, revolution cannot be exported or stopped from abroad. The irrepressible internal contradictions of Philippine society will keep on developing against US imperialism and all its running dogs. We are already fed up with the reactionary theory of "conciliation of contradictions"...the Lavaite philosophy of "interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena." The Party and the people are antagonized by little Proudhons, little Kautskys, little Deborins, little Bukharins, little Trotskys, little Khrushchovs and little Brezhnevs

who wish to muddle up the Philippine revolution.

IV. The Lavaite theory of "stupid masses" and "incidental leadership"

Within their narrow circles, the Lavaites evade the responsibility of leadership by attributing errors and failures to objective conditions "beyond their control" and to the masses "being at fault." They harp on the "correctness" and "goodness" of their motives, without relation to effects. It is necessary for us to present the correct dialectical relationship between leadership and the masses as we criticize the subjectivist, conspiratorial and careerist attitude and policy that the Lavaites take on the question of leadership and the masses.

The attitude of the Lava revisionist renegades towards the masses is best expressed by the bulletin of anti-communism in the following manner: When the masses allowed themselves to be duped into believing that artesian wells and PACD toilets would lift them out of their misery, it was rather difficult to resist the temptation of despising their stupidity. But we persisted in humdrum mass work, sustained by our Marxist-Leninist faith in the inevitability of revolution...

These words can only come from counter-revolutionaries who fancy themselves in bourgeois fashion as the "heroes of the herd." No genuine revolutionary would call the masses "stupid" and mass work "humdrum." That these are written in an "internal" and "theoretical" bulletin posing as communist shows that the authors are anti-communist conspirators. That the authors should claim "Marxist-Leninist faith" is to discredit Marxism-Leninism. These revisionist scoundrels deserve to be despised to their doom.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "The masses are the real heroes while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant, and without this understanding it is impossible to acquire even the most rudimentary knowledge."

The Lava revisionist fascists curse the masses with the vile intention of covering up their crime of misleading the revolutionary mass movement in yesteryears when they succeeded in usurping the leadership in the old merger party. They callously blame the masses. But unwittingly, they uncover the roots of their longstanding unrectified opportunism and their present revisionist treachery. They hate the masses!

The Lavaites were so stupid that their "revolutionary work" was all negated by a few artesian wells and PACD toilets, they would rather make recriminations

against the masses whom they would picture as having "waited hopefully for Magsaysay the man of action, not of words...to translate his words into action." They give credit to Magsaysay as they abuse the masses in their attempt to wash their hands of responsibility for gross errors, failure and defeat.

The imperialist-landlord agent Magsaysay was not able to put artesian wells and PACD toilets even in 10% of Philippine barrios. Even if he did, these things could not overturn the correct mass line of a truly revolutionary leadership. Artesian wells and PACD toilets do not revolutionize the lives of the peasant masses. The Lavaites were responsible for something that was grave, that involved the correct relationship between the leadership and the masses. This was not something that was as light and flippant as the gimmickry of Magsaysay.

Now we understand why until now the "humdrum mass work" of the Lavaites has not yielded anything better than their empty claims that the reformist outfit MASAKA is making "revolution" through the Agricultural Land Reform Code. They have pitifully become the appendage of the Land Authority of the reactionary government. Until now we have not heard any landlord complaining against them; certainly, landlords cannot be stopped from raising a howl when their interests are opposed.

The Lavaite ringleaders have acknowledged the reactionary land reform code as US-inspired but it is precisely what their MASAKA is trying to have implemented to the detriment of the peasant masses. They have directly helped the landlords further harshen the feudal system of exploitation. They are accomplices in the creation of sisantes (displaced tenants) and in the further impoverishment of the peasant masses in a number of towns, especially in Bulacan, Nueva Ecija and Laguna.

The Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism continues to slander the masses: History has shown that when the masses are paralyzed by fear and deluded by promises of reforms, no howling of slogans or waving of banners and raising of clenched fists could summon them back to the struggle. They have to learn from experience and they have to experience the futility of reforms before they become receptive once again to the idea of revolution. The Lavaites have an extremely low regard for the masses. First, they say that the masses are "paralyzed by fear and deluded by promises of reforms" until they learn that these are worth nothing. Second, they never stop to consider what slogans and whose banners they raise. Third, they wish to "give a lesson" to the masses by

leaving them to an indefinite series of reactionary reforms. They oppose the truth of Chairman Mao's teaching that in a semicolonial and semifeudal country "social democracy" is not as possible and as effective for deceiving the people as in capitalist countries.

Nothing good ever comes out of an arrogance towards the masses. Nothing good ever comes out of taking opportunist lines such as the "Left" opportunist line represented by Jose and Jesus Lava from 1948 to 1954 and the Right opportunist line represented by Jesus Lava since 1955.

The Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism admits: Our Party was effectively isolated. The masses were scared just to be seen in the company of known cadres. They shunned organizations with the slightest hue of red. In that situation we had to content ourselves with inordinately modest goals.

It was not real Communists that the masses were afraid of. It was the Lavaite counter-revolutionaries usurping the name of Communists whom they even fought. They were not scared; they repudiated the criminal abuses that flowed from opportunism and from a counterrevolution that sabotaged the revolutionary mass movement from within. Chairman Mao speaks of the masses in the following manner: Every revolutionary party and every revolutionary comrade will be put to the test, to be accepted or rejected as they decide. There are three alternatives. To march at their head and lead them. To trail behind them, gesticulating and criticizing. Or to stand in their way and oppose them. The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history.

Chairman Mao gives us clear and correct guidance: As long as we rely on the people, believe firmly in the inexhaustible creative power of the masses and hence trust and identify ourselves with them, no enemy can crush us while we can crush every enemy and overcome every difficulty. Without this correct attitude towards the masses and without the correct mass line, a political party can only pretend to make revolution and is bound to fail.

Until now, the Lava revisionist renegades have not changed their counter-revolutionary attitude towards the masses.

Let us take note of a passage from a "political transmission" of their bogus political bureau issued on June 12, 1971: Progressive organizations should

cultivate new links with the hitherto inert and deluded masses, with that vast segment of the population who are normally impervious to revolutionary propaganda.

These traitors never tire of slandering the masses, calling them "inert," "deluded" and "impervious to revolutionary propaganda."

The Lava revisionist renegades should always serve as our teachers by negative example. In this regard, let us sear into our minds the teaching of Chairman Mao: "Modesty helps one to go forward, whereas conceit makes one lag behind. This is a truth we must always bear in mind."

The Lava revisionist renegades have already become notorious for serving US imperialism and the landlords, for committing all sorts of crimes and for bloodily opposing the Party and the people's army in the countryside. Now, let us get a passage from one of their "mass" publications. The January 1971 issue of BRPF's Struggle states: Witness the latest violent rallies last December 9, 1970 at Plaza Lawton and January 13, 1971 at Plaza Miranda. On the other hand, even those who remain when violence erupts only manage to reveal their unpreparedness to battle it out with the mercenary hirelings of the fascist Marcos with their utter lack of discipline and disorganized behavior. Are these the revolutionary masses whom the KM points to as the liberators of the Filipino people?

The Lavaites consider themselves clever for being able to caricature the revolutionary masses. This is the malicious spirit that runs through all their counter-revolutionary propaganda, especially when it is directed against the youthful masses of workers, peasants, students and intellectuals whom they sweepingly call "immature," "reckless," "kabataang musmos" (a phrase borrowed from the reactionary columnist Max Soliven).

The Lava revisionist renegades have the temerity to claim that they have broken out of their isolation and express a wish to recruit more youthful forces. They even claim that the national democratic mass organizations, which they consistently calumniate, have benefited from their policies. For all their braggadocio, it has become a familiar public spectacle for their puny outfits to be literally kicked out of gigantic mass actions and to place themselves on the side of fascist brutes before, during and after these mass actions in every manner that they are capable of. Now that they have overstepped themselves by committing

fascist crimes, their exposure as counter-revolutionaries has become even more thorough and their isolation is certain to lead to their extinction.

Consistent with their overlord attitude towards the masses, the Lava revisionist renegades have also concocted the counterrevolutionary theory of "incidental leadership." This is a theory which is made to sound as if they were not gravely concerned with the question of leadership. It is their way of telling the people to be unconcerned about the question of leadership so that they, the super careerists posing as humble "collectivists," can dictate what ideological, political and organizational line to take.

The bulletin of anti-communism babbles: "The question of leadership is incidental to our struggle with the Mao Thought party." Leadership is not something incidental to any political struggle. It is essentially the question of line in ideology, politics and organization. Cadres or persons who take the lead carry a definite line, represent a definite class and perform the function of leadership.

Leadership is a fundamental question in the struggle of the Communist Party of the Philippines against the bogus communist party of the Lava revisionist renegades. No matter how these revisionist scoundrels make it appear that they are unconcerned about what leaders or what class should lead the revolutionary mass movement, their counter-revolutionary propaganda clearly shows that they have in mind themselves and the big bourgeoisie and the big landlords to persist as overlords in Philippine society.

When they brandish Khrushchov's anti-Stalin fallacy of "personality cult," it is to attack the revolutionary leadership of the proletariat. When they slander Comrade Mao Zedong by speaking of the "Mao cult" they attack not only one person but the great leader of world revolution, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the world proletariat and people, the Communist Party of China, the Chinese people, the Filipino proletariat and people, the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army. In short, these slanders hew to the leadership and line of the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. The Lava revisionist fascists have placed themselves on the side of US imperialism and its running dogs.

In the history of proletarian revolutionary struggle, enemy agents have surfaced to say that Marxism is not scientific socialism, that Leninism is not Marxism or

that Mao Zedong Thought is not Marxism-Leninism. These scoundrels have not hesitated at making the most vicious personal and ideological attacks against the great communist leaders Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong.

In the Philippines today, it is not surprising for the Lava revisionist renegades to concentrate their slander on the person of Chairman Amado Guerrero. They wish to attack the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the entire revolutionary mass movement. It is not surprising for the Lava revisionist renegades to concentrate their slander on the person of Comrade Dante. They wish to attack all Red commanders and fighters and the heroic armed struggle in the countryside. It is not surprising for the Lava revisionist renegades to concentrate their slander on the person of Jose Ma. Sison. They wish to attack the legal mass organizations which are the main current of the revolutionary mass movement in urban areas.

Because of their conspiratorial and bankrupt line on the question of leadership, the Lava revisionist fascists would rather have Marcos, the fascist puppet chieftain of US imperialism, as their own leading representative. This is the direction of their ceaseless protests that the national democratic mass organizations are taking a "purely anti-Marcos line." At the same time, the chief target of their propaganda is Guerrero or Sison whom they alternately refer to. Such is the bankruptcy of the Lava revisionist renegades.

The vile outbursts of Lavaite propaganda against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the revolutionary mass movement in general is clearly synchronized with large-scale campaigns of "encirclement and suppression" in Central Luzon and Northern Luzon and also with "special operations" of "special forces" of the US-Marcos clique, with the special assistance of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang in the Greater Manila area. The Lavaite publications shamelessly refer to persons, organizations and places for enemy ruffians to assault.

The Lava revisionist renegades harbor boundless presumptions beyond their capabilities. They boast of having "made Sison." But they cannot "make themselves." They boast of being "great theoreticians." But their slapdash manifestos prove the contrary. They boast of being "great organizers." But they are clearly isolated from the great mass movement. They boast of being "great revolutionaries." But their words in black and white and their public and sinister deeds prove that they are counter-revolutionaries. Their last resort is to feign

humility and accuse others of "megalomania" in their old style of thief crying "Thief!"

Praising the enemy in a roundabout way, they make him appear as being responsible for the great unity, strength and prestige that the revolutionary organizations and people have achieved. They claim that the revolutionary forces have been artificially created by the enemy himself with publicity and finances. They have absolutely no faith and no trust in the revolutionary masses and the revolutionary leadership that has emerged through consistent struggle. They consider the distorted reporting and comments on gigantic mass actions by the reactionary press as support for the revolutionary mass movement. They consider contributions pooled from the masses as coming from the enemy.

If only the Lava revisionist renegades would turn against and attack their big bourgeois and landlord masters with the same fury that they attack the revolutionary mass movement, they will certainly get their share of the distorted reporting and comments in the mass media. The big mass media are owned by reactionaries who serve imperialist-comprador-landlord advertisers and at the same time try to deceive their petty-bourgeois readership with the myth of "press freedom." The obscurity that the Lava revisionist renegades have suffered is their own making. But certainly they are now becoming increasingly notorious among the revolutionary masses because of their revisionist and fascist treachery. They should take note that their big bourgeois and landlord masters have succeeded so far to suppress in the reactionary mass media news about revisionist fascist crimes.

The Lava revisionist renegades have a low regard for themselves. Unwittingly, they reveal this fact with their own straight statements, though we can always conclude from their unadulterated lies that they are rotten and cheap. Here is an unwitting self-revelation from the editorial of their bulletin of anti-communism: "Many comrades, eager to retaliate, have raised the demand for a paper that would engage the Mao Thought party in a fierce mud-slinging bout."

They spit on their own "comrades." They consider them as no better than mudslingers and pretend to criticize them but in fact go on mudslinging against us. Contempt for the masses has become so ingrained in them that they do not realize it when they themselves have slapped their own faces. The February 15th issue of Sang-ayon sa MAN at one point actually calls Lava "a Pilate" although the author of the article means to say that MAN is "absolutely" not an instrument

of anyone.

On the other hand, the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism speaks of its "general secretary" as the "highest and most powerful official." By this phrase alone, they betray their servility to some potentate of sorts.

Whoever is their "highest and most powerful official," the Lava revisionist renegades remain opportunist and revisionist. They are even worse now. They commit fascist crimes. It needs to be repeated that the local revisionist renegades will never lose their Lavaite appellation so long as they persist in keeping to what is Lavaite revisionism, the long-standing opportunism in the old merger party that has served as the basis of modern revisionism and lately of revisionist fascism.

It is also idle for the Lava revisionist renegades to espouse the theory of "being born red" under the pretext of discarding its old theory of "noble lineage." They bluff no one when they say that their "Secretary General" is no longer a city-based intellectual and that the membership of their bogus central committee is 90% "proletarian and peasant." No one is born red. Marx and Engels became great proletarian leaders, though their class origin was neither worker nor peasant, by remolding themselves and engaging in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. The Communist Party has a single class character which is proletarian and is the advanced detachment of the proletariat; it cannot be both "proletarian and peasant." It is, however, important to make sure that most Party members should be of worker and peasant origin. And the Party never closes its door to elements of petty-bourgeois origin who adopt the revolutionary proletarian outlook and remold themselves by engaging in revolutionary practice.

Godofredo Mallari, Alejandro Briones, Gorgonio Narciso, Domingo Castro and Felicísimo Macapagal have no claims to being peasant or proletarian now. Mallari is an enemy agent and a businessman of considerable assets drawn from his counterrevolutionary work. Briones is a bourgeois politician, an hacienda overseer and a criminal gangster. Narciso is a bureaucrat in the reactionary government. So are Castro and Macapagal whose racket is to receive honoraria from the Land Authority and to swindle peasants. Though they can trace peasant origins, they are as anti-peasant as Francisco Lava, Jr. whose main business is to compel the peasant masses to pay fees to Lavaite shysters. All of them are isolated from the revolutionary peasant movement.

To cover up the fact that an overwhelming majority of the bogus central committee of the Lava revisionist renegades are bureaucrats, enemy agents and chronic aspirants for bourgeois electoral posts, the Lava revisionist renegades have concocted the theory of "physical affinity," have applied it on the leaders of the national democratic mass organizations, have unjustly tried to seek out these leaders' kinsmen who are employed in the reactionary government and have even gone so far as to invent blood relations, political kinship or anything else intended to insinuate doubts about the convictions of genuine leaders of the national democratic movement.

A typical example of the shallow and malicious fascist trickery of the Lava revisionist renegades is the following statement of BRPF's Struggle (January 1971): "Jose Ma. Sison has a brother who is an NBI agents and another brother is with the Presidential Economic Staff (PES)." Falsehood and truth are deliberately mixed. Sison has no brother with the NBI. Though his brother was with the PES, there was no sane reason at all to kidnap and presumably murder him and his driver Elpidio Morales and to gloat over the fascist crime in several tens of thousands of copies of the July 1971 issue of BRPF's Struggle and other leaflets distributed all over Greater Manila and certain parts of Central Luzon and Southern Luzon.

Francisco C. Sison held a civilian post in the reactionary government, had no pretensions of being a leading revolutionary like the Lavaite bureaucrats and had never interfered in the affairs of the revolutionary mass movement. It was an absolutely stupid calculation that he would know the whereabouts of his brother. Not even the previous kidnapping and presumable murder of Carlos B. del Rosario had yielded anything to the fascist criminals concerning the whereabouts of Jose Ma. Sison.

Consistent with their theory of "physical affinity," the Lava revisionist renegades have gone so far as to fabricate in Sang-ayon sa MAN (February 15, 1971) the following: "Perhaps the blind followers of Sison, who is a son of the late Vicente Sison who was a MAKAPILI and traitor to the Filipino people during the time of the Japanese and because of that was allegedly killed by the Huks have a wrong belief..." This fabrication is absolutely insane. As already reported by various national democratic mass organizations, Sison's father, Salustiano, was a patriot who resisted the Japanese fascists in Ilocos Sur and who died of natural causes in 1958. In their propaganda and other activities, the Lava revisionist renegades have utterly degenerated into fascist liars. Their theories of "noble lineage" or of

"being born red" or of "physical affinity" are all fascist rubbish.

In the final analysis, the question of leadership is whether or not we adhere to and implement the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution today. The Lava revisionist renegades boast of applying the principle of "democratic centralism" in their organization. But the essence of their "centralism" is modern revisionism and fascism. We have already presented how they have abhorred and violated the mass line; no correct ideological, political and organizational line can therefore be expected of them. Their counter-revolutionary revisionist line has led them to fascist gangsterism. Because it adheres to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and to the mass line, the Communist Party of the Philippines can be expected to lead the revolutionary mass movement correctly and victoriously. Our Party relies on the masses, has faith in them and fully arouses them. Its principle of leadership is "from the masses to the masses," "take the ideas of the masses and concentrate them, persevere in the ideas and carry them through."

V. The Lava revisionist and reformist line of parliamentary struggle

Lenin, in his Address to the Second All-Russian Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East, told the Communists of the Eastern peoples that they must recognize the characteristics of their own countries and that, relying upon the general theory and practice of communism, they must adapt themselves to particular conditions different from those in European countries.

Instead of waging parliamentary struggle over a protracted period of time, the Chinese Communists under the leadership of Chairman Mao Zedong brilliantly applied Lenin's theory of uneven development and set out to wage protracted armed struggle and establish Red political power in the countryside before seizing the cities. Comrade Mao Zedong developed the theory of people's war and carried out the strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. These theory and strategic line are apt for a semicolonial and semifeudal country.

Today, in a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines, the Lava revisionist renegades imagine themselves to be an imperialist country like tsarist Russia and think of "revolutionary situation" in terms of being able to launch a strategic offensive on the cities and seizing political power within a short period of time after a protracted period of parliamentary struggle. They deliberately and arrogantly oppose Chairman Mao's teachings in the same way that they did in all

previous years, especially when the line of armed struggle was formally adopted but distorted into a putschist line by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership.

Because they oppose the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought no less, the Lava revisionist renegades completely fail to recognize the excellent revolutionary situation in the world as well as in the Philippines. They fail to see that a completely new and higher stage of world proletarian revolution has been effected by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, enabling Filipino revolutionaries to make armed struggle the principal form of struggle. The world has not stood still since 1917 or even since 1949. This is now the era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward world victory.

Based on its detailed examination of the concrete situation in the Philippines, the Communist Party of the Philippines takes the view that conditions are excellent for waging protracted armed struggle as the principal form of struggle, for taking the strategic defensive and launching tactical offensives in the countryside or for fighting on exterior lines within interior lines, for gradually building up the revolutionary forces, for effecting land reform in a revolutionary way and for doing everything that will transform the backward barrios into advanced political, military and cultural bastions of the revolution.

It is revisionist and reformist for the Lava revisionist renegades to engage in parliamentary struggle as the principal form of struggle, work for the bogus land reform program of US imperialism, advocate nationalization through legislation and the stock market, allow their ringleaders to run for offices in the reactionary government, fan up hopes in the constitutional convention and the like. Though they claim to be already engaged in armed struggle as a "secondary" form, they have already been found to be using their armed minions for opposing the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the people in so many criminal ways. At this early stage, they have already utterly failed. Their posts in the reactionary government and their main system of reliable agents so evident in their legal outfits are dead weights around their necks. They are fools for daring to fight the proletarian revolutionary party whose main organization is the people's army.

It is absolutely correct for the Communist Party of the Philippines to have right away as its main organization the New People's Army. It should not be a lamb waiting to be butchered any time by US imperialism and its running dogs. It is

simply impossible to develop a people's army only at a later date when the people's enemies are striking us down from positions that may be gained by us from parliamentary struggle (if it were the principal form of struggle). We allow our actual and potential class allies to compete with the reactionary diehards in running for electoral posts in the reactionary government and we get their cooperation for the revolutionary armed struggle. But the Party should never have bourgeois electioneering as its principal concern above the requirements of armed struggle. We cannot develop a genuine people's army without immediately attending to the decisive question of land in a semicolonial and semifeudal country and without arousing and mobilizing the peasant masses to rise up in arms, engage in agrarian revolution and build revolutionary bases under the leadership of the proletariat. If we do not engage in armed struggle as the principal form of struggle, it would just be enough for the US-Marcos clique to hire a few revisionist gangsters to perform "liquidation" jobs and spy on us. The joint criminal activities of the US-Marcos clique and the Lava revisionist renegades underscore the correct line that we have taken.

The first time that the Lava revisionist renegades reacted formally to the proletarian revolutionary line was sometime in 1967 when they issued through the Information Bulletin of the Czechoslovak revisionist party a statement carrying the following view: "The correct position, which is the position of the PKP is to combine dialectically parliamentary struggle and armed struggle, legal and illegal forms of action." Previously, the 1967 May Day Statement of the Provisional Political Bureau of our Party had been published in major publications of fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties like the Peking Review (China) and the People's Voice (New Zealand). Our statement defined our commitment to rebuilding a Marxist-Leninist party cleansed of modern revisionism, or Right and "Left" opportunism, to revolutionary armed struggle, to a revolutionary united front and to proletarian internationalism.

Now the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism declares: In our assessment of the existing balance of forces, the time for strategic offensive has yet to come. We are still at the stage of preparation and the main form of struggle is legal or parliamentary struggle. The principal tasks are the politicization and organization of the masses, including the most backward sectors who up to now constitute the vast majority. The armed struggle must be waged even today but it occupies a secondary and subordinate role in relation to the parliamentary struggle. As the revolutionary situation develops, however, the armed struggle will steadily gain importance until objective conditions shall dictate that it be

adopted as the main form.

That it is not yet time to wage a strategic offensive is no argument for parliamentary struggle being the principal form of struggle. It is idle and it is to beg the question for the Lava revisionist renegades to prate that the strategic offensive has yet to come and therefore the principal form of struggle is legal or parliamentary struggle. In a semicolonial and semifeudal country, only those revolutionary forces that take pains in protracted armed struggle, in fighting through and winning the strategic defensive and the strategic stalemate will be in a position to launch the strategic offensive victoriously. It is simply inconceivable how a party while engaged in parliamentary struggle as its principal activity is able to set up sizable revolutionary armed forces even if only in one town. What is possible would be to have a few gangsters like those of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang latching on to Task Force Lawin, landlords and reactionary politicians. Even at this early stage, a stage of squads and platoons, the New People's Army is already being subjected to massive enemy assaults by Task Force Lawin and by their special assistants, the revisionist fascists.

Were it not for the strong mass support of the urban petty bourgeoisie, especially the students, teachers, journalists and other professionals, the spying and informing done by the Lava revisionist fascists on city-based and legal mass organizations would have caused a massive enemy crackdown on Party cadres, a destruction of the main body of the Party or at least a paralyzation of the same. But because the main body of the Party (its cadres and members) is in the people's army and in the countryside, we cannot be destroyed at one blow. So, both the US-Marcos clique and the Lava revisionist fascists do not really pose a serious threat to us, even if a massive fascist onslaught in urban areas were to come any time. Even here our Party cadres and members are by necessity and choice underground and their Party membership unknown even as they participate in and lead mass activities.

Ang Gabay elaborates on the "strategy and tactics" of the Lava revisionist renegades. It gives a hilarious misinterpretation of such strategic stages of people's war as the strategic defensive, strategic stalemate and strategic offensive. It pushes the erroneous idea that parliamentary struggle is the principal form of struggle during the "strategic defensive." Through what it calls the "general tactic" of parliamentary struggle, the "subjective strength" of the revolution is brought forward to what it quaintly calls the "strategic counter-offensive," a stage which the "tactical leadership" must breeze through because

of the "geographical limitation in the Philippines" and the "advanced war materiel" of the reactionary state. A "quick shift" is supposed to be made to the "general offensive." The three-stage schema of "strategic defensive," "strategic counter-offensive" and "general offensive" does not at all indicate how the people become armed and build their political power step by step; it actually preaches parliamentary struggle as the preparation for "Left" opportunist or adventurist actions in the 1950 style. The Lavaites expose their abject ignorance of simple military terms by relabeling the strategic stalemate as "strategic counter-offensive" and by failing to recognize that "counter-offensive" and "offensive" are synonymous terms for the revolutionary forces which start from the defensive.

It is worthwhile to read Ang Gabay itself in order to know better the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist pretensions of the Lava revisionist renegades. In this regard, we are reminded of what the great Lenin said: "These people are striving to invent something quite out of the ordinary and in their effort to be clever make themselves ridiculous." Hereunder is a passage from the Lavaite publication: The stages of struggle, therefore, is composed of three major parts according to the balance of the subjective strength of the contending forces. In the first stage, the forces of the State against the forces of the revolutionary Movement is stronger. This is the stage of the strategic defensive. Because the aim in this stage is to make the forces of the movement balance those of the State, it is only reasonable that the primary task of revolutionaries should be to organize and arouse the large part of the Filipino masses. Also at this stage, the national crisis begins to spread. The ripening of the national crisis also means the occurrence of the revolutionary situation. This leads to the second stage: the stage of the relative equilibrium of forces. This is the stage of strategic counteroffensive. If the revolutionary Movement has no sufficient preparation to meet this task and hesitates to accomplish this, it is only natural that the revolution will not happen. But if during the stage of strategic defensive, the movement prepares for this stage, it will not encounter difficulty in shifting its general tactics from parliamentary struggle to the waging of People's War. It is in the ability of the tactical leadership that the increasing adherents of revolution can be mobilized and placed in the front ranks of people's war. This needs quick action on the part of the Movement in order to adapt to the geographical limitation of the Philippines; otherwise, it will be defeated by the State because of her advanced war materiel especially in transportation, communication, military bases and modern weapons of war. This existing concrete situation dictates the necessity for the quick shift to the third stage of struggle, the stage of general offensive.

The primary task under this condition is the seizure of power.

It is clear in the conditions described above that the stage in which we find ourselves today is the first stage of struggle...the stage of Strategic Defensive. At this stage, the revolutionary Movement enters the last step of Strategic Defensive and is within view of the second stage of the struggle...the Strategic Counter-offensive. The legal form of struggle is still the main tactic of the period...

The Lava revisionist renegades are out of their wits if they believe that their principal form of struggle which is parliamentary struggle will prepare the strategic offensive. They have not learned at all from the line of parliamentary struggle adopted formally by Jesus Lava since 1956; it is a line that has sabotaged and subverted the revolutionary mass movement. But they still have the temerity to wish that it should have been adopted earlier and should have lasted even longer. They wish to skip stages in people's war and hope for a putsch in the cities someday. This subjectivist thinking links Right opportunism to "Left" opportunism. All Communists should be forewarned that there are these scoundrels who would first enjoy themselves in their air-conditioned rooms and peddle the "radical reforms" of US imperialism and who would scheme to infiltrate a few gangsters into the ranks of the revolutionaries when the strategic offensive shall be on as a result of the victorious conduct of the prior stages of strategic defensive and strategic stalemate in people's war.

In mass demonstrations, we have already had a preview of what these Lava revisionist renegades are capable of doing. They bring in a few people with large banners and then attempt to sabotage and subvert the revolutionary mass movement from within by howling revisionist, chauvinist and bourgeois pacifist slogans. At the same time, they have a few other hooligans of their own who commit acts of provocation and vandalism against the people so that they can peddle their pro-imperialist and pro-Marcos Rightist line under the pretext of combating what they call "Left adventurism." It is now characteristic for the Nemenzos, Dizons and Torreses to be babbling about the question of "strategic offensive" in connection with the militant demonstrations of the new democratic cultural revolution or with workers' strikes while the Lavas, Santosos, Mallaris and Pascuals order a handful of hooligans to combine with the fascist agents of the US-Marcos clique to disrupt the mass actions which are the "parliament of the streets." We must be uncompromising and kick these scoundrels out of our midst again and again until they can no longer stand up. Their behavior now while their "main form" is parliamentary struggle will be their behavior when

their "main form" shall be armed struggle.

While they are at their kind of parliamentary struggle, they oppose the revolutionary mass movement, whether it be the first quarter storm or the second upsurge of 1970 or the strikes against the oil firms and various firms or the temporary seizure of schools. Taking the name of Comrade Stalin in vain in the style of the Brezhnev gang, they refer to him only to adorn their erroneous view that there is yet no revolutionary flow. Pretending to be Marxists, they stick such labels as "Left adventurism," "petty bourgeois revolutionism," "romanticism" and the like on what has been clearly defined as the strike movement and the national democratic cultural revolution of a new type. When they monopolize or successfully infiltrate an organization, they use it to attack us as they have done with the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism. In the countryside, their minions peddle the Agricultural Land Reform Code, swindle or extort from the peasant masses, engage in cattle-rustling, organize BSDUs and inform on and attack the Party and the people's army. Give them quarters and they strike you down.

The Lava revisionist renegades say that they need to have parliamentary struggle as the "main form" first so that they can engage in the "politicization and organization of the masses." Does armed struggle preclude these? No! In our case, politics is in command of armed struggle which is our principal form of struggle, and of parliamentary struggle which is our secondary form of struggle. It is in command of everything that we do at any stage. In the countryside, armed struggle cannot be developed without arousing and mobilizing the peasant masses and without building Party branches, local organs of political power, the barrio mass organizations and the local guerrillas and local militias. The subjective forces for revolution are being built up because objective conditions for revolution now exist. These subjective forces are further developing the objective forces and conditions for revolution. It is utterly Rightist for the Lava revisionist renegades to make the mock pledge that they "will wage armed struggle on a large scale when objective conditions shall ripen" for them.

In the meantime, the Lava revisionist renegades through the July 4, 1971 issue of Ang Gabay tries to intimidate, belittle and scorn those who are interested in revolutionary armed struggle by sweepingly calling them "romanticist youth," "adventurist children" and "petty bourgeois students and lumpen" whom they consider to be unworthy of joining the ranks of their "people's army" and the ranks of "professional revolutionaries" like them. These anti-communist

scoundrels rail that those who wish so much to join the people's army or know the existence of such an organization are merely showing "low consciousness" and are being aware of "only one way of increasing their efforts." They beat their breasts and bellow that it is they and not others who can decide as to who should join the guerrillas and as to when the "cruel blow of people's war" should be unleashed. They also say that for the broad masses of the people to take the road of armed revolution now is to go against "the decision of the people's army." What "people's army" are these anti-communist scoundrels talking about in the first place?

Ang Gabay states: But despite the truth that conditions are not ripe yet in order to shift the main tactic to the waging of armed struggle, many among the ranks of petty-bourgeois students and lumpen are demanding that this process is hastened to accommodate their desire to join the People's Army. This romanticist youth do not understand that the People's Army constitutes only the most conscious, most disciplined, most reliable and most determined elements from the revolutionary ranks. These adventurist children cannot understand that their weak will that surfaces especially in the period of tactical defeat or when confronted with serious problems even only in the ranks of legal organization, is one of the major reasons why they cannot be accepted by the People's Army. Their reasoning that their joining the People's Army or their knowledge about the existence of this organization is the only way of increasing their efforts is not a reason of a true revolutionary but is only a sign of their low consciousness. They should understand that the People's Army in the Philippines under the leadership of the PKP continues to exist and continues to fight wherever it is.

Although it is true that the prominence of the People's Army is fully inspiring, this should not be made the basis for the activity or non-activity of revolutionaries especially of revolutionaries who have been assigned to man the parliamentary struggle. It is not their task to decide whether they can join the guerrillas and they have no right to insist on counting themselves among the ranks of professional revolutionaries. It is not their task to decide when the People's Army should fully unleash the cruel blows of people's war and they have no right to wage this against the decision of the People's Army.

In their bulletin of anti-communism, the Lava revisionist renegades disparage as "cowboy ideology" such Marxist-Leninist statements of Chairman Mao Zedong as "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" and "Without a people's army, the people have nothing." They slander us by claiming that we hold the

gun as a "fetish." Is it a fetish when the Party commands the gun? It is their fascist gangsterism that proves their "cowboy ideology." They put themselves into ridicule when they try to twist our stand that armed revolution is the only road to national and social liberation. Between the two aspects of revolutionary struggle, armed and parliamentary, it is armed struggle that is the determinant and is the principal aspect. What is essential to Marxism-Leninism is that it stands for revolutionary violence against counter-revolutionary violence and that it stands for proletarian dictatorship. The moment we fail to grasp this truth we become counter-revolutionary revisionists.

The best proof that the principal form of struggle today is the armed struggle is not only the fact that the main body of Party cadres and members is engaged in armed struggle but also the fact that most of the masses organized by the Party and the New People's Army are in the countryside enthusiastically participating in various ways in the armed struggle. While so far the urban legal mass organizations have aroused and mobilized the masses in several tens of thousands for each public meeting at Plaza Miranda and have made recruitment of members from them only in part, the Party and the New People's Army have brought under local organs of political power and barrio mass organizations at least 300,000 people in Northern Luzon and Central Luzon. This figure does not yet include those in the guerrilla bases and guerrilla zones in other regions. It is extremely evident that the people are more enthusiastic when they have armed power. There is a big qualitative difference between the people that we have organized and those misled into being enrolled into the MASAKA. We are supported in our life-and-death struggles with the enemy, whereas the mythical membership of MASAKA has not succeeded in making real the bureaucratic ambitions of the Lavaite ringleaders who run in reactionary elections.

In the cities, the revolutionary masses have become increasingly militant because they recognize that their efforts serve to inspire the Party cadres and Red fighters in the countryside and to promote the armed revolution on a nationwide scale. They put their trust in the Communist Party of the Philippines because it has a force for destroying the enemy and defending the people's democratic interests. That is the very reason why the Lava revisionist renegades resort to all kinds of lies against the New People's Army and now flaunt their Monkees-Armeng Bayan-MASAKA gang so as to achieve their evil counter-revolutionary purpose of subverting and sabotaging the revolutionary mass movement in the cities as well as in the countryside.

The Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism keeps on slandering us. It says: “While denouncing in venal terms what he calls ‘the misleaders of the 1950s,’ Guerrero is actually repeating the same errors committed by the Central Committee under the Jose Lava leadership.”

Guerrero also mocks the idea of strategic counter-offensive advanced by Comrade Jesus Lava at the ebb of the revolutionary tide. But again he upholds the very philosophy underlying it. He asserts that a counter-offensive is the best way to restore morale and redeem the sagging militancy of the masses. Last year, he tried to put this into practice in Tarlac, and the result was worse disaster. Instead of reversing the tide, it isolated his organization.

We are fond of quoting the Lava revisionist renegades because that is a good way of catching their lies. Here as usual they imagine us saying or doing something and then in black and white they write that we have said or done it. They would rather invent an assertion from Chairman Amado Guerrero than quote a passage from the writings and policy statements that he has made which are well circulated. What errors of Jose Lava are being repeated? What "strategic counter-offensive," what "sagging militancy," what "disaster" and what "isolation" are they babbling about? Once more we tell the Lava revisionist renegades that while there is a great difference between the line of protracted armed struggle and their line of protracted parliamentary struggle there is also a great difference between the line of protracted struggle and Lavaite putschism. There is a great difference between our being on the strategic defensive now and our being on the strategic defensive in the future. Also, there is a great difference between our being on the strategic defensive now and the malicious Lavaite imputation to us of the wrong belief that now is the time for the strategic offensive. Once more we say that the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership was stupid for adopting a putschist line and a two-year timetable in 1950 and once more we say that Jesus Lava was stupid in adopting a policy of strategic counteroffensive after the 1950 debacle, when there was no basis for such a policy and when the enemy was on his strategic offensive.

Regarding the masses today, their militancy keeps on rising. The Lava revisionist renegades are fond of claiming disasters and isolation befalling the New People's Army. Their propaganda is supplementary to that of the US-Marcos clique, particularly the reactionary armed forces. The fact is that the fascist allies of the Lavaites in Task Force Lawin are getting dizzy with more and more guerrilla bases and guerrilla zones emerging on an unprecedented scale in Northern Luzon

and Central Luzon. The BSDUs about which the Lava revisionist renegades are so ecstatic are either being wiped out or bringing themselves and their arms to the New People's Army. Mistaking their ill will for reality, the Lavaites ask why, if the New People's Army is already crushed, Chairman Amado Guerrero and Comrade Dante are not yet apprehended. Then they make the most malicious answer to their own question: "The PKP Intelligence Bureau can neither reject nor confirm rumors that they are protected by powerful figures in the ruling class." Such irrationality and such rumor mongering now prevail among the Lava revisionist renegades. What we have confirmed about the tale that the NPA is already "crushed" and that Chairman Amado Guerrero and Comrade Dante have "broken up" is that the Lavaite rumormonger Haydee Yorac and Benigno Aquino are among the main informants of Eduardo Lachica for his anti-communist book *Huk: Philippine Agrarian Society in Revolt*. This book has exactly the same ideas as those expressed in the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism. This book has been published by the local CIA conduit, Solidaridad Publishing House.

In *Peace, Freedom and Socialism* (December 1970), the Lavaite William J. Pomeroy states in reference to the period 1948-56 in the Philippines: There was a leftist tendency to project the armed struggle to the exclusion of other forms of struggle, and a similar tendency to assert the full hegemony of the Communist Party of the Philippines over the national liberation struggle to the neglect of a broad antiimperialist struggle.

It was indeed "Left" opportunist of both the Jose and Jesus Lava leaderships "to project armed struggle to the exclusion of other forms of struggle" and, we add, to order the people's army to seize political power in Manila in two years' time without the real mass basis for it. But here in the same passage is introduced by the revisionist hack and US imperialist agent Pomeroy that brazen counter-revolutionary idea that: to assert the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines in the struggle for national liberation is to neglect a broad anti-imperialist struggle. We insist that the three magic weapons of the Philippine revolution are: the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the national united front. The Lava revisionist renegades express through Pomeroy in *Peace, Freedom and Socialism* their view on Philippine reactionary elections in the following manner: The boycott call [against the presidential election of November 1969] stressed that it was not intended to reject the electoral process, but to condemn its corruption and misuse to serve the interests of a few.

Adopting the slogan of boycott but being dishonest about its practice, the Lava revisionist renegades put up one of their ringleaders, Alejandro Briones, as candidate for congressman in the second district of Tarlac in 1969. Briones even had the temerity to send an emissary to the Party and the New People's Army to ask for "cooperation" and "support" in October 1969. It was at this occasion that the emissary of Briones boasted about the "Armeng Bayan." (This was before the discovery of its crimes of bloody intrigue.) Briones was rebuffed, of course. He lost the election as one of the tail-enders among at least ten candidates, where a single sizable bloc of votes would have meant a lot.

The participation of the Lava revisionist renegades in reactionary elections is a good gauge of what they call their "peasant strength." In 1967, Briones had also run for mayor in his own hometown of Victoria, Tarlac and had lost. Together with other reactionaries, the Lava revisionist renegades have become discredited. They come out as having neither bourgeois strength nor "peasant strength." They rationalize that their electoral failures are successes because their purpose in the first place is "not to win but to explain."

Such an explanation is bankrupt. The Lavaites leave themselves open to the accusation, which is truthful, that they are mere "nuisance" candidates out to make money on some reactionary candidates by splitting the votes of other reactionary candidates. They cannot compare themselves to the Bolsheviks in their electoral struggles for the Duma. One thing that can be said immediately is that revolutionary cadres in the countryside of a semicolonial and semifeudal country have all the chances for conducting mass work on a daily basis. What the main Lavaite organization, the "peasant" MASAKA, does is to prostrate itself before reactionary candidates for funds every election time and before the reactionaries in power for the same stuff off-election time.

Let us now take a very outstanding statement in the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism: "Parliamentary struggle does not mean putting up candidates for elective positions in order to transform the nature of the neocolonial government. It simply means laying stress on infiltration of public institutions and legal organizations, and utilizing and broadening whatever democratic rights are available. "

On the basis of facts, is not top Lavaite Alejandro Briones so representative of several Lava revisionist ringleaders running for top reactionary posts? That may, however, be considered one of the Lavaite methods of "infiltration." Top

ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegades are employed in the Court of Appeals, Commission on Elections, Land Authority, Bureau of Soils, University of the Philippines, UP Law Center, National Intelligence Coordinating Agency, Counter-Intelligence Unit of the Philippine Constabulary, Task Force Lawin and the like. These "infiltrators" account for at least 80% of their bogus central committee. While we recognize that they have "infiltrated" the reactionary government, we also recognize that they have been infiltrated by it to the extent that they have become the cheap fascist tools of the US-Marcos clique.

Maravilla also expresses in Peace, Freedom and Socialism the position of the Lava revisionist renegades on the constitutional convention: The Communist Party, while prepared to fight issues wherever they arise, including in the struggle for constitutional reform in which it will fight for the adoption of democratic amendments, has warned of the futility of expecting democratic changes from neocolonial bourgeois bodies in which the people and their organizations are not represented and has insisted that changes can come only from mass struggles.

Shorn of its embellishment, this passage lays bare the Lavaite theory of "end parliamentarism through parliamentarism." So they will fight for "constitutional reform," for the adoption of "democratic amendments." Since it has been their line that "all legal possibilities must first be exhausted," we raise the question as to whether the revisionists once they are better placed in the reactionary state will ever tire not only of issuing presidential decrees, congressional bills, and court decisions but also of holding constitutional conventions.

The Lava revisionist renegades issued sometime last year a statement of their bogus political bureau on the constitutional convention. The statement goes: The fact that the Constitutional Convention in the context of the present alignment of forces will never realize the ultimate goals of the national democratic movement is not sufficient ground to adopt a policy of boycott. On the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, take note of the double talk in the same statement. Also take note of the disparity between the statement and the "boycott" pronouncements of some Lavaite outfits like BRPF and MPKP.

Again taking the name of the masses in vain, the statement of the bogus political bureau of the Lava revisionist renegades runs further: On the basis of first-hand reports from cadres who work daily among the masses of workers and peasants, (we are) convinced that illusions about the possibilities of reforms through the

Constitutional Convention are still widespread. In other words, this specific type of parliamentary institution is not yet politically obsolete. The Lava revisionist renegades always follow the reactionaries in arranging the agenda of counterrevolution and take to every fashion and farce the reactionaries design. Taking the name of the Communist Party of the Philippines in vain, the Lavaite statement continues:

The other form of participation which PKP considers to be the most realistic under existing circumstances is designed to help the masses learn from life itself, through their own experience, the futility of parliamentarism, of constitutional reforms. In implementing this, four concrete steps are suggested: 1) Support candidates who include in their platforms and actually campaign for the basic goal of the national democratic movement. It is not enough for them to promise that, once elected, they will carry the voice of the Movement in the Convention. The campaign is a more important vehicle for political education than the Convention debates. 2) Distribute leaflets and organize teams of hecklers and agitators for joint rallies sponsored by the COMELEC. The objective is to instigate discussion of basic national issues, specifically to expose the bankruptcy of conservatism and the futility of reformism. 3) Organize mass rallies during the Convention to demand elimination of Parity, rejection of the "vested rights theory," confiscation of big landholdings and properties of American monopolies, removal of the government's power to restrict the rights of political dissent and industrial strikes, etc. 4) Since the Convention delegates will represent the vested interests in a neocolonial society, they will surely ignore these demands. Therefore, it is necessary to prepare the campaign machinery for a "NO" vote in the plebiscite.

Romerico Flores, the Bulacan chieftain of the Lavaite outfit MASAKA, expressed most clearly in his "Masaka Day" (September 19) speech the line of the Lava revisionist renegades: In order that the Filipino people become sure about the improvement of the Constitution which is the life and soul of our society, it is necessary to use the power of the people. The full change of the Constitution in accordance with requirements of modern society is needed. This depends on the representatives of the people who cannot be bought with the money and power of the foreigners and the Filipino reactionaries who are not ashamed to betray the interests of our country. The representatives who come from the ranks of the masses who understand and feel the situation and requirements of the majority of the people. The Malayang Samahang Magsasaka agrees to the full change in the form of our government. A parliamentary

government wherein the representatives come from every sector of our society according to their function and number. [Our translation.]

Romerico Flores himself ran for the constitutional convention and lost despite the much-vaunted "peasant" strength of the Lava revisionist renegades in Bulacan, the home province of the Lavas. His comic antics are representative of those of so many Lava revisionist renegades who ran for the constitutional convention in Nueva Ecija and Laguna and used all sorts of Lavaite tricks including the art of heckling imported direct from Hyde Park by their chief theorist, only to lose miserably. As in every reactionary election that they participate in, the Lava revisionist renegades only succeed in giving their approval to the reactionary elections and at the same time discrediting themselves before the people. Such parliamentary opportunism is abhorrent.

The Lava revisionist renegades are rabid constitutional democrats and inveterate lapdogs of US imperialism. They attack the organizations exposing the constitutional convention as a farce. They do not believe that the masses are for a genuine revolution.

So they say in Sang-ayon sa MAN (June 12, 1971): There are organizations which from the very beginning have expressly stated that we won't get anything from this CONCON. They outrightly call this a dupery and dissuade the masses from getting involved in this convention because it is claimed that we won't get anything from this. There are also organizations which held demonstrations at the same time that the convention was opened and posted costly "posters" condemning the convention. Is this tactic correct?

Let us further analyze some facts existing until today. There are still more people today who still believe that we can achieve change without going through a bloody revolution and killing among fellow countrymen. In short, people who believe that we can achieve significant changes through mere reforms and not through revolution. The number of people who hope that this CONCON will be the solution to our problems is still considerably larger than the number of progressives. There are still so many people who get irritated at the abusive and insulting language of the so-called progressives who seem to consider that nobody is right except them. These people who still constitute the majority are what we call the masses of the Filipino people. Under such circumstances, how can we persuade and attract these so-called masses?

All the distinctions that the Lava revisionist renegades have made between the "struggle for reforms" and reformism are hogwash. It is clear in the foregoing passage that after all they hold the view that the people believe that "we can achieve significant changes through mere reforms and not through revolution." This is unadulterated reformism. It falls into line with the Lavaite motto: "To a revolutionary, reform and revolution are interrelated and one cannot be emphasized at the expense of the other."

The Lava revisionist renegades will say anything to slander the national democratic organizations such as calling revolutionary propaganda as mere "vandalism," "rudeness" and "vulgarity" as in the following: We have also noticed that some organizations put so many printed wall posters stating that the CONCON is a deception on the people. They seem to ask the people not to participate in and rely on this show. But in our opinion, inspite or precisely because of the profusion of wall posters expressing this warning, people do not pay attention to these writings because what they have in mind is that these are done by troublemakers and are a type of "vandalism" which do not appeal to them. Especially if we consider that those who do these practically do not realize that their actions do not attract but alienate masses because of the common rudeness and vulgarity of the words they use and the people whom they abuse in such manner are people who are more recognized and honored by the majority and the common people than those who write these but who do not want themselves known or who do not identify themselves.

Despite the fact that they did not succeed in electing a single candidate to the constitutional convention (certainly Lichauco and Gunigundo are not Lavaites!), the Lava revisionist renegades prate what a fine thing it would be if the reactionary constitutional convention would just proclaim in the preamble of the constitution "our genuine independence" as proof of "our being nationalist." In all Lavaite gatherings, this sort of proclamation is done at the drop of a hat but so far the Lava revisionist renegades on their own continue to subvert and sabotage the revolutionary mass movement. Reading the passage below is once more hearing an old idealist nonsense from Francisco Lava, Sr., the notorious crackpot and grey eminence of the Lava revisionist renegades:

It is enough to show that as proof of our lack of independence the government cannot decide as to the definite date of our independence. Before, it was celebrated every July 4th. But when this act of ours was exposed and became shameful which shows our servitude to the Americans, this was transferred to a

new date and this became June 12 as set by Macapagal who is a die-hard puppet of the Americans.

But, any researcher who studies the independence allegedly proclaimed by Aguinaldo in Kawit, Cavite in 1899 proves that this freedom was empty....In other words, we are still a "protectorate" and a colony of the United States and without independence.

Therefore, it is only correct that the "preamble" of the constitution which will be adopted should proclaim our genuine independence as a proof of our being nationalist.

The Lava revisionist renegades take up the pretense of criticizing the erroneous "Left" opportunist lines of Jose and Jesus Lava only from 1948 to 1955 but they do not really have any clear idea what these exactly were or are simply dishonest about them. Thus, there are two hilarious results in their "criticism and self-criticism and rectification": First, they misrepresent the disastrous "Left" opportunist lines of Jose and Jesus Lava as the application of Chairman Mao's theory of protracted people's war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. Second, they use today the "Left" opportunism of Jose and Jesus Lava to justify Right opportunism. They support the Right opportunist line which Jesus Lava formally adopted in 1956 and chide him for not having adopted it earlier as the renegade and anti-communist Luis Taruc had proposed. So, the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism states: "In the opinion of the present PKP leadership, the mistake Comrade Jesus Lava made was not in shifting emphasis from armed struggle to parliamentary struggle, but in shifting too late." Afterwards, it turns to abusing the masses for their "stupidity" and "dupery" in believing Magsaysay.

The dishonesty and malice of the Lava revisionist renegades in their "criticism and self-criticism and rectification" became utterly clear when they concentrate on misrepresenting the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army as "Left adventurist" and claiming themselves to have learned lessons from the past. They quote Comrade Lenin several times only to attack Comrade Lenin and even Chairman Mao once to attack Chairman Mao. They always leave these quotations hanging in their propaganda. These are merely used as sugar-coating for every Lavaite attempt to muddle issues. It would be to offend Comrade Lenin if one quotes him about the concrete analysis of concrete conditions only to fail in making the concrete analysis of concrete conditions in

one's own country. It is the obnoxious style of the Lava revisionist renegades to preach above the heads of the great masses of our people.

VI. The Lavaite theory of "enlightened new imperialism" and "US Imperialism is serious about land reform"

The Lava revisionist renegades have thoroughly converted the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism (MAN) into their antinational, antidemocratic and anti-communist instrument. It is being used to attack not only Chairman Amado Guerrero, the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army but also its founding general secretary Jose Ma. Sison and various non-communist national democratic mass organizations against which the Lava revisionist renegades have special spite.

What has become of the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism? Twenty-three members of its 38-man national council are running dogs of the Lava revisionist renegades and a number of these are the top ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegade clique. At least 90% of its mass membership are redundant members of such Lavaite outfits as MASAKA, MPKP, BRPF, KILUSAN, CTUP, Nationalist Lawyers' League and the like. The small membership of the bogus communist party of the Lava revisionist renegades has become an open affair in the MAN. One simply has to take note of the same few persons assuming positions here and redundantly in two or three other Lavaite organizations to observe who is who.

An examination of the contents of MAN publications like Sang-ayon sa MAN and Political Review shows that, under the pretext of attacking only the person of founding MAN general secretary Jose Ma. Sison, the MAN actually attacks more entities, the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and non-communist national democratic mass organizations. More than it has pretendedly attacked the evils of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism, it has used the vilest and most vulgar language to slander patriotic and progressive entities, persons and organizations, which have proven themselves to be the most militant fighters in the struggle for national democracy. The Lava revisionist renegades have also used the MAN as a platform for making counter-revolutionary attacks against Mao Zedong, the Communist Party of China and communism.

What is behind the actions and actuations of the MAN? Everything can be traced

to the Lavaite theory of "enlightened new imperialism" consecrated by the MAN Second National Congress, which marked the Lavaite takeover of the organization. This theory is a refurbishing of Kautsky's revisionist theory of "supra-imperialism" which Lenin had roundly repudiated.

The program of the MAN, "MAN's GOAL: The Democratic Filipino Society," gives the gist of this theory of "enlightened new imperialism": This colonial line...may be stated as the promotion of capitalist development in the Third World under the hegemony of foreign monopolists. For this reason, various client-states of the United States have sponsored, with the support of the latter, land reform, tax reforms, reforms in public administration, community development programs and others. All these permit some form of local capitalism to succeed.

Like their classical revisionist predecessors and their Soviet revisionist masters, the Lava revisionist renegades make a lot of posturing against US imperialism. But in the final analysis, they wish to spread the counter-revolutionary idea that US imperialism permits the development of local capitalism in a semicolonial and semifeudal country. To befuddle others, they make a lot of fuss distinguishing what they call "colonial" and "national" industrialization. But their main point is to attack the Marxist-Leninist view that imperialism, after linking with feudalism, arrests rather than promotes the development of capitalism in colonies and semicolonies. A certain quantitative growth of local industries in the Philippines cannot be considered a qualitative change nullifying the Leninist theory on imperialism as the final stage of capitalism.

That US imperialism is now being wracked by an internal crisis, being beset with military defeats abroad and trying frantically to draw more and more profits from accumulated foreign direct investments and extremely onerous loan capital exports should convince everyone that it will not promote capitalist development in the Philippines. It is completely false, contrary to the claims of Jesus Lava, that US imperialism will destroy its feudal social base and create a full-fledged capitalist society in the Philippines in the classic style of development of pre-monopoly capitalism. The Lava revisionist renegades take the view that this capitalist development is certain and that the only issue to be debated on is whether this be "colonial" or "national."

The Lava revisionist renegades go to every length to picture US imperialism as almighty. They obscure its bankrupt political and economic position at home and

abroad. They underestimate the rebellions and strike movement of American workers, colored minorities, students and now even the imperialist troops. They minimize and express disdain for the revolutionary armed struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations as in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Palestine, Thailand, India, Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, Philippines and elsewhere in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They refuse to see that the imperialist powers, especially US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, must collude yet bitterly contend with each other because the areas for neocolonial exploitation is rapidly shrinking. They foolishly deny the immediate and long-term effects of the consolidated position of socialist China in the world proletarian revolution. The irrepressible and colossal growth of the world revolutionary forces has long ago changed the course of world history from capitalism to socialism. And today the world revolutionary situation is becoming more and more excellent.

Consistent with their bleak view of the world struggle against US imperialism and world capitalism, the Lava revisionist renegades go to every length to attack the national democratic revolution. They concede to US imperialism the "enlightened" role of making "land reform" and permitting local capitalism "to succeed." They welcome the very "tax reforms" now being used to suck more blood from the broad masses of the people as something as positive as the US-inspired "land reform." They also welcome the "reforms in public administration" now being used to facilitate the rise of counterinsurgency and fascism in the same manner.

The MAN program concedes to US imperialism the ability to provide anti-nationalists with an omnipotent weapon: Since there would be marked improvement in the living conditions of some sectors of the population, this tactic, if not exposed, would provide anti nationalists not only with a weapon with which to challenge the concept of attainment of national power as a precondition to the achievement of change, but also as a means to entice some sectors of the nationalist factors to abandon their anti-imperialist position.

The poisonous idea of the Lava revisionist renegades is very clear. They concede everything to US imperialism and the "anti-nationalist forces." They actually tell us that if US imperialism would improve living conditions here there is no more need to fight it. They trap themselves in their own inanities. Of what use would be the flimsy weapon of mere "exposure" supposedly wielded by them against the weapon of "improved living conditions" supposedly wielded by US imperialism?

The editorial of the April-May 1971 issue of Political Review states: "Imperialism is in full-scale offensive for effecting radical reforms to prevent another Cuba." The implication of this statement is that US imperialism can do anything as it pleases to frustrate the efforts of the revolutionary masses.

The editorial goes on: The imperialist-controlled "revolutionary situation" is more than artificial show. It is an earnest recognition that the whole social setting must undergo revamp if capitalism is to survive at all. Revolutionism could awaken the backward elements of the ruling classes to the gravity of the political and economic crisis. More than that it could lead to reforms that effect a refinement in the operation of the exploitative system in order to keep the oppressed masses in good humor again. To say that the imperialist aim is merely to get rid of President Marcos and his greenish-revolutionary spouse is to take a very limited view of the situation. Under attack are the outmoded forms of political and economic exploitation that stand on the way to more "enlightened" capitalist construction, or in the first place, its survival.

What a profound stupidity is the profound belief of the Lava revisionist renegades that the revolutionary situation that has grown on the real internal and external crisis of US imperialism is artificial show! More profoundly stupid and more profoundly counter-revolutionary is their belief that the "revolutionism" of the oppressed masses is "more than an artificial show" only in the sense that it is all made up by US imperialism to "awaken the backward elements of the ruling classes" and "to lead to reforms that effect a refinement in the operation of the exploitative system to keep the oppressed masses in good humor again." Only running dogs of US imperialism are capable of such twisted thinking in the face of reality. Only traitors are capable of such hopes as that US imperialism is after all the mastermind behind revolutionary activities, that "backward elements of the ruling classes" are being pressed to join up with the "advanced elements" of the ruling classes and that a "refinement" of exploitation "will keep the oppressed masses in good humor again." What is all this convoluted analysis of the Lava revisionist renegades for? They wish to spread the poisonous idea that US imperialism itself is making the attack on the outmoded forms of political and economic exploitation in order to remove the obstacles towards "more `enlightened' capitalist construction, or in the first place, its survival." The Lavaites are consistent believers of Kautsky's theory of "supra-imperialism." Actually, in the first place, they do not think that US imperialism is in any real crisis. Inflation, increased unemployment, devaluation, balance of payments problem, higher taxes and all other incontrovertible manifestations of crisis in

the country today must be to them either figments of the imagination or tactical moves of US imperialism to strengthen itself further.

It is very clear why the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism has taken the line of "letting the Laurel-Langley Agreement lapse but letting the Investment Incentives Law take over." It has long agreed to the replacement of the phrase "parity rights" with the phrase "national treatment." We are no longer surprised why even as the Investment Incentives Law had been enacted in 1967, the Lavaite MAN never questioned it or even mentioned it in its program. This Investment Incentives Law is even worse than the Laurel-Langley Agreement. And the constitutional convention which the Lava revisionist renegades have endorsed is going to bless this new law, together with several other legal devices, to prolong US imperialist domination. Senator Lorenzo M. Tanada, co-author of the Investment Incentives Law and chairman of the MAN, openly expressed in his keynote address to the Second National Congress of MAN the "nationalist" view that "just compensation" be paid to American shareholders who sell out; that foreign capital be attracted and given incentives; that more stock exchanges be put up; that foreign investment be spread out among as many foreign nationals as possible (including Japan and the Soviet Union, of course); and the like.

What is certainly unique about a document like the MAN program is that it does not even pretend to be addressed to the Filipino people but to the Philippine reactionary state. Since its Second National Congress, the MAN has not engaged in anti-imperialist mass actions that are as purposive and as militant as those of the first quarter storm of 1970. Instead, the Lava revisionist renegades have completely transformed MAN into their clique instrument in conducting malicious attacks against the revolutionary mass movement and in supporting their petty parliamentary struggle.

The revisionist scoundrel Jesus Lava states in his Camp Crame article regarding the Agricultural Land Reform Code: American imperialist self-interest in this regard is truly enlightened; it seeks to perpetuate its dominance by splitting the peasantry from the national movement for emancipation, by isolating the anti-imperialist nationalists from the peasantry.

There are two major points in this treacherous statement. First, US imperialism is presented as capable of splitting the peasantry from the national democratic revolution with a sham land reform program such as the Agricultural Land

Reform Code. Second, US imperialism is "enlightened." All these points constitute another resurrection of Kautsky's theory of "supra-imperialism" which harps on the unlimited capability of imperialism to extend its life by going against its own moribund and decadent nature as the final stage of capitalism. All these constitute an attack against Lenin who clearly proved in his great theory on imperialism that imperialism allies itself with the most reactionary feudal interests to counteract the bourgeois democratic revolution in colonies and semicolonies

Jesus Lava states: The American imperialists are not joking in their desire to effect land reform. The alliance of the imperialists and feudalists became truly effective during the time of classical or old colonialism. In truth, the main requirement for the life of imperialism then was to be able to get the content of mines, to establish big plantations which plant raw materials needed by factories in the US, like sugar, abaca, coconut, pineapple, etc. and to export their finished products.

In a new situation like this, the persistence of feudalism in the countryside (the alliance of the imperialists and feudalists) previously was able to help long-term interest of imperialism, and was able to establish its power in colonies has turned into the opposite...it has become the danger to its power, and has become the fuse for the collapse of the imperialists in the neocolony.

Here, Jesus Lava in bad sentence constructions [which should be confirmed by the reader by referring to his article] equates feudalism and the national democratic revolution to each other and mixes them up as similarly a danger to US imperialism.

In Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, the great Lenin said: The bourgeois reformists, and among them particularly the present-day adherents of Kautsky, of course, try to belittle the importance of facts of this kind by arguing that it "would be possible" to obtain raw materials in the open market without a "costly and dangerous" colonial policy; and that it "would be possible" to increase the supply of raw materials to an enormous extent "simply" by improving conditions in agriculture in general. But such arguments become an apology for imperialism, an attempt to embellish it, because they ignore the principal feature of the latest stage of capitalism: monopolies. Free markets are becoming more and more a thing of the past; monopolist syndicates and trusts are restricting them more and more every day, and "simply" improving

conditions in agriculture means improving the conditions of the masses, raising wages and reducing profits. Where, except in the imagination of sentimental reformists, are there any trusts capable of interesting themselves in the conditions of the masses instead of the conquest of colonies?

It is important to take note that the Lava revisionist renegades are conscious that the Agricultural Land Reform Code is an instrument of US imperialism. They are, therefore, conscious agents of US imperialism in making the implementation of the Agricultural Land Reform Code their main activity in the countryside.

Through the actual operation of this law of sham land reform, with the active complicity and cheering of the Lavaite outfit MASAKA, the landlords have made full use of all provisions that have further oppressed, dispossessed and exploited the peasant masses. It is for this reason that the Lava revisionist renegades are regarded as cheap agents of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism in the limited areas reached by them in Central Luzon and Southern Luzon.

The Lava revisionist renegades pompously claim to have a "membership" of 100,000 peasants in their MASAKA outfit. While it is true that through MASAKA they have divested great numbers of people of their money in the form of membership dues, lawyers' fees and "contributions" since 1964, it is clear that these do not constitute stable revolutionary peasant strength. In such swindler outfits as MASAKA, KASAKA and Federation of Free Farmers, "members" come and go as fast as they are deceived and as fast as they wake up to the fact that the Agricultural Land Reform Code is all a sham.

What fails the Lava revisionist renegades in their boisterous bluff that they have the support of large "peasant" masses is the obvious fact that since 1964 they have not made any single peasant strike even if only in the reformist style of the Khi Rho and the Federation of Free Farmers. It is too much to expect that they are conducting agrarian revolution, which ranges from forcible reduction of rent and interest to the confiscation of land, because such a phenomenon cannot come about "quietly." The landlord class cannot be stopped from raising a howl when agrarian revolution occurs, even if the Lava revisionist renegades prefer to conduct it "without press fanfare" as they claim.

The Lava revisionist renegades seem unaware of the fact that the general membership of MASAKA is fast awakening to the fact that the MASAKA has

merely encouraged landlords to take advantage of loopholes in the Agricultural Land Reform Code to the detriment of the peasant masses. Thousands upon thousands of former MASAKA members curse the MASAKA for having fleeced them of membership dues and contributions and also condemn such shysters as Ruben Torres, Haydee Yorac and Merlin Magallona for having collected lawyers' fees from them. In the countryside, MASAKA is now called MASAMA (the real acronym of the outfit which means evil) by the masses.

Whenever Party cadres and units of the New People's Army reach the areas where there is or there was a MASAKA chapter, the peasant masses pour out their grievances against the local tyrants, which include the despotic landlords, rotten bureaucrats and bad elements from the MASAKA who are either extortionists, swindlers or cattle-rustlers. The Party and the New People's Army are joyously welcomed or awaited today in areas where the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-MASAKA and the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique have committed various kinds of abuses. Reacting to the advances made by the Party and the New People's Army, the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-MASAKA has helped Task Force Lawin in setting up BSDUs.

The Philistine method used by the Lava revisionist renegades in bamboozling the people about their imaginary numbers is to boast when they are in the countryside that they have all the workers, students and professionals in Manila under their command and when they are in Manila that they have all the peasants in the countryside under their command. When they make international press releases through the hack of modern revisionism William J. Pomeroy, they claim to have the revolutionary mass movement under their command in both cities and countryside. They slander the Party, the New People's Army and all national democratic mass organizations as being the beneficiaries of the very counter-revolutionaries that raise hell in the reactionary press and distort facts that the mass protest actions and the military victories of the New People's Army have become so significant and so considerable that the local and international bourgeois press at the least cannot ignore them in their slanted reporting and comments.

The proletariat, student youth and other city-dwellers can never be bluffed by the Lava revisionist renegades. The mass protest actions in cities are unprecedented in magnitude and scale in the entire revolutionary history of the Philippines and these are not the achievements of the isolated Lavaite outfits. Revolutionaries in the cities are also aware that the Communist Party of the Philippines and the

New People's Army under its leadership build Party branches, regular guerrilla squads and platoons, local guerrilla and militia units, local organs of political power and barrio mass organizations for workers, peasants, youth, women and children. The Lavaite outfit MASAKA impresses no one with its parliamentary "peasant" strength when it cannot even have its ringleaders Alejandro Briones, Romerico Flores, Cesar Arenas and the like elected to the various government posts that they have sought. The electoral frustrations of these Lavaites have not raised the political consciousness of the people. On the other hand, they have only made the Lava revisionist renegades a laughing stock in some towns and in some electoral districts.

VII. The Lavaite line of "taking the purely anti-Marcos line"

The Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army have always expressed full support for the genuine national democratic organizations which have been most militant and consistent in awakening the people in the Greater Manila area and throughout the country to the great revolutionary struggle for national democracy against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

When the great mass actions of unprecedented magnitude and scale broke out in 1970, the Party paid them close attention and issued the statements necessary for inspiring and guiding them. Party cadres in cities and provincial capitals have militantly worked for what has come to be widely known as the new type of national democratic cultural revolution for promoting armed struggle. The course of the revolutionary mass movement in urban areas is defined by the series of Party statements some of which have been compiled under the title First Quarter Storm of 1970.

Inspired by the brilliant development in cities, the Party and the New People's Army have worked and fought even more vigorously in the countryside. They have expanded and consolidated the revolutionary mass movement in the countryside to support the revolutionary mass movement in the cities. The people's war in the countryside is the best answer to the constant threat of martial law and the acts of terrorism perpetrated by the Marcos fascist puppet clique in behalf of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

To give further profound direction to the revolutionary mass movement in both countryside and cities, Chairman Amado Guerrero has written Philippine Society

and Revolution, an attempt to give the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought a national form and guide the Philippine revolution. This book relates the people's democratic revolution not only to the re-establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines on December 26, 1968 but also to all previous revolutionary events in Philippine history. It is a comprehensive study involving the main strands of Philippine history, the basic problems of the Filipino people, the social structure and the class logic of the strategy and tactics of the Philippine revolution. Here are presented the character, motive forces, targets and tasks of the Philippine revolution.

The general line of the Communist Party of the Philippines, which is the people's democratic revolution, has been enthusiastically carried out by the revolutionary mass movement. The situation of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism has seriously worsened. At the same time, the revolutionary mass movement has fundamentally rid itself of such long-term saboteurs and disrupters as the Lava revisionist renegades and has become stronger and more united to its core. Though the Lava revisionist renegades keep on fretting about the failure of their kind of "unity" since 1967, the revolutionary mass movement has made vigorous advances that cannot be denied by anyone who is not blind to the main trend of current history.

No one in his right senses will deny that it is the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the genuine national democratic mass organizations which have been responsible for building up a broad revolutionary mass movement against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. Certainly, it is not the Lava revisionist renegades and their bureaucratic and puny outfits. That is a matter of recent history and cannot be twisted by a few badly written articles and manifestos by hacks of the Lava revisionist renegades.

Before we refer to the great achievements of the revolutionary mass movement, which are palpable enough to all, we have taken pains to show the basic counter-revolutionary character of the ideology and political line of the Lava revisionist renegades. As we take up the criminal collusion between the Lavaite traitors, renegades and scabs and the US-Marcos clique, we become ever more convinced that they are enemies of the people deserving of not only all previous ideological and political repudiation but also of more and harder blows for every crime that they commit against the people, the Party, the people's army, the national democratic mass organizations and their leaders.

The collusion between the Lava revisionist renegades and the US-Marcos clique became unmistakably clear during the first quarter storm of 1970. A handful of Lavaites like flies intruding upon a feast of the people invited themselves to the January 26 and 30-31 demonstrations and raised big banners. Later it was discovered that when the demonstrators were subjected to the most brutal fascist treatment like the Mendiola massacre, maiming, mass arrests and mass torture, the handful of Lavaites had scampered on January 30, 1970 to the safety of an extension office of the fascist puppet chieftain Marcos and were rewarded with sandwiches and soft drinks.

After Marcos delivered his January 31 speech attacking his victims and the great mass of demonstrators as "Maoists," "anarchists" and "mob," the Lava revisionist renegades immediately started to sing the same tune and added refrains of modern revisionism. In succeeding days, the Marcos fascist puppet clique used the Lava revisionist renegades and the still unexposed Lacsina yellow outfit to spread the rumor among the national democratic mass organizations that a massacre would occur if the mass protest rally scheduled for February 12, 1970 at Plaza Miranda would be pushed through. The national democratic mass organizations saw through the tricks of the enemy, unmasked the treachery of the Lava revisionist renegades and proceeded to hold the February 12 mass action and created in full the first quarter storm of 1970...a historic phenomenon of far-reaching significance in the heroic struggle for national democracy against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Undaunted by their exposure as agents of counterrevolution, particularly as agents of the US-Marcos clique, the Lava revisionist renegades brought out their scab line of accusing the revolutionary mass movement of "taking the purely anti-Marcos line." It is preposterous for them to consider Marcos as nothing more than his own person. They thought that this was a clever idea to defend Marcos. They harped on this line to cover up the strident reality that US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism were for the first time in the entire history of the Philippines being exposed and opposed with utmost clarity and concreteness by the national democratic movement on a nationwide scale.

Throughout 1970 and thereafter, the Marcos ruling faction showed its ugly fascist character and its character as a puppet of US imperialism and as the general representative of the local reactionary classes. As a reaction to the revolutionary mass movement, Marcos reinforced the fascist puppet character of

his regime and resorted to using all kinds of fascist tricks to attack and slander the national democratic movement. Despite all these, the Lava revisionist renegades consider themselves clever for having sidled up to Marcos and defending him. They made fools of themselves by claiming in effect to defend the CIA (Alejandro Melchor, Juan Ponce Enrile & Co.) from the CIA (Benigno Aquino, the American Jesuits & Co.). They wish to divide the people into "factions of the CIA." They peddle the counter-revolutionary line that the people are not themselves the motive force of history but a mere plaything of the reactionaries.

The counter-revolutionary character of the Lavaite line accusing the revolutionary mass movement of "taking the purely anti-Marcos line" became utterly clear again when at the beginning of 1971 Marcos was doing everything within his power to oppose the mass protest actions against the US oil companies and the commemoration of the Mendiola massacre. The Lava revisionist renegades unleashed their "special knowledge," issued an emergency manifesto and spread the rumor that Marcos would be overthrown through a coup d'etat on January 25, 1971 by the CIA, using as pawns Vice President Fernando Lopez, Senator Benigno Aquino, the American Jesuits, the clerico-fascists and the national democratic mass organizations and even the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army. The Lavaite traitors wanted to make Marcos appear as "no longer useful" to US imperialism at a time that he was making himself extremely useful to US imperialism, particularly in the suppression of worker-student strikes against the US oil companies.

In a ridiculous attempt to appear credible, the top ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegade clique took leaves of absence from their bureaucratic posts in the reactionary government to "prepare" for the outbreak of violence on the day that they had appointed. It turned out that the clerico-fascists, renaming themselves as the Social Democratic Front, were advocating a "stay-at-home" or "watch-the-television" policy, which was no different from the "take-a-leave-of-absence" or "go-to-Bulacan, Bulacan-or-Cabiao, Nueva Ecija" policy of the Lava revisionist renegades. On its part, the Communist Party of the Philippines issued the timely statement of January 18, 1971 clarifying the issues and criticizing the imputation of "Left" opportunist or putschist ideas to national democratic mass organizations by the US-Marcos clique, the Lava revisionist renegades, the clerico-fascists and other counter-revolutionaries. The Party correctly encouraged the masses to go on with their protest actions and to brave the enemy bluff. The result was that the brazen fascist threats of Marcos, the pseudo-

Marxist analysis of the Lava revisionist renegades and the paid advertisements of the Social Democratic Front all fell apart.

Even after January 25, when the masses braved fascist-revisionist threats and held a peaceful militant rally, the Lava revisionist renegades defined the defense of Marcos as their main political task in the January 1971 issue of Struggle: "The present main task of the Movement therefore would be to expose this anti-Marcos camp of the ruling classes riding on the wave of popular discontent and posing as champions of genuine reform. Marcos would still be dealt with but the main task of completely discrediting him before the masses has been, for the most part, already accomplished. It would be also a secondary task of the Movement to expose pseudo-revolutionary groups now collaborating with the CIA-managed anti-Marcos camp like the Left adventurist KM, the infantile SDK, the clerico-fascist Lakasdiwa, NUSP, YSP, and that bunch of surrenderers of the NPA."

The above passage speaks of a main task and a secondary task. A careful analysis of this and subsequent Lavaite pronouncements and activities clearly show that to perform their "main task" of attacking the "anti-Marcos camp" the Lava revisionist renegades are actually out to defend the US-Marcos clique and attack the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the non-communist and legal mass organizations.

In line with their wild counter-revolutionary thinking, the Lava revisionist renegades elaborated on their line accusing the national democratic movement of "taking the purely anti-Marcos line" in Struggle. They beg for giving Marcos "understanding": It would be useless to quarrel over how Marcos should be called; whether it be an agent of neocolonialism or a chief puppet of US imperialism. What is important is to understand the present situation of Marcos in relation to American imperialism and the cleavage within the ruling classes.

The Lavaites still want us to believe that any day now US imperialism will overthrow Marcos. Struggle insists: "The CIA has now practically shifted its attention to and bestowed its favor upon the anti-Marcos faction of the ruling classes." Struggle accuses the national democratic mass organizations of complicity with US imperialism and elaborates: "There is an all-out campaign waged by this band to further discredit Marcos in order to launch a CIA-sponsored coup d'etat and install a new US puppet. Of course a purely anti-Marcos line is what holds this group together....Now there exists an anti-Marcos

faction of the ruling classes that wields economic, political and military powers complete with international connections and blessed by the CIA Therefore the US imperialists can now afford to fan the flames of dissatisfaction with the Marcos regime, organize counterrevolution and pave the way for the ascension into power of the anti-Marcos bourgeoisie and landowners.”

Given the present position of Marcos vis-à-vis US imperialism and given the open cleavage within the ruling classes, US imperialists through the CIA now seek to organize massive purely anti-Marcos movement in order to facilitate the takeover of the anti-Marcos faction of the bourgeoisie and landowners. Part of the tactics of the CIA and the anti-Marcos camp is to use every anti-Marcos exclamation on the part of the national democratic forces to their advantage.

The Lava revisionist renegades can never give credit to the integrity and ability of the revolutionary mass movement and the national democratic forces in exposing, opposing and taking advantage of the bankruptcy of the US-Marcos clique. They cannot trust and have faith in the masses; they are blind to the fact that the revolutionary masses accumulate their own strength through their struggles. Consistent with their theories of "stupid masses" and "incidental leadership," they attribute to US imperialism the success of the revolutionary masses in isolating the rotten US-Marcos clique. They deny such colossal facts as the steady advance of the revolutionary mass movement and the revolutionary leadership made evident by the mountains of anti-imperialist, antifeudal and antifascist manifestos and books and the repeated people's marches and people's assemblies whose gigantic size and level of political consciousness are unprecedented.

In the editorial of the April-May 1971 issue of Political Review, the Lava revisionist renegades give credit to US imperialism and its running dogs for the revolutionary upsurges in the cities and the countryside: Even President Marcos who has cleverly combined voracity and puppetry, is now at war against the oligarchy... As though to assure that the "revolutionary situation" would not go out of control, the imperialist forces have abetted the split in the progressive movement and it would not be much of a surprise if it would turn out that they too have provided leadership to "revolutionary" groupings, including armed contingents.

The counter-revolutionary line of the Lava revisionist renegades is that the revolutionary mass movement cannot be genuine because they are out of it.

Trying to squirm out of their repudiation and isolation, they sometimes count themselves among the progressives only to make malicious slander against these, including the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army which are the principal components of that which they themselves acclaim as the progressive movement. They are bogged down in their own double-talk in the face of the surging revolutionary mass movement.

Going so far as to make self-contradictory statements, the Lava revisionist renegades seek not only to protect Marcos but praise US imperialism. So, their bulletin of anti-communism says: Marcos has been found sorely wanting. In the process of failing to carry out successfully American-sponsored programs of reform such as rural development and land reform because of the Government bureaucracy and corruption he has woven, Marcos has thus failed to carry out the essential imperialist task of arresting the growth of the revolutionary movement of the masses led by the national democratic forces. And so, Marcos is now a liability because his very corruption and bankruptcy obstructs the successful implementation of reform programs and hastens the revolutionary process aimed against American imperialism.

The Lava revisionist renegades seem at times to take digs at Marcos and even to admit the undeniable reality of the growing revolutionary mass movement but only to be able to give praise to the "reform programs" of US imperialism which they consider so efficacious as to be able to stop the revolutionary mass movement. There is consistency in the inconsistency of the Lava revisionist renegades of claiming at one turn that the revolutionary mass movement is instigated by US imperialism and at another turn that this same revolutionary mass movement grows on the rottenness of a puppet regime which US imperialism wants now to depose for the sake of counterrevolution. Consistently, they picture US imperialism as always on its own volition capable of arresting the growth of the revolutionary mass movement. Also consistently, they picture the revolutionary mass movement as the passive object of the "benevolence" of US imperialism. They deny the fact that the grave crisis in which Marcos finds himself is not only the result of his own corruption and failure to carry out "reform programs" but also the result of the grave crisis in which US imperialism itself is bogged down. They deny the fact that US imperialism itself is already in a grave crisis and is being dealt increasingly harder blows by the revolutionary masses in the United States itself and throughout the world. The Lava revisionist renegades in clear pursuit of their philosophy of "interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena" muddle up the

situation to mix up the friends and enemies of the revolution.

Confirming the political line carried by BRPF's Struggle, the Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism states: "Who is the bigger oligarch of the two (Marcos and Lopez) is of no concern to the revolutionary organizations, except perhaps to the fronts of Guerrero for reasons not exactly ideological." This is a silly statement. The Communist Party of the Philippines and the revolutionary mass movement it leads will always be interested in any serious split of the reactionary classes and will always take advantage of it to expand the united front and further isolate the reactionary diehards.

The Lavaites have the bad habit of licking the boots of the people's enemy. They have done this to practically every ruling clique in the Philippines from the time of Quezon down to Marcos. Vicente Lava committed the old merger party to a policy of unity without struggle with the Quezon ruling clique and the US government in the antifascist struggle, particularly in the years preceding the outbreak of World War II, and then of welcoming the US imperialists and the Osmeña government after the war of resistance. Supporting the Osmeña ruling clique, the Lavaites converted the old merger party into a minor servitor of the Nacionalista Party through the Democratic Alliance. The Castros, Frianezas, Lavas and Tarucs shamelessly quarreled over which candidate for puppet president to support in 1946, instead of continuing to build the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the people's army and the revolutionary united front.

Despite the utter fascist character of the Roxas ruling clique, the Lavaites agreed with it on the "pacification campaign" which was directed against the Communist Party, the people's army and the people and which resulted in the murder of so many cadres and Red fighters in 1946-47. During the critical year of 1948, Luis Taruc was permitted in June by Jose and Jesus Lava to bargain with the Quirino ruling clique on the surrender of the people's army; and the Lavas themselves drafted a memorandum of the old merger party pledging loyalty to the reactionary constitution and government for the Committee on Un-Filipino Activities in December. To cover up their old-time opportunism in connection with the Quirino ruling clique, the Lava revisionist renegades now recriminate themselves for having taken "a purely anti-Quirino line" from 1948 to 1952 and for having taken a boycott policy in the presidential elections of 1952. What else could have these sham Bolsheviks done to become a voting factor in the reactionary elections? To cover up their opportunism, they express a wish to have more of it to achieve the success that keeps on eluding them. They

insist on the counter-revolutionary line that Right opportunism is the solution to "Left" opportunism and that the reactionary elections should be the central question in a semicolonial and semifeudal country. The point is that even if they supported Quirino, they could not have been saved from the enemy strategic offensive because of their unrectified opportunist errors of the Right variety and then of the "Left" variety which sabotaged the old merger party from within and which had already isolated them from the masses.

During the time of the Magsaysay ruling clique, Jesus Lava and his fellow Lavaites entertained the surrender emissaries of Magsaysay like Manahan and Mondoñedo who are diehard CIA agents. During the time of the Garcia ruling clique, Jesus Lava tried to flatter Garcia by sending him letters of support including one praising the Anti-Subversion Law "for giving Communists without criminal record a chance to surrender and live a peaceful life." Lava has only recently publicly acknowledged his obsequious and anti-communist letters to Macapagal. The treacherous anti-communist note dated March 15, 1964 which he sent to Macapagal contain the following:

“We men here have a high regard for President Macapagal's sincerity in realizing his promises to the people and in his sense of fairness and justice. He is the man who could put an end to communism in this country...though only it should be...by being considerate and generous to their needs. I am speaking in behalf of the whole Communist organization.”

Until now, Jesus Lava cannot dispute the authenticity of the note which is supposed to be in his own handwriting.

There is nothing surprising about the Lavaite policy towards Marcos whom Jesus Lava openly described in 1969 as "veering on the course toward the achievement of our cause." Jesus Lava flattered Marcos in the following terms: "President Marcos picked up the issue of nationalism, as no other presidential candidate before him did, to win his re-election. Everybody knows that we in the Party have been advocating this issue for the last forty years." Lava also claimed that there was a "quickenning withdrawal" of Philippine ties with the United States as a determining factor hastening the "nationalist goal of self-reliance" under the Marcos puppet regime. These statements were reported by the Manila Times and until now the Lavaites have not yet called the reporter to task as a "liar." The letters framed and sent by the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique to Marcos were no different from the counter-revolutionary line and approaches

made by the Lava revisionist renegades towards Marcos. This in fact only shows that the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique was nothing but a historical and political ramification of Lavaite opportunism.

A favorite line used by the Lava revisionist renegades to call for support for the puppet reactionaries in power is to claim that the puppet president has gained the displeasure of US imperialism and that an assassination or a coup d'etat threatens the puppet president. Always, the implication of this line is that the revolutionary mass movement has to move to the defense of the puppet president who will in turn give concessions to the Lavaite ringleaders. It seems that the Lava revisionist renegades, who are always concerned about personal safety and selfish interests, have never stopped to consider that the disruption of the "normal processes" of the reactionaries will favor the revolutionary masses in the end.

Only a short-sighted fool will cower in fear before the threat of a coup d'etat or martial law. The best thing to happen is for the reactionaries to lose the advantage of claiming that a "democracy" exists in this country. Let them throw away all their rules of decorum and due process to the garbage. In this regard we will always oppose them for abusing the people. The overthrow of the Ngo Dinh Diem clique in south Vietnam was not of any help to US imperialism. It merely encouraged the Vietnamese people to fight even more fiercely and build up their own organs of political power in the countryside. Right now, even as the series of coup d'etat is over and there are now reactionary elections monopolized by Thieu, Ky and their kind, the people in south Vietnam have built their own Provisional Revolutionary Government.

In the Philippines, the Communist Party of the Philippines has correctly taken the view that if the reactionaries and their imperialist masters should choose to make a coup d'etat or declare martial law, the revolutionary movement, especially the armed struggle in the countryside, will be able to advance even more rapidly. The more violent the split among the reactionary classes, the more excellent is the revolutionary situation for the Party, the New People's Army and the people. A coup d'etat or martial law will come about due to the bankruptcy of the entire political system of the reactionaries, with such conditions as that the revolutionary mass movement has become truly strong and that the reactionary ruling classes can no longer settle their differences in the old way.

The Lavaites have long served as special agents of the big bourgeoisie and the

landlord class. Their special task has always been to infiltrate into the ranks of the revolutionary mass movement so as to corrode their unity and strength from within. But now they are exposed, repudiated and kicked out of the revolutionary mass movement. They can no longer be effective with their old opportunist tricks. They have sealed their doom with their fascist crimes no matter how much hope they place on their collusion with the US-Marcos clique and on their Soviet social-imperialist masters. The revolutionary masses are now led by the Communist Party of the Philippines, correctly guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

VIII. The Lavaite line of attacking the new forces and the national united front

To support their revisionist renegade stand and their fascist crimes, the Lavaites have shamelessly described the main current of the revolutionary mass movement as "Left adventurist," "petty bourgeois revolutionism," "romanticism" and have flung many other labels along the same line. The reality that they are trying to argue against and misrepresent include the strike movement and the national democratic cultural revolution of a new type which are now rapidly advancing in urban areas; and the armed struggle in the countryside which is still in the stage of strategic defensive, within which tactical offensives are being launched, in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist teachings of Comrade Mao Zedong.

The Lava revisionist renegades never tire of impertinently prating about the "strategic offensive" which is supposed to make a "revolutionary situation" in the style of seizing political power in Petrograd and Moscow in the October Revolution. But all their show of sham Marxism is nothing but an excuse for carrying out what they have openly and in black and white declared as their main task: to defend the "Marcos camp" against the "anti-Marcos camp." When we analyze the quantity and quality of Lavaite propaganda, we can easily see that they want to stop what they prefer to call the "purely anti-Marcos line" so that they can in turn harp on their own "purely anti-Sison line."

The Lava revisionist renegades have chosen to concentrate their fire on Jose Ma. Sison, whom they alternately refer to as Chairman Amado Guerrero, so as to attack the entire revolutionary mass movement, especially the new and youthful revolutionary forces, and serve them up for brutal repression jointly by the fascist gangsters of the US-Marcos clique and their own.

It is undeniable to the toiling masses and to the youth that Jose Ma. Sison's Struggle for National Democracy and founding efforts in several mass organizations have contributed greatly to the brilliant transition of the sixties to the seventies of the revolutionary mass movement. The mass organizations that have made possible the upsurges of revolutionary mass actions in the seventies can directly trace their development to the sixties. We hold high regards for Jose Ma. Sison as an outstanding figure in the national united front and among the revolutionary youth and for his indefatigable efforts to push forward the national democratic movement. His maligners cannot but appear as agents of counterrevolution and cheap gossipers of the lowest order. The Party cannot remain silent concerning him while he and what he stands for are subjected to attack. At any rate, we admire the national democratic mass organizations for defending him and themselves and for appropriately counter-attacking the entire gamut of Marcos fascists, revisionist fascists, clerico-fascists and other denizens of counterrevolution.

The Lava revisionist fascists think wrongly that they can combine their role of being special agents of the US-Marcos clique and their pretensions to being Communists. But they have only succeeded in exposing themselves for what they are. Their kind of propaganda and their fascist crimes against the national democratic movement smack of the infantilism and adventurism that they maliciously asperse to others. Fabricating the personal circumstances of Sison, such as claiming his father is "Vicente" and giving him a "fifth" brother, is not only a case of simple impertinence but also a case of irrational fascist propaganda. To crow about the "honesty" and "logic" of these fabrications, as the Lava revisionist renegades do in print and in floods of leaflets, is to heap abuse on the broad masses of the people. It is correctly stated by a non-communist observer like Miss Liwayway T. Reyes, a former member of one of the Lavaite outfits, that the Lava revisionist renegades are vulgar anti-communists. Upon their exposure, these scoundrels come off inferior to their anti-communist superiors like Jose Crisol and his staff.

In their role as cheap government informers, the Lava revisionist renegades have miserably failed to be convincing. They claim that Sison reorganized the Communist Party on December 26, 1968 but at another turn they claim that he did so a long time ago in 1962. They claim that he never set foot in the countryside before he met Comrade Dante but at another turn they claim that he went to the countryside to talk to MASAKA members. They ceaselessly proclaim themselves in public print that they compose the "legitimate"

communist party but they do not suffer the fascist crimes inflicted on those whom they attack. They are not hailed to the reactionary courts for "violation" of the Anti-Subversion Law even if only to raise their credibility. We have the crudest and most foolish kind of revisionist renegades before us.

Trying to gain wider publicity for their campaign of slander and calculated attempt to implicate particular organizations in the genuine national democratic movement to the underground, the Lava revisionist renegades extended to Teodosio Lansang their "internal" bulletin of anti-communism in addition to other more widely distributed anti-communist materials which Lansang had already had.

Lansang wrote an article for the May 14, 1971 issue of Asia-Philippines Leader, "One More View From the Left," and acknowledged having read the "internal" bulletin: A month later, in February 1971, Ang Komunista, "internal bulletin of Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas" (Vol. 2, No. 1) came out with eight major articles, one of which "Marxism-Leninism and Revolutionary Quixotism," supposedly written by "Mario Frunze" reveals a similar image of Amado Guerrero and his group. Lansang asserts: After "Guerrero" had fled the city and was later heard to have joined forces with Dante, following a supposed Party plenum, the KM...to which "Guerrero's" personal name had been identified as organizer and leader but which in fact was a Party assignment before as general secretary of the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism (MAN) and first deputy chairman of the Socialist Party of the Philippines, and occupied positions of authority and importance in a few other organizations.

Apparently enjoying the same license that the "revolutionaries" of the Lava revisionist renegade clique enjoy and being in the same conspiracy with them, the crackpot Teodosio Lansang has his own bragging and his own fabrication to make regarding an "ad hoc national liberation committee" in the reactionary press: "various revolutionary and progressive groupings in the movement... beginning with the topmost CPP-NPA combination down to the lowest level of a small and newly organized student cultural group, like the SAKABA (Samahan sa Kaunlaran ng Bansa)...it will do well for the whole of the movement to reconsider its strategy and tactics...Just before he (Sison) left his comrades, he was also interested in the chairmanship of an ad hoc committee on national liberation..."

To buttress his position, Lansang openly declares himself to be a "precious

cadre" of "thirty years' standing" and keeps on calling others "comrades" in the national liberation movement.

Just about everyone, including the slanderers, is implicated with the underground. Yet the Lava revisionist renegades continue to report to their offices in the reactionary government and to their business or professional offices. They even sport pistols and revolvers and have armed escorts now. They continue to make their campaign of slander in coordination with the propaganda mills of the reactionary government and such "sober revolutionaries" as the Lacsinas and Lansangs of the "Socialist Party of the Philippines." They are using every bit of their worn-out reputation as "revolutionary veterans" to make malicious claims about the "counter-revolutionary role" of others. Yet despite all their pretensions, they are left undisturbed by the US-Marcos clique. Against the attempt to implicate them with the underground, such legal and non-communist mass organizations as the Movement for a Democratic Philippines, Kabataang Makabayan and Samahang Demokratiko ng Kabataan have heroically stood their ground and have not slackened in their patriotic militancy.

A consistent line of attack pursued by the Lava revisionist renegades is that the revolutionary youth so much influenced by Chairman Amado Guerrero and Jose Ma. Sison have "separated the young from the old." But to reduce this absurdity to what it is, a young woman activist writes in the Asia-Philippines Leader (June 11, 1971) the following: "As a matter of fact, Sison and Guerrero have been attacked by the reactionaries for having the highest respect for Mao Zedong and for having the lowest regard for a much younger man like Richard Nixon."

She explains further: "We the young activists and students must oppose (the) fabrication that we do not regard the present revolutionary mass movement as being continuous with previous revolutionary mass struggles. There is a great difference between rejecting the failed leadership of the Lavas and giving credit to the previous revolutionary mass struggles and the revolutionary cadres truly worthy of respect."

It is puerile for Lansang to speak arrogantly about our being "not born yet" or "still in swaddling clothes" when the Lavas were already bungling the revolution or Lansang was still enjoying himself abroad in one vacation resort after another...

The youth are doing everything within their capability to help maintain and bring

to higher stages the revolutionary mass movement of workers, peasants, and the urban petty bourgeoisie, irrespective of age. But they have no illusion that the youth alone can make revolution; the revolutionary class standpoint demands proletarian leadership and the mobilization of the toiling masses of workers and peasants.

Despite their reputation as revolutionary "veterans," however, the Lavas, Lansangs and Lacsinas have opposed and slandered the revolutionary mass movement as nothing but the work of the "adventurist" and "anarchist" young. These "veterans" echo every line of attack uttered by the fascist Marcos to justify kidnapping, murders, massacres, and disruption of popular demonstrations.

The Lavas, Lacsinas and Lansangs have the bad habit of ascribing silly and incongruous statements and deeds to other people. They say that it is Sison's or Guerrero's view that "the young must be separated from the old." They fabricate statements to this effect because they cannot make any direct quotation from Struggle for National Democracy or Philippine Society and Revolution. Then, they turn to abusing the young as "immature," "inexperienced," "reckless," "adventurist," and the like.

One outstanding characteristic of the ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegades is their relatively advanced age. However, this does not necessarily mean maturity in revolutionary work when we consider the age disparity between them and the youthful masses of workers, peasants, students, intellectuals and other patriots that have repudiated them. Rather it is a clear manifestation of a long period, almost two decades, of seeking cowardly safety and of counter-revolutionary hibernation. They seem to be getting active now that there is a revolutionary flow (which they still describe as transition from ebb to flow") but only to impose their degenerate Lavaite ways and oppose the revolutionary youth who find them repulsive. On the other hand, truly revolutionary cadres of previous revolutionary struggles who have had a good grasp of the developing situation have been invariably welcomed into the ranks of the revolutionary movement.

At the age of thirty, the great Lenin explained why the youth of less than thirty predominate in the revolutionary ranks: of every class, the proletariat included, also depends both on the position of this class and on the principal form of its struggle. Lenin complains, for example, that young workers predominate in our Party, that we have a few married workers, and that they leave the Party. This

complaint of a Russian opportunist reminds me of a passage in one of Engels' works... Retorting to some fatuous bourgeois professor, a German Cadet, Engels wrote: "Is it not natural that youth should predominate in our Party, the revolutionary Party? We are a party of innovators, and it is always the youth that most eagerly follows the innovators. We are a party that is waging self-sacrificing struggle against old rottenness, and youth is always the first to undertake a self-sacrificing struggle." No, let us leave it to the Cadets to collect the "tired" old men of thirty, revolutionaries who have "grown wise," and renegades from Social-Democracy [Communism]. We shall always be a part of the youth of the advanced class.

It is very natural that most of the Red commanders and fighters of the New People's Army are young peasants, workers and former students and also that most of the activists in the national democratic cultural revolution of a new type and the strike movement centered in the urban areas are young workers, students, professionals and handicraftsmen. On the basis of these large new forces, the proletarian revolutionary party of today is youthful. At any time, this is a fact that cannot be avoided; the youth are always the majority in any population and are reflected by the membership of any party. This is underscored in the revolutionary mass movement by the failure of the Lavaites to arouse and mobilize the broad masses of the people for an extremely long period. At any rate, we agree with Engels and Lenin that the spirit of revolutionary innovation so characteristic of the youth will always attract the youth to the Communist Party of the Philippines.

It is unthinkable how the Lava revisionist renegades, as they grow older but never wiser, will ever leave their posts in the reactionary government, their business establishments and other conservative commitments. If they continue to make sweeping attacks against the new forces of the revolution, they will find themselves more isolated, more filthy-mouthed and more decadent in the years to come. Their blood debts have further shortened their shameless career.

Let us quote some invectives of the Lava revisionist renegades against the youth from Sang-ayon sa MAN: "Never has it [Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism] taken the pretension of being Marxist-Leninist like the common pretension of many movements or organizations of infantile youth who still have milk in their tongues [may gatas pa sa dila]... Nevertheless, we can be proud that never have we betrayed our ideals and never have we betrayed the people and we have not yet had any of the childish and ignorant youth killed... But the

students went to extremes and destroyed the windows and the stores of the people...who recoiled and became angry with the demonstrators.”

From BRPF's Struggle: “To think that the KM arrogantly describes itself in its program adopted as its 3rd Congress as the vanguard of the Filipino youth! Since when has a student-petty bourgeois-based group been a vanguard of any revolutionary struggle?”

Take note of the Lavaite shift from the phrase "the vanguard of the Filipino youth" to "a vanguard of any revolutionary struggle." There is an attempt at a cheap trick but literary incompetence and ideological bankruptcy on the part of the trickster are too obvious. Is it not a historical fact that the organization being maligned is both "a" and "the" vanguard of the youth movement? It is the Lava revisionist renegades who have the false illusion that it is their kind of youth organization (the MPKP) which is "the vanguard" not only of the Filipino youth but of the entire Philippine revolution.

The lead paragraph of the editorial of the July 4, 1971 issue of Ang Gabay reads fully as follows: The situation obtaining in the whole archipelago at present is showing the certain treading of the Filipino masses on the revolutionary road towards national democracy and freedom. In the face of this fact, the vanguard organization of the Filipino youth [reference to the MPKP] is today performing a decisive task of leadership in the Philippine revolution. [Underscoring ours.]

That is a blatant denial of the proletariat's role of leading the Philippine revolution through its highest form of class organization, the Communist Party of the Philippines. The Lava revisionist renegades wish to have their scab youth group assume the vanguard role in the entire Philippine revolution.

Whenever the Lava revisionist renegades speak about Kabataang Makabayan, they wish people to believe that it had disintegrated a long time ago by "splits." The Lavaite bulletin of anti-communism even boasts that the "disintegration" of KM has been the result of "retaliatory blows from the Party." If that is the case, what is all the fuss about KM? They also publicly boast that it was the expert intrigues of Merlin M. Magallona and Romeo Dizon through Vivencio Jose and Perfecto Tera that caused the formation of Samahang Demokratiko ng Kabataan against KM. But what is the fact today? KM and SDK, the major non-communist youth organizations, are together in the forefront of the struggle against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism and Soviet-Lavaite

revisionism.

It is a major method of the Lava revisionist renegades to bluff people with their supposed "peasant" strength in their campaign to slander and attack the new revolutionary forces and the broad national democratic front. The Lava revisionist renegades are fond of brandishing the MASAKA as a sign that they have the peasantry in their pockets and boasting that no revolution can be made without the list of those swindled by them. This kind of empty Lavaite arrogance is manifested by the BRPF's Struggle speaking of "MPKP-controlled areas."

The following passage is more extensive: While MPKP may grant that the KM has a large student following in the city, it cannot say that KM has the advantage where it counts most... in the countryside. KM leaders themselves know for a fact that they cannot equal, much less approximate the following that MPKP and fraternal groups have in the countryside...

William J. Pomeroy in his article "Who's Who in the Fight" echoes his fellow revisionists in the Lavaite MPKP: To Sison's mechanical attempt to transfer the Maoist ideas on the peasantry to the Philippines, the MPKP said: "The KM commits unpardonable blunder in declaring the peasantry in the Philippines to be the decisive force because they are 'the most oppressed and most numerous'." Sheer number alone does not constitute a valid criteria for determining which class should be the decisive factor. In the neocolonial and semi-feudal set-up of Philippine society, the decisive force is the alliance of the workers and peasants. The leadership, however, is provided by the working class, in conformity with historically confirmed and elementary principles of dialectics of present revolutionary movements, principles which the KM understandably ignores, what with the dominance of petty-bourgeois elements in its ranks. It is also ironic that the KM does not even have a massive peasant base in spite of its contention that the peasantry is the leading force."

In the above passage, the Lava revisionist renegades once more resort to adducing their own words and ideas to other people. They claim that KM takes the view that the peasantry is decisive for being the "leading class" and they laugh at their own dishonesty and then make another childish taunt that KM does not even have a peasant base. It would be fair for KM to slap the faces of these revisionist prevaricators with its manifestos and with Jose Ma. Sison's Struggle for National Democracy. On behalf of the Party, we urge all the national democratic mass organizations to read and study Chairman Amado Guerrero's

Philippine Society and Revolution and we also wish to assure them that the revolutionary bases in the countryside serve as a powerful rear and basic support for all revolutionary efforts in the cities.

The Party has observed that there is a high level of ideological and political consciousness among the genuine national democratic organizations. It is well understood among them that the proletariat is decisive for being the leading class; the peasantry is decisive for being the main mass support and the urban petty bourgeoisie is decisive for being the most important stratum for winning the middle forces and shifting the balance of forces in favor of the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines. These are basic and therefore decisive forces; without one the others cannot win the revolution in a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines.

In the basic document of rectification, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," the historical and social roots of Lavaite opportunism and revisionism have been traced to the unremolded petty-bourgeois thinking of the Lavas which was made to prevail in the old merger party. Obviously wanting to get back at the Party and revolutionary movement that have repudiated them, the Lava revisionist fascists have taken to the bad habit of expressing disdain for the masses of the urban petty bourgeoisie like students, teachers, journalists, professionals and the like and considering any mass organization with large concentration of these elements as counter-revolutionary. The Lavaites should be reminded time and again that there is a great difference between the petty-bourgeois elements creeping into a Communist Party with unremolded petty-bourgeois thinking and the entire social stratum of the urban petty bourgeoisie which, after the semiproletariat, is the closest ally of the proletariat.

The Lava revisionist fascists are today extremely antagonistic to the urban petty bourgeoisie because they have become the agents of the big bourgeoisie, the US-Marcos clique and the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalists. They do not have the honest desire of criticizing minor currents like those of Che Guevara-ism, Regis Debrayism, Carlos Marighellaism and the counter-revolutionary ideas of Herbert Marcuse which our Party has properly criticized. They have the vile motive of attacking the entire urban petty bourgeoisie when they concentrate their attack on the mass organizations which have been in the main current and among those in the forefront of the strike movement and the national democratic cultural revolution of a new type. The revolutionary students, teachers, journalists and other professionals are greatly assisting the proletariat and its

Party in arousing and mobilizing the masses on a nationwide scale for the people's democratic revolution against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

One important reason why the US-Marcos clique cannot yet make an all-out attack against the Party and the people is the unprecedented rising of revolutionary consciousness among the urban petty bourgeoisie. This social stratum has made heroic sacrifices for the revolutionary mass movement and every time an abuse befalls them, the US-Marcos clique as the abuser, has found itself more politically isolated. The key to the nationwide promotion of revolutionary ideas is the powerful support of progressive sections of the urban petty bourgeoisie to the revolutionary proletariat.

The political actions of the urban petty bourgeoisie, together with the toiling masses, cannot be disregarded by the reactionary press, even if such press is controlled by the big bourgeois and big landlord publishers and advertisers. It is because the great bulk of newspaper readers and radio listeners belong to the urban petty bourgeoisie. The reactionary press can only pretend to report on revolutionary events. It cannot disregard such events as those massive protest actions participated in by the urban petty bourgeoisie, though these are led by the revolutionary proletariat. Revolutionary ideas also travel fast among the members of the urban petty bourgeoisie, including the working journalists, whether the reactionaries like it or not. As a whole, the reactionary press has always tailed after revolutionary events and distorted its reporting and comments on these against the revolutionary cause. Direct democratic action is resorted to by the revolutionary masses precisely because the channels of "democracy" in the hands of reactionaries, including the press, are stumbling blocks for the airing of genuine public opinion. The Lava revisionist renegades in their fascist bankruptcy would rather imagine now that there is a conspiracy between the reactionary publishers and the national democratic mass organizations, despite the fact that it is a Lavaite ringleader like Ching Maramag who is a big boss in the Roces publications.

Here is another clear counter-revolutionary Lavaite attack against the entire petty bourgeoisie, the youth and journalists: The myth about revolutionary peasants and workers rallying around "Chairman" Amado Guerrero and his close comrade-in arms, Commander Dante, appeals to youthful romantics who need an exciting symbol in an otherwise boring petty-bourgeois existence. It provides a constant source of sensational news to metropolitan journalists and it is

indispensable to the puppet armed forces who must have celebrated villains to hunt down for budgetary purposes...

This is an inane statement worthy of a Teodoro Valencia. In fact, the only kind of journalists ever willing to broadcast the views of the Lavaites includes Eduardo Lachica, Teodoro Valencia and Max Soliven. The Philippines Herald, an organ of the biggest comprador group in the Philippines, is fond of utilizing the press releases of the Lavaite outfits in order to slander the revolutionary mass movement.

The Lava revisionist renegades prefer to call the awakening and mobilization of the masses as "publicity" with pejorative connotation. So, they state in their bulletin of anti-communism: In the petty-bourgeois order of values, publicity is the highest measure of success. Ignacio Lacsina, the Socialist Party leader, noted quite perceptively that these buffoons would sacrifice the long-range objectives of the socialist movement in their infantile craving for daily publicity.

At a time that the fraud and press-release maniac Lacsina is already being cast away as a yellow labor leader and as rubbish, the Lavaites pick him up as an authority from whom to derive "wisdom" in their attempt to show that they "shun" the limelight. But we recall that obscure speech of Francisco Lava, Jr. before the MPKP on November 30, 1969 where he categorically states that he wants "officers who can get more publicity in the metropolitan newspapers, radio and television." Thus, the MPKP was reorganized on January 25, 1970 and such press-release hacks as Ruben Torres and Romeo Dizon, a Lava clansman, became chairman and general secretary, respectively.

We also recall the press release concerning the MPKP which Lacsina issued on February 15, 1970 when he was trying to cover up his own counter-revolutionary role.

We quote: Ignacio P. Lacsina, chairman of the Socialist Party of the Philippines, yesterday denounced the Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino (MPKP) as a "pseudo-nationalist paper organization" and sought its exclusion from the Movement for a Democratic Philippines.

Exposing what he described as the MPKP's underhanded "splitting activities," Lacsina charged that "this phony organization is the creation of an inordinately ambitious clique of senile leftists whose inability to attract popular support has

led them to futile, if destructive, attempts at power takeover of militant youth, labor and peasant groups."

Lacsina said that "the main preoccupation at present of the MPKP seems to be the promotion of a split between the students, on the one hand, and the workers and peasants, on the other, who have forged strong solidarity in their common struggle against imperialism, feudalism and fascism.

The Lava revisionist renegades have hired themselves out to the US-Marcos clique and to earn their keep they have to resort to every trick to divide the urban petty bourgeoisie from the proletariat in the cities and to divide the revolutionary mass movement in the cities from the revolutionary mass movement in the countryside. So much exasperated by large masses of the urban petty bourgeoisie adopting the general line of the Communist Party of the Philippines, which is the people's democratic revolution, the US-Marcos clique has hired the services of the Lava revisionist fascists for "pinpointing" Communists and slandering entire mass organizations in cities with the use of pseudo-Marxist analysis.

What the US-Marcos clique cannot accomplish with open force during mass actions, the Lava revisionist fascists have pledged to accomplish with pseudo-Marxist analysis and selective terror in coordination with the reactionary state.

The spite of the Lava revisionist renegades for the revolutionary forces in the cities, especially the urban petty bourgeoisie, is best expressed in the vulgar language of the editorial of their bulletin of anti-communism: PKP (Lava revisionist renegades) draws a distinction between an ordinary peasant member of the Mao Thought party and the "salamins," the intellectuals from the city who harbor intense hatred towards us.

The Lavas, the Nemenzos, Dizons and Torreses must have stopped wearing glasses or have taken to wearing contact lenses to make this kind of statement.

The Lava revisionist renegades have become such rabid agents of the big bourgeoisie and the big landlord class that they despise not only the petty bourgeois but also the national bourgeoisie. They attack the national bourgeoisie on the ground that it, with the exception of a few elements whom they call the "nationalist bourgeoisie," has completely sold out to US imperialism. In effect, they deny that there exist contradictions between the national bourgeoisie and foreign monopoly capitalism which includes US imperialism and Japanese

imperialism. They actually boast that US imperialism has already sufficiently brought the national bourgeoisie into "joint ventures."

The Lava revisionist renegades deliberately obscure the composition of the national bourgeoisie, with its right, middle and left wings. They wish to deprive the proletariat of a significant ally in the people's democratic revolution. Thus, they express through Ang Gabay the following: As a special class in the Philippines, therefore, the middle bourgeoisie or national bourgeoisie is no longer allying itself with the working class against the American imperialists. In this regard, they would rather upgrade the lumpen proletariat as a more reliable ally. They do so to the extent of putting it at par with the petty bourgeoisie.

The national united front policy of the Communist Party of the Philippines is a proletarian policy concerning classes in Philippine society. It entails knowing who are our friends and who are our enemies among the various classes and strata.

Chairman Mao teaches us: Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? That is a question of first importance for the revolution...A revolutionary party is the guide of the masses and no revolution ever succeeds when the revolutionary party leads them astray. To ensure that we will definitely achieve success in our revolution and will not lead the masses astray, we must pay attention to uniting with our real friends in order to attack our real enemies.

The national united front is led by the proletariat and is based mainly on the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry. Through the Communist Party of the Philippines as its advanced detachment, the proletariat goes into the midst of its closest and most reliable ally, the peasantry, to conduct mass work and wage revolutionary armed struggle. On the basis of the worker-peasant alliance, such middle forces as the urban petty bourgeoisie firstly and the national bourgeoisie secondly can be won over as allies in order to isolate and destroy the enemy diehards. A united front of the proletariat, peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie should be built up in order to deal death blows on the big bourgeoisie (the imperialists and the big compradors) and the big landlords. The forces of the national united front have a common ground for common agreement. It is the people's democratic revolution, otherwise known as the national democratic revolution against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The program of the national united front corresponds to the Party's Program for a People's Democratic Revolution. The national united

front is therefore a component of the political line of the Party. It is a weapon complementing and serving the revolutionary armed struggle.

It is not always necessary to have a formal nationwide united front organization to be able to implement the united front policy of the Party. But the Party at the moment has a special organ, the Preparatory Commission of the National Democratic Front, which helps popularize the national democratic line and pays special attention to relations with allies. Whether there is a formal united front organization or there is none as it is now the case, there can be no "absolute unity" within the united front as the Lava revisionist renegades insist. There is unity and struggle within the national united front because of the varied class interests within it. There is restraint on struggle only insofar as it fosters national democratic unity against the enemy. The Party maintains its ideological, political and organizational independence and initiative and proves its leadership through revolutionary theory, policies and deeds. Likewise, the allies can also be expected to maintain their own independence and initiative.

The Movement for a Democratic Philippines is not the entire national united front, though it strives vigorously to help build up and unite the broadest alliance of legal mass organizations and personages for the national democratic revolution. There is no doubt that it had played quite a significant role in Greater Manila and other urban areas in the country. But it takes more than the Movement for a Democratic Philippines to make the entire united front. It is silly of the Lava revisionist renegades to conjecture that the Party itself takes this alliance of legal mass organizations as the entire united front or even a mere replica of it.

It is even sillier for the Lava revisionist renegades to insist that the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism is the entire national united front under the command of their bogus communist party. This organization is controlled and run by the Lava revisionist renegades and therefore is disconnected from and opposed to the revolutionary armed struggle. It has become a Lavaite outfit for attacking the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the entire revolutionary mass movement. To go over its organizational set-up is to go over all other Lavaite outfits. It is here where all Lavaite outfits, including the bogus communist party and Armeng Bayan, converge.

It is in the rural areas today that the Communist Party of the Philippines is creating the biggest, most stable and firmest basis for the national united front.

By conducting mass work and waging a protracted people's war here, the Party is building up the worker-peasant alliance. Among the peasant masses, the Party is creating the basis for independence, initiative and leadership in the united front. Among the peasant masses, the Party also maintains the revolutionary class line in relying mainly on the poor peasants, winning over the middle peasants and neutralizing the rich peasants. Armed contingents are being drawn mainly from the peasant masses and the advanced detachment of the proletariat leads them. The New People's Army is the splendid fruit of the worker-peasant alliance. Party branches are springing up in the countryside. The people's government has emerged in the countryside in the form of local organs of political power like the barrio organizing committees and the barrio revolutionary committees. In these organs of political power, the three-thirds agreement is being followed as a practical application of the Party's united front policy. It means that one part is drawn from the communist cadres and members; another part is drawn from mass activists from the ranks of the poor and lower-middle peasants; and still another part is drawn from other revolutionary elements.

The organs of political power are led by the Party and are supported by local mass organizations of workers, peasants, youth, women, children and cultural workers. In Northern Luzon and Central Luzon alone, there are now at least 300,000 people governed by the local organs of political power and participating in various mass organizations at the barrio level. These constitute a powerful mass support for the national democratic front all over the archipelago. How do the handful of BSDU gangsters and swindlers in the Monkees-MASAKA-Armeng Bayan compare to these?

In the urban areas today, the workers are rapidly rising under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines. They are vigorously launching strikes and are joining mass actions on various political issues against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The Party is establishing Party groups in various labor organizations and Party branches in workplaces and communities. The workers hate the Lava revisionist renegades for sabotaging the Party and the workers' movement for several decades and they also hate the labor aristocrats that ride roughshod over them. Linking closely with the workers in strikes and other mass actions is the urban petty bourgeoisie whose wide influence has served to popularize the national democratic line and expose the fascist tricks of the enemy. Workers, students and other city residents are also found together in various national democratic mass organizations. Party branches have been established in schools and offices and Party groups in various mass

organizations. The revolutionary forces in the countryside are inspired by the revolutionary slogans and achievements of these mass organizations. In turn, these mass organizations can rely on the revolutionary forces in the countryside.

In its own unstable and vacillating way, the national bourgeoisie is opposing monopoly capitalism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. It has its own organizations that look after its own interests. It has a few representatives or spokesmen in the constitutional convention, though this is dominated by the reactionary parties. It also has representatives or spokesmen in both the Liberal Party and the Nacionalista Party, though these reactionary parties are strategically controlled by the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. The left wing, middle wing and the most progressive members of the national bourgeoisie have extended support to the revolutionary mass movement and have even come to the legal defense of national democratic mass organizations. The national bourgeoisie can be expected to cooperate more with the revolutionary mass movement as the latter grows in strength and US imperialism increasingly becomes weakened. The Party must always exercise revolutionary vigilance in its relations with the national bourgeoisie because of its dual character.

United front tactics can be applied on the reactionaries in order to isolate and destroy the enemy diehards among them. It is a good policy to fight the reactionary factions one by one and to make use of the contradictions among them to favor the revolutionary mass movement. It is important to pay close attention to the split between one reactionary faction and another reactionary faction in the concrete conditions of a province or district; and within the ruling Nacionalista Party between the US-Marcos clique and other cliques. These splits or contradictions are favorable to the revolutionary mass movement.

The more violent the contradictions among the reactionaries become the better for the revolutionary mass movement. When such violent contradictions occur, we acquire plenty of room for maneuver and for gaining mass support. All progressive classes, strata and groups tend to seek leadership and support from the revolutionary party of the proletariat and the people's army. It is favorable to us that the reactionaries are rapidly arming themselves to the teeth against each other. They have now increased their bodyguards and enlarged their security agencies into veritable private armies.

The stronger the revolutionary mass movement becomes, the contradictions

among the reactionaries tend to become more violent. The ruling clique tends to use the reactionary armed forces and the police and such additional forces as the BSDU, "Monkees" and its own private gang not only against the revolutionary mass movement but also against a reactionary faction seeking power for itself. In other words, it tends to monopolize power. It does occur, however, that a lower ruling clique tends to seek cooperation with the revolutionary mass movement when it considers it politically hopeless to oppose the masses or when it is bitterly opposed by another reactionary faction enjoying the support of a higher ruling clique. In any case, the Party can make use of the contradictions among the reactionaries to defend and advance the revolutionary mass movement, especially the people's army.

The national minorities of Mindanao have been fiercely waging armed struggle against the reactionary armed forces and the big landgrabbers. Their armed struggle and ours support each other. In this sense, we have a united front against the common enemy. It accords with the Party's united front policy to support the struggle of the national minorities of Mindanao for self-determination against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The Party must exert all efforts at the same time to avert sheer religious strife which only favors both the Christian and Muslim reactionaries. The national minorities have to coordinate with the poor settlers in fighting against the real exploiters and oppressors...the real landgrabbers who are big landlords and big concessionaires for plantations, mines, ranches and timber. A united front of minorities and poor settlers can be worked out as the Party establishes itself in Mindanao and creates its own armed contingents there.

As the political and economic crisis of the ruling system worsens, the Party, the New People's Army and the national united front will become stronger weapons of the revolutionary masses for destroying the enemy and for advancing the people's democratic revolution. US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction are certain to be doomed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, let us quote from Chairman Mao: I hold that it is bad as far as we are concerned if a person, a political party, an army or a school is not attacked by the enemy, for in that case it would definitely mean that we have sunk to the level of the enemy. It is good if we are attacked by the enemy, since it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and

ourselves. It is still better if the enemy attacks us wildly and paints us as utterly black and without a single virtue; it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work. Indeed, after the outburst of written Lava revisionist fascist propaganda, it has become exceedingly clear how correct is the revolutionary road we have taken under the illumination of the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It is so much easier now than before for every member of the Communist Party of the Philippines to answer revisionist fascist attack after the Lavaites have comprehensively laid bare in black and white their ideas and schemes.

The wild fascist actions and propaganda of the Lava revisionist renegades are a manifestation of desperation and are the last fits of the dying. These revisionist scoundrels are like leeches squirming on salt. They will eventually cough up the blood that they have sucked from the people. They will soon curl up and expire.

We can safely make a prediction that it will not be long before the Lava revisionist renegades would be totally disintegrated like the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. But the danger of modern revisionism will still remain. In the future, there will be revisionist renegades with more finesse and subtlety. It is therefore an important task to study seriously and combat vigorously Lavaite opportunism of the past and the Lavaite revisionism of the present with the long-term view of facing more serious dangers from the evil of modern revisionism. By consistently fighting modern revisionism, we sharpen our ideological, political and organizational weapons against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Reiko Interview

December 18 & 19, 1989

You are here in Europe and must have seen what is happening in Eastern Europe very closely. We'd like to hear your analysis and evaluation of the so-called democratization of East European countries?

There are plenty of problems. The No. 1 East European country in terms of size and military power is, of course, the Soviet Union. According to Gorbachov, there has been economic stagnation, especially under the Brezhnev regime. I start with the Soviet Union because by an understanding of the changes in Soviet policies we can have a better understanding of developments in other East European countries. Perestroika, glasnost and detente are components of a single policy.

We know that under the Brezhnev leadership the Soviet Union beefed up its military power—bringing it to a level of parity with that of the United States. So much resources went into the military buildup. Brezhnev and Reagan competed in high-speed military buildup. Of course, the Soviet Union has long-standing commitments in Eastern Europe, like the deployment of more than half a million Soviet troops. These troops and their military equipment must be very expensive to maintain. The Soviet Union also has to ante up fuel and other supplies to the other East European countries.

At the same time, the Soviet Union has engaged in a great deal of self-criticism about which the United States and other capitalist countries are very happy. There has been so much self-criticism about the rigidities of centralized planning, bureaucratism and the like. Capitalist propagandists point to these as manifestations of the failure of socialism. This kind of self-criticism obscures other issues like, for instance, the diversion of tremendous resources into military expenditures.

I suppose that a socialist country does not one-sidedly choose to spend so much on the military. Defense becomes a major concern only because the Soviet Union since the victory of the October Revolution has been under siege. The civil war

and the interventionist war occurred. Then came the Nazi invasion and the entire run of World War II. After this, the Cold War and the hot wars in Korea and Vietnam into which tremendous Soviet resources were expended. It is no small matter therefore to be able to save on military expenditures.

Japan, for example, became quite prosperous by free riding on US security and military deployment in the Asia-Pacific region. Of course, the United States deployed its military forces in the region in its role as winner in World War II and as the new policeman of the entire world.

With regard to perestroika or economic restructuring, there have been overstatements about economic difficulties as a result of the system of public ownership of the means of production or the lack of private enterprise, centralized planning or the lack of free play of market forces and so on. These are presented as the causes of inefficiency and bureaucratism.

One cannot be blind to the heavy sacrifices involved in the industrialization of the Soviet Union, a very backward country industrialized in a very short period of time from 1929 to 1941. The industries put up were smashed to the extent of 85 per cent by the Nazi invasion. In another short period of time, from 1945 to 1956, the Soviet Union was able to recover. So, it has been historically demonstrated that socialist construction or economic construction according to the basic socialist principles has its merits.

But at this stage, the Soviet Union needs to retool and expand its industries. I refer not just to the heavy industries but especially those producing basic consumer goods as well as high-grade consumer goods that have become commonplace in the West and Japan. Existing industries not related to military production have been neglected technologically. The Soviet Union though has been ahead of the United States in many lines of military production, especially in space technology.

The upper-income, highly educated and highly skilled stratum in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries envy their counterparts in the West when they see that cars and sophisticated electronic products have become commonplace in their countries. They feel deprived that these are not easily available to them.

There is a a connection between the production of basic consumer goods and

high-grade consumer goods. If a worker simply gets wage increases—real wage increases relative to prices—but there are no high-grade consumer goods on which they can spend beyond the basic consumer goods—there is a slackening of labor discipline with regard to the production of those basic consumer goods. The opportunity and the drive to acquire high-grade consumer goods can pep up the workers. So, there is a relation between these two types of goods.

Gorbachov himself has pointed out that there is a slackening of labor discipline; workers have taken to vodka because this is the kind of leisure and extra spending widely available to them. One may have a large income and have enough savings but he cannot just buy a car or acquire a videorecorder or the like.

The Soviet Union can fix its economy by making real savings for productive investments. It has to rely on itself. It can make big savings by lessening military production and by withdrawing troops and equipment deployed in other East European countries. It can also make savings on supplies, like fuel and equipment, anted up to other East European countries. The present Soviet leadership even expects that soon it can demand world market prices for these supplies.

The Soviet Union also expects to make large savings by cutting down on military and economic assistance to the third world. It has started to save by pulling out of Afghanistan and moving towards a settlement of the Kampuchean problem. The Soviet adventure in Afghanistan has been a big drain on the Soviet economy.

In addition to savings, the Soviet Union expects to gain more access to credit, investments and market in the capitalist countries. It also wants technology transfer from the advanced capitalist countries to be able to augment its own technological capabilities. So, it is inducing the West to delist banned strategic items from the COCOM list.

There are, however, problems with regard to getting Western credit. The Soviet Union has no new products to sell competitively, like those sold by West Germany and Japan. It exports mainly raw materials, especially fuel, at unfavorable and deteriorating terms of trade.

The capitalist creditors—knowing the high demand for high-grade consumer

goods in the borrower-country—tell the borrower that it is too expensive to simply import industrial plants and effect technology transfer; and thus they push for the direct importation of high-grade consumer goods.

IR: As you are experiencing in the Philippines . . .?

Yes. And the high demand for these kinds of goods come from the high-income, highly educated and highly skilled stratum that most influences policies. The borrower is told, “You get these high-grade finished products right away to satisfy consumer demand, perk up the market and make your people, at least the upper stratum, happy. If the borrower gets persuaded, he gets hooked on to something extremely costly and devastating to the economy. At the least, this can delay productive investment.

Apart from its mainly raw-material exports, the Soviet Union continues to import a lot of grain. So, for its economic restructuring to succeed, the Soviet Union has to rely mainly on its own savings and productive investment and only secondarily on access to Western credit, investments and markets.

Glasnost is a necessary component of the Gorbachov policy. It means allowing the people to criticize the causes of economic stagnation. Brezhnev was in power for two decades. He restrained the policies of Khrushchev and is said to have pursued what is derisively called “Neo-Stalinism” with its rigidities. Some would even say that Brezhnev conformed more to the basic principles of socialism. So, glasnost also means undoing Brezhnevite structural patterns of thinking and behavior so that forces hewing to the Gorbachov line can come into full play.

Detente, at this point, is obviously correlated with perestroika and glasnost. Gorbachov wants to save on military expenditures so that there is relaxation of tensions, a reduction of military confrontation, an end to the cold war, an opening up to the capitalist countries and even Soviet entry into multilateral economic and financial organizations traditionally dominated and controlled by the capitalist countries.

Of course, detente is good. Marxist-Leninists have always been for the peaceful coexistence of states. World war, especially nuclear war, has to be prevented. A peaceful environment is necessary for socialist construction. These are aims that can be appreciated.

IR: Gorbachov's new thinking initiated a kind of explosion of people's power in other East European countries. And these people's movements have raised several questions about the future of socialism as a system, including the relationship between the party and the people and the introduction of a market economy. In a word, do you think these movements are positive or negative?

I prefer to analyze the developments and show the positive and negative aspects.

First of all, democratization, especially as defined by Western propagandists, has meant the undoing of leaders and ruling parties shaped under the shadow of Brezhnev. Those leaders supported and celebrated the suppression and removal of the Dubcek regime in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The internal forces in these East European countries are of various strata with various trends of thinking. These forces can also be considered wholly, with their nationalisms. So, we should consider these internal forces in the other East European countries as well as Gorbachov's policy.

Gorbachov has the Soviet Red Army command in most other East European countries. This has been a major factor preventing the leaders of the other East European countries from moving against the mass actions. The leaders of East Germany and Czechoslovakia, Honecker and Jakes, for instance, had been put under restraint to move against the mass demonstrations.

Internal forces and conditions differ in these East European countries. Take Poland. For a long, long time before Gorbachov, the traditional forces in Poland, especially the Catholic Church, have been strong. The Catholic Church has been behind Solidarity. Poland was allowed to deal with the West and incurred its huge foreign debt long before Gorbachov.

Poland had been allowed to go its way because the self-assertion of Yugoslavia, the Hungarian uprising and the Prague spring had had their impact. Of course, the Soviet Union suppressed the Hungarian uprising and the Prague spring but at the same time had been compelled to make accommodations to Poland, especially because of powerful forces beside the Polish United Workers' Party. Even then the ruling party in Poland had to consider the impact of the traditionally strong opposition forces there. Poland was very backward in economic and technological terms. It was allowed to borrow from the West and have its economy determined to a large extent by loan conditionalities.

What is ironic is that the economic mess, which was the effect of huge foreign loans from the capitalist countries, would discredit the communists in power. With the new developments, the non-communists and even anti-communists have become responsible and, appropriately too, for the economy. This will give genuine communists an opportunity to bounce back and hold a discredited Solidarity responsible for an economy that cannot but plunge into a deeper crisis.

Poland has a foreign debt of US\$40 billion. It has the problem of getting new loans to cover its annual debt service of more than US\$4 billion. Solidarity leaders have proposed austerity measures, including a wage freeze. Let us see how they will be able to keep the support and sympathy of the workers. Anyway, there is the fact that Poland is in an economic mess for which the Polish United Workers' Party has been held responsible by a broad range of discontented people.

Let us consider Hungary. Hungary has serious economic problems. Like Poland, it has gone into large scale foreign borrowing. Part of the loans has been used to augment resources for industrialization. But the kind of industrialization on which a large part of these loans was used is export-oriented. And another large part was used for the importation of high-grade consumer goods.

Let us take Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic. In these two countries, dissatisfaction is more political than economic. Although the people in these countries enjoy a higher standard of living than those in the other East European countries, including the Soviet Union, they tend to compare themselves in both economic and political terms with those of the most advanced capitalist countries.

The GDR is No. 10 in terms of gross national product (GNP) while the larger part of Germany, West Germany, is No. 4. But there is a linkage between the economic status of the country and the question of political freedom. The people in East Germany hold the Socialist Unity Party responsible for not making high-grade consumer goods more easily available to them. The high-income, highly educated and highly skilled workers and professionals feel deprived when they are not allowed to travel to Western Europe and shop there. It took an East German seven to ten years on a waiting list to acquire a car even if he had enough savings. So he compared himself to his counterpart in the West who could easily acquire a car due to easy access to credit for consumption. There is also a sense of dissatisfaction on the part of the East German that the wages he

gets for the same kind of work is less than that of his West German counterpart. The East German is therefore driven by a desire to go to the West for higher wages and high-grade consumer goods.

Controls were necessary for East Germany to develop a socialist economy. East Germany was the more backward part of Germany. It did not benefit from anything like the Marshall Plan from which West Germany benefited. It took great effort to develop the economy of East Germany to its present level. Had there been no restrictions on travel, hard currency needed for economic construction and even goods needed by the people would have flowed out to the West. Before the Berlin Wall was put up, those who received free education in the East would cross over to the West and looked for work there. Those who sold farm produce in the western sector would return with cameras. The limited manpower and material resources of East Germany would have flowed out. The controls had been beneficial for the economic development and political consolidation of East Germany.

However, after some time, these controls would come to be resented. There was some relaxation: free travel would be allowed but only to other East European countries to keep money within the Comecon. But people's resentment continued to build up. There was the demand for freedom to travel to Western Europe. So, political dissatisfaction grew even in the socialist countries with relatively better economies.

So, you have different conditions. For instance, in Poland, political dissatisfaction was dramatized by the fact that a section of the working class represented by Solidarity was suppressed by the ruling working-class party. In Czechoslovakia, people had a sense of oppression when a playwright like Vaclav Havel would be imprisoned.

There are many currents operating within the general flow of this process called "democratization": nationalist, anti-communist, politico-religious, reform-minded communist and communist (those who are supposed to be traditional or more adherent to the principles of socialism).

As Gorbachov has pointed out, there are nationalist currents. Though the highest principle is the survival of humanity, especially against nuclear war, every country is allowed to protect its national interests. So, the Soviet Union has its national interests in building national economic power. At the same time, within

the Soviet Union, there are the nationalist currents arising from the various nationalities; and outside of the Soviet Union, there are also national currents. The most conservative kind of adherence to nationalism is specially linked to very reactionary and even pro-imperialist interests. Nationalism will continue to be a cause of tensions in Eastern Europe.

IR: What do you think is the main cause of the failure of the ruling parties in East European countries?

In the capitalist-dominated countries, propaganda focuses so much on the so-called failure of socialism. And the self-flagellation by the leaders in socialist countries added to denunciations made by antisocialist forces underscore these claims about the failure of socialism. I will try to describe the problems.

We may raise this question: What were these countries before the socialist revolution? Most of them were backward agrarian countries. Socialism put them on the track of industrialization despite the fact that they came from a very low economic and technological level; despite the fact that their economies were further ruined by imperialist war; and despite the fact that they have had to channel a lot of resources to national defense against imperialist encirclement. The socialist countries do not exploit the third world countries as the capitalist powers are doing. The socialist countries have even assisted other third world countries and liberation movements.

All these are being obscured. Even highly placed Party and state officials in the socialist countries have been currying favors with the capitalist powers in their desire for foreign loans, investment and technology transfer. So there has been a weakening, a feebleness even among those who are expected to uphold the basic principles of socialism. Worse, there are now highly placed state and Party officials saying that imperialism is a good thing, in conformity with Kautsky's theory of productive forces. According to them, imperialism is good because it destroys pre-capitalist formations in the third world and to oppose imperialism is supposed to be reactionary. So, Kautsky is being upheld against Lenin who made the critique of imperialism.

Another thing, these same Party and state officials now consider proletarian internationalism to be a provocative slogan and they no longer use the term and even go against its spirit. Worse, proletarian internationalism is considered provocative to the capitalist powers and burdensome to socialist countries in the

sense that the latter would have progressed faster had they not been burdened with assisting the national liberation movements and socialist-oriented countries in the third world.

These are self-centered ideas. It is ironic that leaders of these socialist countries in the past and at lower levels of development could be more willing to go into cooperation beneficial to national liberation movements in the third world. Exactly at a time that these East European countries are better off they compare themselves to the capitalist powers and desire to develop their economies with the cooperation of capitalist countries to the extent that some of their theoreticians have started to peddle the nonsense that imperialism has changed its nature.

IR: Don't you think that the ruling parties in these socialist countries failed to provide alternative values to commercialism or consumerism to their own people? I ask this because you mentioned that commercialism or the excessive desire for commercial products exists as a basis of democratization?

Democratization as it is now unfolding in Eastern Europe means seeking to erase or repudiate the leading role of the working-class party in the state and in society. It does not mean encouraging the people to actively participate in the affairs of the state and society or allowing them to criticize the errors and shortcomings of their leaders within the framework of building a socialist economy and society. There seems to be no more consideration of the fact that the accomplishment of social revolution meant the social liberation of the largest number of individuals belonging to the working classes—proletarian and peasant.

But, of course, we recognize the fact that a party that assumes the vanguard role in a certain process has to be on guard against becoming bureaucratized and alienated from the people, notwithstanding the historic fact of such vanguard role. There may actually be alienation from the working class that it represents and this gives anti-proletarian elements the opportunity to seize the flag of democracy.

As progressives outside of the socialist countries, we must be alert to what those who use the flag of democracy stand for. I have already clarified that this flag is not all positive. It is used in a negative way to stand for putting market forces into full play, pushing privatization (with the objective of having joint ventures

with foreign capitalist multinational firms and banks) and strengthening linkages with imperialism.

IR: What do you think is the most important lesson for the Philippine revolution in terms of political system?

The Philippine revolutionary movement is very conscious of the fact that countries like the Philippines, those of Latin America (with the exception of Cuba) and the rest of the third world have always been integrated into the world capitalist system. These countries have not achieved economic development and other forms of progress despite (or more correctly because of) their being integrated into the world capitalist system. Entities in the socialist countries who expect progress by strengthening linkages or bonds with the capitalist powers will not achieve their purposes.

Among the socialist countries, Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary and China have had plenty of lessons in building linkages with the capitalist powers and adjusting their economic and even political policies.

With regard to political lessons being learned, I suppose that the CPP will retain a broad united front in support of social revolution and will allow for pluralism. The CPP will prove its vanguard role through its ability to lead the united front and the entire Filipino people. Communists are making sacrifices in the effort to win the national democratic revolution. Once this task is completed and the task of socialist revolution and construction begins, the Communist Party, as a matter of course will have to strive further to prove its leading role. Even now, it is an open game. Any party can compete with the CPP in becoming an instrument of the people in the revolutionary process. It is possible for a communist party to fail or to merely have a share of power. But at this point the CPP is asserting its vanguard role in the revolution not only by words but by dint of hard work and struggle. It is in the protracted process of the people's revolutionary struggle that the Party goes through a process of testing and proving its vanguard role.

There is a big difference between the Philippine revolution and the political upheavals and political changes that occurred in Eastern Europe. The Soviet Red Army counterattacked and overthrew the Nazis and their local puppets. The communist parties easily assumed leadership. Of course, these parties expressed the aspirations and demands of the working people. But in these East European countries, the communists came to power because of the Soviet Red Army.

Some of these countries were previously agrarian but no land reform was undertaken. When the communist parties in these countries failed to undertake land reform, it also failed to build its strength among the peasantry. In the Philippines, the Communist Party—because it is waging an agrarian revolution—is well-rooted among the the peasantry in the countryside and not only among the working class in the urban areas.

IR: I want to hear more about your thoughts on the role of the Party in leading the united front in the Philippines. Can you elaborate on this role in your vision of your future society?

In the Philippines, the National Democratic Front is the most consolidated underground united front organization. But the CPP does not regard the NDF as the complete united front. The united front goes beyond the formality of an organized united front like the NDF. The united front is ever growing; so the door is open to all progressive and patriotic forces. As a matter of fact, the NDF, of which the Communist Party is the vanguard, would like other parties and organizations to come into its framework. But if these organizations are not willing to do so, then there is the formula, NDF + X. X means any party or organization wanting to link up with the NDF as an equal. A party or organization does not have to enter the NDF framework to be within the united front. There can be consultative and consensual arrangements for a broader united front.

There are also the various progressive forces in the legal arena. They have their own sectoral and multisectoral alliances on the basis of certain issues or comprehensive sets of issues. In the process of the radical transformation of society, both the legal and illegal forces can move together even if there are no formal linkages.

But after the revolution, all patriotic and progressive forces will certainly be able to participate in the affairs of the state. Their representatives will be in representative organs of political power. On the eve of revolutionary victory, I suppose the Communist Party and the National Democratic Front will sit in a broad people's consultative assembly that will bring about a people's consultative council This council will have a united front character.

IR: What kind of political principles do you offer for its realization?

The state that will arise will be a people's democracy. And the broadest range of patriotic and progressive forces will participate in it. It is not enough to have the representative organs of political power. There have to be parties and people's organizations of various classes and sectors participating democratically in state and societal affairs. Even people who are unorganized or outside of definite people's organizations and parties should have venues for exercising their democratic rights. It is not enough to hold elections or to put together representatives of people's organizations. There must be principles, policies and methods by which the people in all their variety can effectively express themselves and actively participate in the economic and political life of their country.

IR: By what methods do you think this is possible?

There can be established channels and methods, including the recall of elected or appointed officials. The people should have the right or should be allowed to come out spontaneously to sign petitions and mass actions not only to express their grievances but, more importantly, also to make constructive proposals.

Of course, there will be limits adopted against those who wish to overthrow the revolutionary state. The forces participating in the democratic life of the country should not seek the overthrow of the state. If they do, they run the same risks revolutionaries have to take in seeking to overthrow the counterrevolutionary state.

IR: You mentioned integration into the world market that third world peoples have already experienced. What do your own experiences mean for the socialist countries that are now seeking integration into the world market?

This may be a very important point for them. I only wish to point out that there are limits to this integration. The socialist countries should realize that other countries in the third world have had long experience in dealing with the capitalist countries. It has been claimed that in dealing with these capitalist countries, the socialist countries have better chances than third world countries of getting equitable terms.

So, the socialist countries need technology transfer. They need to export some of their products to get foreign exchange for paying loans and for what they import from the capitalist countries. But it is important for the socialist countries to

exercise vigilance and recognize the limits in their dealings with the capitalist countries. The capitalist countries seek the economic subversion of socialist countries; and economic subversion will lead to political subversion. When the counterrevolutionaries seek to overthrow the socialist state, there could be military confrontation. The confrontation could be contained within the country but it can also spill out to other countries.

The counterrevolutionaries in a socialist country might move too fast. Their destabilizing potential is great. That is why the United States and US strategists, including President Bush, are advising the anti-communists and non-communists in Eastern Europe not to move too fast, force the issue and make the ruling party react. It is of recent memory that when the liberals and other counterrevolutionaries in China challenged the Chinese Communist Party and state, there was the tragedy of June 4. Of course, China has its own story. In my view, it is not the failure of socialism but the evils of capitalism that have caused the social unrest—corruption, imbalances in the economy, consumerism running ahead of production, inflation and the like.

IR: But that was a result of Deng Xiaoping's policy.

Well, according to the Chinese leaders, Hu Yaobang and Zhao Ziyang had been responsible for what went wrong in China. But as Deng Xiaoping himself puts it, when you open the windows, especially to the capitalist countries, flies are bound to come in. And once these are in, these can generate more flies.

IR: But they opted to open the windows ...

Yes, it is the price to be paid for things China wanted to get from the West and Japan. Probably the screens were not put up well or there were holes in the screens or no screens were put up.

IR: And this is the final question about what is happening in China. The process of democratization or integration of the world, including the dialogue between Bush and Gorbachov as a process—how do these influence the Philippine revolution at the moment?

The affirmation of the principle of peaceful coexistence, detente and relaxation of tensions, and so on is undeniably good. We recognize the need for socialist countries to expand and retool their industries with technology that can be gained through economic relations with capitalist countries. But there are certain

changes within socialist countries and certain pronouncements from leaders of these countries that jolt revolutionaries in countries like the Philippines.

Revolutionaries and the people in the Philippines have had continuous experience of multinational firms and banks, especially US and Japanese, and are critical of these. So, they are shocked when these are praised highly in socialist countries. Of course, socialist countries claim that they deal with the multinational firms and banks from a strong position because they are independent and self-reliant. However, we know that these socialist countries make certain adjustments in their economies to please the multinational firms and banks.

For instance, in China, capital was returned to the national bourgeoisie, including former big compradors who technically became national bourgeois by adhering to a socialist policy of industrialization. And they enlarged their capital by borrowing from state banks. They were encouraged to go into the construction business. Eventually, they went into export-import or big comprador operations. Bureaucrat capitalism emerged with officials and their relatives getting into business and using their position and influence in government.

The communes were dissolved and the best land, orchards, fishponds, productive assets, tractors and the like, —accumulated through collective labor— were given to those who would emerge as rich peasants. Many peasants were displaced. For some time, these displaced peasants who were allowed free movement within the country could be absorbed in construction jobs. China became a huge construction site as export processing zones, hotels and other tourist facilities, auditoriums and residential buildings were put up rapidly. Rich peasants were allowed to build three-story houses even on agricultural land. The most beneficial of these constructions were, of course, residential buildings; but there were many nonproductive construction projects. The Chinese economy was bound to get overheated. There were difficulties due to limited agricultural supplies. With more and more people engaged in construction and the services, inflation was bound to arise. The high-income group was also fond of high-grade consumer goods and this led to dissipation of resources.

Inflation, corruption, gross imbalances in the economy arose. As early as 1987, the need for austerity measures was already recognized and exactly that time Zhao Ziyang was proposing the complete deregulation of prices. Of course, the

proposal was rejected. Previous to this there was talk of giving free play to the market forces, privatizing state enterprises and reducing the role of central planning.

From all these, you can see that there has been a drive to liberalize the economy. What is now being criticized is the demand for a bourgeois liberalization of the superstructure. On TV then, you could view anti-Chinese and anti-communist films like the Yellow River Elegy which made a derisive play on the color yellow and idealized the “blue” civilization of the West. And how did Fang Lizhi with his consistently bourgeois liberal ideas ever become a communist party member?

In the backlash against the cultural revolution, which had gone awry because of ultrademocracy and anarchy, there was a swing to the other extreme of allowing the Party and the state to be penetrated by antisocialist elements. As in Eastern Europe, there was what we may call the peaceful evolution toward antisocialism and capitalism that became evident under Khrushchov, slowed down under Brezhnev and reemerged under Gorbachov. Antisocialist ideas arose within the Party and the state as well as among the people. Strong anti-communist currents have started to grow among the people because revolutionary education has not been properly attended to and when comparisons are made in the media between the capitalist and socialist countries, there is no mention of the third world countries—that part of the capitalist world exploited by the capitalist countries and to whom the latter owe their prosperity. The people, especially the youth have become unmindful of the conditions of the third world peoples exploited by imperialism.

There can be no fair comparison of socialist and capitalist countries unless there is a correct description of the latter’s exploitative relations with the third world and an appreciation of the fact that the capitalist affluence is the result of the impoverishment of third world peoples in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Abstract comparisons, unmindful of capitalism’s long career of accumulating capital as well as of the socialist countries’ own history of overthrowing pro-capitalist and reactionary regimes in the past will not be edifying to the people in the socialist countries.

Actually, the game of Western propagandists is simply to make these abstract comparisons between socialist and capitalist countries. Within the socialist countries, there is also this misguided trend of making these kinds of comparison

and denigrating the independent and self-reliant efforts of the people in improving their situation from one historical stage to another.

IR: But there is the actual competition between capitalism and socialism as social systems. So, one cannot avoid comparing the capitalist and socialist countries.

In economic terms, how can the socialist countries export cars to compete with West German and Japanese cars? The socialist countries can look forward to this but they must admit that they cannot compete with West Germany and Japan in the production of cars. In the future, given more time, savings, more productive investments, they may produce as efficiently, if not more efficiently than those that are now front runners in car production.

But at this point in the socialist countries, a real priority is the development of the public transport system. As in clothing, it is better to assure all the people of cotton clothing than allow a few to wear silk and satin while the greater number go naked as in Kuomintang days. It is only when the level of production rises that you can have more variety of goods. The socialist countries can look forward to providing more than the basic necessities. They now have the capacity to provide a great variety of goods.

The difference between Marxist economics and bourgeois economics is that the former is more mindful of the production side while the latter, of the market side. But of course, there is the necessary connection and interaction between production and distribution (marketing). In dealing with these two interacting but different aspects of the productive process, one has to determine which is principal.

The Soviet Union is already quite advanced in many lines of technology. The most advanced steel making process that Japan is using came from the Soviet Union. The problem is that the Soviet Union has not been able to retool all its steel plants and make full use of the process to be competitive with Japan. Japan has had the advantage of being the latecomer favored by later technologies.

IR: I should have asked this earlier. You mentioned the united front in the political system. Under this system, what kind of economic policy will you adopt?

National industrialization and land reform. These two are interactive. From land

reform and development of cooperatives we develop agriculture to provide the food and raw material requirements for the industries. Heavy industries will be put up but at a pace that will not overstrain the people and other sectors of the economy, especially the agricultural, as had happened in the pioneering effort of the Soviet Union to establish heavy industries.

We shall pay special attention to avoiding certain pitfalls in the drive to industrialize. We shall put up light and medium industries to bridge heavy industry and agriculture. The light and medium industries will process the raw material produced from agriculture and mining to supply the consumption and production needs of the peasants and the entire people. Learning from the experience of the socialist countries, there will be as much as possible a comprehensive, well-balanced and smooth process of industrial development.

The Philippines can be ambitious in terms of economic development because it has a comprehensive natural resource base. In terms of natural resources, the Philippines is better off than Japan. Japan gets most of its raw materials from abroad. The Philippines has 14 strategic mineral resources necessary for industrialization. In our socialist construction, we can make full use of our comprehensive natural resource base and our domestic market, which is large—now already 60 million consumers.

IR: But what kind of national planning or alternative planning system will you adopt so that the working people, especially, can be fully mobilized?

In terms of ownership and therefore initiatives, we shall take advantage of several sectors. There will be the state sector to handle industries requiring large amounts of capital that only the state can be capable of pooling. We would rather have a domestic giant, like the Philippine state, than foreign giants, like US and Japanese multinational firms, owning such industries. There will be state enterprises both for production and distribution. These state enterprises for distribution will handle strategic raw materials and certain basic goods to assure the needs of the people.

There can also be joint ventures between the state sector and the private sector. So, the national bourgeoisie, including former big compradors who cease to be compradors and become national bourgeois technically by adhering to the state policy of industrialization and development, can become joint owners of enterprises.

There will be the cooperative sector of petty producers, especially in agriculture and sideline enterprises, to raise the level of agricultural and sideline production. Cooperativization in conjunction with mechanization will be an effective way of raising production not only among the peasants but also among other urban petty producers.

There can also be a private sector of single proprietors and partnerships among both the national and the petty bourgeoisie. Highly individualized skills, such as those of excellent craftsmen, cooks, tailors, etc.—specialized services—can be given full play.

So, for a sufficient period of time, we will have variations of the forms of initiative as well as of ownership. We merely remove the private monopolistic type and other harmful/exploitative forms of ownership and enterprise.

IR: In the coming years there may be much mixing on a worldwide scale of ideology and views. What kind of mixing will bring about hope for the future and better this process forward, especially internationally. You can bring your opinion to East European people's forums ...

For one thing, when the Philippine revolution, our national democratic revolution wins, conditions shall have drastically changed. Before the end of this century, some of the socialist countries will have developed appreciably. It takes ten to twenty years for a country to really develop the way Japan, for instance, developed after World War II. I think Japan will get into trouble as it is now being forced to pour more resources into the military. If some countries move up the economic ladder, they will start to compete with the capitalist countries.

The decline of the United States and the crisis of the world capitalist system will weaken the imperialist threat to the Philippines. We have to recognize that the world capitalist system has been plagued by the crisis of overproduction since late 1960s. The capitalist countries have been able to increase their productivity and use new technology in the 1970s because at first, they were able to lend Eurodollars and then petrodollars to third world countries. The third world countries reached their borrowing limits and could not pay the loans.

In the 1980s, it was China's turn to be loan client. The loans were a temporary way of disposing surplus capital and surplus commodities to the debtor countries. China developed its linkages with the capitalist countries and was

soon exhausted as an outlet as it began to institute austerity measures. The Soviet Union seems to be the new outlet for finance capital.

After these outlets are exhausted, the crisis of overproduction will hit the capitalist countries harder. The third world and socialist countries can join up to give the advanced capitalist countries a big fight. A new international economic order may arise from a general strike of debtor countries as well as from the increased strength of certain socialist countries. I think China and the Soviet Union, plus probably GDR, Czechoslovakia and Hungary have the best chances of advancing economically.

IR: And will the Philippines join?

There will be gains and losses in the further development of some socialist countries. But there will be those that will make hard gains, even if they are burdened by loans and payments will not be easy.

You know the source of my optimism? The world cannot afford too many capitalist countries. There are already more than enough in the OECD and they are already in crisis. The world economy cannot accommodate too many advanced capitalist countries. The crisis of overproduction will open a wider ground for socialism to resurge. There is the high probability of socialism arising in certain capitalist countries in one decade or two.

The Decline and Rise of Socialism

July 18, 1990 National Midweek

The triumphant propaganda of capitalism one-sidedly celebrates the disintegration of socialism in certain countries. It obscures the exploitative character of capitalism and the current crisis of overproduction, the worst in the entire history of the world capitalist system.

We are living in a world not only of capitalist monopolies but also of super monopolies and high technology. These have integrated the world capitalist system, (or if you wish, the world economy) as never before and accelerated the crisis of overproduction.

As a result of the reconstruction and economic miracles in the capitalist countries devastated in World War II, the emergence of the phenomenon of stagflation in the late Sixties, and the rapid advances in science and technology from the Seventies onward, the major capitalist powers have sought to relieve themselves of their surplus capital and surplus commodities by extending huge amounts of these to Third World countries for infrastructure construction, increased raw material production, and overconsumption by the upper social strata.

The flow of funds and supplies to the Third World has been slanted towards consumption rather than to well-grounded industrial development, except in a handful of newly-industrializing countries. Thus, the Third World countries have remained underdeveloped, are overburdened with a foreign debt they can never hope to pay back and are reeling from austerity measures. They have an overcapacity to produce raw materials for export and to assemble some reexports (like garments, toys and semiconductors), but the terms of trade are always

deteriorating against them.

The crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system is most conspicuous and worst in the Third World on a sweeping scale. The advanced capitalist countries have the high technology capable of wiping out poverty in the world, and yet they use it to aggravate the poverty of the people in the Third World by extracting huge super profits and huge amounts of debt service.

Despite the long history of capital accumulation, the high technology and continuous extraction of profits and debt service from the Third World, the industrial capitalist countries are afflicted by problems of unemployment, the diminution of real wages, the erosion of social benefits and the poverty of significant portions of their populations.

Some countries like Poland and Hungary which have had to make do with outdated equipment from the Soviet Union for their basic industries, and which have shifted from socialism to capitalism, have been, to their further detriment, the clients of Western capitalist investors, suppliers and creditors since the Seventies. The economic mess in these countries should not be blamed solely on socialism. As a matter of fact, the steady erosion of socialism through “reforms” of a capitalist nature have aggravated their economic problems.

After the basic exhaustion of most Third World countries as deficit-spenders and receivers of foreign loans, the United States has become the biggest taker of surplus capital from abroad and the biggest consumer of exports from Japan, West Germany and the newly industrializing economies. Thus, since the Eighties, it has incurred huge trade deficits on top of its huge budgetary deficits to become the biggest debtor country, undermining its own capacity to produce tradeable goods.

As the United States seeks to rise from its industrial decline, consume its own products and go on a trade offensive, the trade surpluses of Japan, West Germany and the newly-industrializing economies will tend to be reduced. Consequently, the contradictions among the major capitalist countries will intensify.

There are limits to the exploitation of the newly-industrializing fields of finance capitalism such as China, India, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. There is already social unrest and turmoil in Third World countries, including China and

India, as a result of “reforms” promotive of the internal growth of comprador capitalism and neocolonial integration into the world capitalist system. After being baited into nonproductive overspending by foreign transnational corporations and banks, the Third World countries are compelled to adopt austerity measures and go into economic stagnation under the shadow of the International Monetary Fund.

The social turbulence in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union cannot be attributed only to the failure of socialism so-called, particularly bureaucratism, outdated technology and the Soviet wastage of resources on the arms race and costly foreign commitments. The promotion of capitalist-oriented reforms and anti-proletarian overconsumption by privileged social strata are also major factors in the economic crisis.

The Eastern European countries that are in the worst economic mess are longstanding loan-clients of both the West and the Soviet Union. The translation of the crisis of their societies into a categorical crisis of capitalism is bringing about worse results such as accelerated capital outflows, shutdown of factories, mass unemployment, loss of social benefits, hyperinflation and aggravated bureaucratic corruption. The unbridled privatization of the means of production and free market of both domestic and foreign consumer goods have aggravated the misery and suffering of the people in most of Eastern Europe.

For the capitalist powers to accommodate the Soviet Union, they will have to further abuse the international credit system in exchange for total Soviet conversion to capitalism. The Soviet Union does not have much competitive goods with which to earn hard currency in the world capitalist market in order to pay for the new technology it seeks.

What it can do to earn a significant amount of foreign exchange is to demand from most East European countries world market prices for its supply of fuel and other raw materials. But even then, that would not be enough. The Soviet Union, the last big frontier for finance capitalism, will become vulnerable to offers of foreign loans tied mainly to spending programs decided by foreign creditors and suppliers.

By pointing out the worsening crisis of overproduction and limits of capitalist expansion, especially under conditions of super monopolies and high technology, we wish to make clear that the objective conditions for the

resurgence of the cause of socialism, together with the cause of national liberation and independence, will eventually reassert themselves in an unprecedentedly conspicuous way throughout the world.

For the benefit of those who are dismayed by the ostensible momentary victory of capitalism, it is worthwhile to recall the fact that the socialist cause had suffered more serious setbacks in the past, and yet had always bounced back with greater vigor and strength.

After the brief success and shattering defeat of the Paris Commune in 1871, the cause of socialism and working-class rule appeared impossible as capitalism expanded and developed into the stage of monopoly capitalism. It took 43 years before the Great October Socialist Revolution occurred in 1917.

On the eve of the rise of the first socialist country (the Soviet Union), the capitalist crisis of overproduction led to bitter rivalry and war among the capitalist powers; and the Second International, consisting of social democratic parties which espoused socialism but supported the war budgets of the European capitalist powers, collapsed.

Again, it looked like the cause of socialism would be extirpated when, in the course of the recurrent crisis of overproduction and bitter strife among the capitalist powers, the forces of fascism destroyed the working-class parties and socialist movements in Europe, and Nazi Germany proceeded to attack the Soviet Union and wreak destruction on the Soviet economy and people. But, in the aftermath of World War II, several socialist countries emerged in Eastern Europe and Asia, encompassing more than one-third of humanity.

The current disintegration of socialism in some countries does not solve but aggravates the capitalist countries' problem of overproduction. The unification of East and West Germany will turn Germany into an all-round superpower that will compete strongly with the other capitalist powers and will thus make a tighter world for capitalism. Whether they remain socialist or become fully capitalist, China and the Soviet Union will also play a role, to the extent that they are able to improve their technology and economy towards lessening or diluting the relative weights of the US, Japan and Europe in a multipolar world.

However, it is safe to say that before all the socialist countries can become capitalist and before all the factors of socialism are lost, the capitalist crisis of

overproduction will reach a point as to provide favorable conditions for the resurgence of the socialist cause in the Third World, in the former and continuing socialist countries and even in the capitalist countries (first in the minor ones, and then in the major ones),

The continuing decline of the dominance of an aggressive United States over the alliance of capitalist powers is the long-term trend, even if momentarily the US together with the other capitalist powers appears to gain from the disintegration of socialism in some countries.

The breakdown of military alliances and restrictions on technology transfer instigated by the US against socialist and anti-imperialist countries during the Cold War can eventually lead to better conditions and wider room for maneuver for peoples taking the socialist road within national boundaries.

The bright future of socialism is assured because the forces of production are bound to break out again from the fetters of capitalism; because the crisis of overproduction is accelerated and the people demand liberation from capitalist oppression and exploitation; and because there is no alternative to capitalism but socialism.

It is not enough, however, for the objective conditions favorable to socialism to exist. The advocates of socialism have to learn both the positive and negative lessons, the achievements and failures, from the historical experience of the socialist countries. For the socialist cause to surge again, there must be the subjective factor reemerging from and mastering the worsening crisis of capitalism, as well as the historical experience and new conditions of socialism. The scientific socialists must solve a comprehensive range of problems in the political, economic and cultural fields. We can indicate here only some of these problems.

In establishing and developing a socialist society, especially when under siege and attack by an imperialism still dominant in the world, there is the need to consolidate working class power and concentrate will and resources. But there is also danger for the working-class party and the socialist state to become bureaucratized, rigid, overreactive and alienated from the people. At the same time, there are forces within and outside the party and state which can gradually undermine the basic principles of socialism and seek to restore capitalism.

Definitely, the working class together with the rest of the people must replace the bourgeois state with a socialist state capable of defending itself and the people and giving full play to democracy. One-party monopoly of political power, over-centralism, bureaucratism and commandism must be rejected. The working-class party can maintain leadership only if it is closely linked with the people through the mass movement, adopt correct policies and cooperate with other patriotic and progressive forces. The legislature must include the representatives of the working-class party, the mass organizations led by the working-class party and all other patriotic and progressive forces, and must take into account the various nationalities.

It is not enough to guarantee national freedom from foreign domination and class freedom from the exploiting classes. Individual freedom must be respected and promoted. Citizens must be encouraged to exercise their civil and political liberties and contribute to the building of socialism. Anyone excluded from the enjoyment of any civil or political liberty must first undergo due process.

There must be the fullest participation of the people in electing leaders and in deciding public policies. The organs of the state and the leaders must be accountable to the people. There must be clear limitations on the organs of the state and the leaders to prevent abuse of power and allow the free flow of new ideas and the transfusion of new blood.

In the socialist transformation of the economy, public ownership through the state and cooperatives must replace private ownership by the bourgeoisie and landlord class. But in technologically and economically backward areas, there must be a sufficient period of transition to allow the contribution of producers other than the state and cooperatives. When the socialist transformation of the economy is completed, there must be no retrogression to the privatization of the means of production.

Planning for economic development and for the soonest possible satisfaction of basic social needs is necessary and can be facilitated with the use of computers. But the plans must be worked out with the lively participation of the people in production at every level of the economy and in every enterprise and farm. There must be three-way consultations among the working people, the management and the political cadres.

There must be a comprehensive and balanced development of heavy industry,

light industry and agriculture. Basic industrialization should be properly paced and should not prevent the immediate satisfaction of basic consumer and social needs. Defense expenditures should not hamper the development of the civil economy. There must be moral and material incentives for the working people. There must be economic incentives in the form of wage differentials and access to high-grade consumer goods.

The market is a necessary aspect of any economy. But in a socialist economy, the market is secondary. The capital goods as well as the basic and nonbasic consumer goods must first be produced before they can be made available in the market. Adulation for the market should not be used to justify the restoration of capitalism, the entry of foreign super monopolies and excessive importation of luxury goods from abroad.

The propagation of the theory of scientific socialism should be based on the promotion of a national, scientific and democratic culture among the people. The two should not be put at odds with each other.

Cultural revolution is necessary but must have a protracted and persuasive character. Revolutionary ideas must be propagated both through institutions and the mass movement. The national character of the culture must correspond to the requirements of the independent modern nation-state, but must not be chauvinist. It must also cherish the traditions, customs and past cultural achievements of the people and encompass the culture of diverse nationalities and ethnic communities within the socialist state.

The scientific character of culture means the promotion of the scientific outlook and methodology among the people and the scientific and technological efforts of the experts and the working people. Necessarily, it also means learning from other peoples their scientific, technological and other achievements.

The democratic character of culture refers to the reflection on the conditions, demands and aspirations of the people; the inspiration and enlightenment of the people to struggle and work hard against the odds and make great achievements; the people's enjoyment of civil and political liberties; and the people's own cultural efforts and their striving to raise their cultural standards.

The crisis of capitalism always propels the needs for socialism. But scientific socialists and the working class are now at an advantage rather than

disadvantage by studying and learning from socialist countries which have either retrogressed into capitalist countries or are still retrogressing. When the historical experience under study is more extensive and richer, it is easier to see what is correct and what is wrong, how to rectify the errors and how to create a new and better socialist society.

On the Problems of Socialism and the Disintegration of Modern Revisionism

Unpublished typescript, December 1990

The turmoil and crisis that have occurred in China, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Mongolia since 1989 have been deliriously hailed by antisocialist and anti-Communist forces the world over as the failure of socialism or communism and as the triumph of capitalism.

The most outstanding political developments have been the disintegration of ruling parties previously purporting themselves to be working class parties; the formal liquidation of the leading role of the proletariat and its party; and the ascendance the political forces of the bourgeoisie using liberal democratic or social democratic language in combination with forces laying the stress on nationalism, racism, religion, monarchism, fascism and other reactionary trends.

The most outstanding economic developments are full-scale privatization and marketization and begging for integration into the world capitalist economy; and the full negation of the principles of public ownership of the means of production and central planning.

A culture of replacing socialist values with capitalist values includes not only an adulation for capitalist ideas and imported consumer goods but also the growing rampancy of prostitution, pornography, all kinds of antisocial activities and beggary.

The so-called socialist camp has disintegrated. Members of the Comecon are going their different ways in seeking foreign investments, loans and trade accommodations from the West. The Warsaw Pact is rendered practically

inoperative.

The modern revisionists who promoted capitalism in the name of socialism and who eventually made possible the all-out negation of socialism have been overthrown one batch after another by the masses who have momentarily come under the hegemony of the forces of outright capitalism and reaction and who are still to learn from a worse hell to come in the form of unemployment, loss of welfare benefits, more intense bureaucratic corruption, etc.

Filipino communists and their allies in the Philippines are mocked and attacked by anti-communists as being engaged in a malignant and futile enterprise such as the struggle to complete the national democratic revolution and to proceed to socialist revolution.

The anti-communists can never be more wrong. The Filipino people and revolutionaries can never choose to remain under capitalism and imperialism under the rule of the big bourgeoisie in tandem with the landlord class; and can only feel sorry for all those in former socialist countries who have the illusion that capitalism is their salvation.

By having been under the sway of capitalism for quite a long time, the Filipino people have suffered intolerable oppression and exploitation. Under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines, they are fighting to break and cast away their chains; and achieve national liberation and democracy. They have no other choice.

The crisis in their own country is serious enough to keep them from being distracted by those who have the illusion that capitalism is their road to affluence and paradise. Capitalism, especially in the form of imperialism, has been hell enough for the Filipino people.

The Communist Party of the Philippines was re-established in the course of combating modern revisionism. It has never forgotten its long-running criticism of this malady. It is not surprised by the downfall of revisionist cliques, the total disintegration of modern revisionism. It can neither defend the fallen revisionist cliques nor welcome the momentarily ascendant forces of antisocialism and anti-communism.

But certainly, it is confident that in due time the people and the revolutionary forces in the countries in question will learn lessons from further/direct

experience under capitalism and will rise again to rebuild socialism.

The achievements and problems of socialism

For a clear understanding of the restoration of capitalism in socialist countries, it is necessary to have at least a brief review of the achievements and problems of early socialism.

Marx and Engels laid the theoretical foundation of scientific socialism by initiating the philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism, making a critique of capitalism, discovering the laws of motion of capitalist society and pointing to the direction that the growing working class would seize political power from the bourgeoisie in order to socialize the character of the instruments of production and make it correspond to the social character of largescale machine production.

In the 19th century, still an era of free capitalist competition, the Paris Commune of 1871 was the first serious attempt to realize the theory of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship under the auspices of the First International. The uprising of the workers of Paris succeeded for a while but eventually failed, obviously because the proletarian leadership committed mistakes and the proletariat needed more political experience and conditions more favorable to proletarian revolution.

Capitalism surged to its monopoly stage. In a period of rapid capitalist growth, the classic revisionists headed by Kautsky and Bernstein prevailed in the Second International and supported the war budgets and colonial enterprise of the capitalist powers even as they called themselves Marxists and mouthed socialism and social pacifism. Upon the outbreak of World War I, an inter-imperialist war, the revisionist social democratic parties were totally discredited.

The Bolsheviks headed by Lenin raised height the banner of proletarian revolution in the era of modern imperialism. Lenin correctly pointed out that imperialism was the eve of social revolution. He made a comprehensive critique of monopoly capitalism or imperialism and showed that socialism could arise where capitalism was weak. The Bolsheviks won the first socialist revolution in October 17, 1917 and established the first socialist state.

The first socialist country arose on the stage of world history, marking the beginning of the era of world proletarian-socialist revolution, precisely because

of the prior crisis of capitalism—the crisis of overproduction and war. Lenin initiated the Third International to promote the establishment of proletarian revolutionary parties in the capitalist countries, the colonies and semicolonies.

Lenin was around to start the new economic policy as a policy of transition from "war communism" (the ration system under conditions of war and scarcity) but did not live long enough to see full-scale socialist construction. Stalin was the Soviet leader who pushed socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization. As the pioneer, the Soviet Union carried these out at great pains, especially to the peasant masses who had the burden of producing food and raw materials for industry.

For the Bolsheviks to win political power and carry out socialist revolution and construction, they led and mobilized the mass movement and seized the initiative from the proponents of bourgeois rule and all its variants. The soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers were effective. But eventually as the one-party system and bureaucratization developed, there came the tendency to issue commands from the center and solve problems by administrative means, separate centralism from democracy and alienate the organs of the party and the state from the people.

The concentration of will and resources is definitely necessary to accomplish the objectives of the socialist revolution, because of the devastation caused by war, civil war and interventionist war; the low level of economic and technological development inherited from the past; and pressures of military encirclement, economic blockade and anti-communist propaganda. But the concentration of will and resources can be overdone and carried to the extreme.

The Soviet Union succeeded in socialist revolution and construction but without deep-seated problems continuing. Whatever can be said of Stalin in criticism or denunciation, the Soviet would not have withstood and turned the tide against Nazi Germany without him. Those who completely condemn him in the Soviet Union and even dare to extend the attack to Lenin are now responsible for the restoration of capitalism and all its evils.

After all its strenuous efforts to accumulate social capital, the Soviet Union once more underwent devastation in World War II. Soon after the war, US imperialism and its capitalist allies unleashed the Cold War against the Soviet Union, the newly risen people's democracies in Eastern Europe and Asia and the

movements for national liberation in the third world. It was certainly to the credit of the Soviet leadership that it could achieve high growth rates in the economic reconstruction of the Soviet Union while at the same time extend material and moral support to the newly emerged socialist countries and the national liberation movements and put the Western alliance in a nuclear stalemate.

It must be stressed at this point that because of the prior crisis of capitalism, leading to World War II, several socialist countries emerged in the form of people's democracies. In Eastern Europe, these included East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania and Yugoslavia. In Asia, these included China, North Korea and North Vietnam.

It was, indeed, the Soviet Red Army in its counterattack against fascism that played a decisive role in installing working class parties in power in most of Eastern Europe. But it cannot be said that these parties were without popular support. They enjoyed popular support as they came to power on the crest of mass opprobrium for the Nazi occupiers. It is still another question whether they further developed the revolutionary mass movement and carried out a deepgoing social revolution, especially on the land question.

It is amazing how the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe carried out socialist revolution and construction in the political, economic and cultural fields in the international environment of the Cold War, involving military encirclement, economic blockade, ceaseless anti-communist propaganda and large outlays for defense. At any rate, the Comecon and the Warsaw Pact stood their ground for quite a while.

In Asia, the socialist country with the largest population, a quarter of humanity, arose. Upon the basic completion of the new democratic revolution through the nationwide seizure of political power by the working-class party, socialist revolution and construction commenced under the leadership of Mao Zedong.

The Chinese communists demonstrated that a democratic coalition government could be formed under the leadership of the proletariat and its party, the Communist Party could base itself on multiparty cooperation, that concessions could be given to the national bourgeoisie and to the petty commodity producers even while socialist transformation of the economy could proceed and that there could be a comprehensive and balanced development of heavy industry, light industry and agriculture.

The two biggest tests of armed strength after World War II occurred in Asia. With the support of other socialist countries, the Korean people thwarted the US aggressor troops in the Korean War. Also, with the support of other socialist countries, the Vietnamese people defeated the US war of aggression in Vietnam.

The rise of socialist Cuba and the socialist-oriented countries in Africa and Latin America, without any direct connection to conditions of world war, was also a significant development in the historic advance of anti-imperialism and socialism. These countries are now decried by all proponents of the capitalist road in socialist and former socialist countries as undue burden and needless confrontation with the capitalist powers.

So far, we have discussed the achievements and problems of socialist countries in the political and economic fields. In the cultural field, the socialist countries have made great achievements in propagating the scientific outlook and methodology; in eradicating illiteracy and expanding the educational system; in promoting internationalism and the national and local cultures and in generating revolutionary schools of art and literature such as social realism, revolutionary romanticism and still others. And there are also problems.

The biggest problem in the cultural field has been the persistence of antisocialist ideas and influence and overreaction to those who seek to promote these. Definitely, the proletarian revolutionary forces must combat antisocialist ideas and produce the cultural works of socialism. But the cultural revolution has to be protracted and persuasive rather than precipitate persecutory. Otherwise, martyrs are created out of malcontents even in countries with a good standard of living, like East Germany and Czechoslovakia.

When the bourgeoisie is deprived of political power and ownership of the means of production, its agents seek cover under nationalism, religion, cosmopolitanism, pacifism, consumerism and sheer cynicism and use the cultural sphere to launch satire and other provocations against the socialist system. The cleverest of the agents of the bourgeoisie and reaction is to infiltrate the organs of the party, the state and the mass organizations in order to discredit socialism and take the fort from within.

It is a great paradox of history that in their earlier decades when they are weaker economically and are faced with bigger odds the socialist countries can stand up courageously to the capitalist powers. When they seek affluence and after

building their industries, they take the economic bait of the capitalist powers, set aside their revolutionary politics and their economies go into shambles.

A working-class party is in grave danger of infiltration by unhealthy elements from the moment it wins political power. It has a great need for personnel to run the affairs of the country and it must expand its membership. But it is liable to attract the unhealthy elements who join the party as an easy ladder to social and political power and privilege. These fictitious communists can take the fort from within by promoting bureaucratism and economism.

Even if theoretical and political education is undertaken but is done in a bureaucratic and catechetical way, without a living and intimate connection with the revolutionary mass movement, the passage of time in a socialist country can mean the waning of anti-imperialist and revolutionary consciousness even among some veterans of the revolution, among new party recruits and in succeeding generations.

Thus, the imperialists have banked on the peaceful evolution of socialist countries towards capitalism. They expect the revolutionary spirit to wane on the third and fourth generations. They place their hopes on the youth who may be children of the growing proletariat but are de-proletarianized by going through university and joining the ranks of the bureaucrats; and also, on the youth who come from the peasantry and other nonproletarian classes and who are predisposed to be drawn further away from the proletarian class standpoint by their formal education and social conditions different from that of the proletariat.

Socialism is liable to create its own grave diggers in an intelligentsia and a technocracy devoid of proletarian outlook and drawn to the affluence and consumerism in the capitalist countries. They become the bureaucrat bourgeoisie who divorce the party, the state, the economic enterprises and the mass organizations from the proletariat and the people.

They proclaim prematurely the end of classes and class struggle in order to obscure the continuing need for the proletarian class dictatorship, especially at a time that they seek with might and main to restore capitalism. They do so under the cover of populist slogans and with the use of supra-class, ahistorical, universalistic and pacifist terms.

The propagation of the theory of no more classes and class struggle is the

prelude to the negation of the class dictatorship of the proletariat; the promotion of economism and discarding of proletarian politics; the overstress on the productive forces and "reforming" the socialist relations of production; playing up the means of production at the expense of the people in production; removal of the restrictions on the bourgeois rights and yet squeezing the working class in the name of labor discipline; and conformity to the demands of the capitalist powers in the hope of gaining access to the world capitalist market, better technology and foreign investments and loans.

The promoters of capitalist restoration in socialist countries also cleverly raise the red flag to attack it by citing great communist leaders like Lenin or Mao as having allowed concessions to the bourgeoisie and petty commodity producers in the period of transition to full socialization of the economy. They misrepresent such period of transition as providing the ideal mode of socialist development and as something that was prematurely ended and should be returned to.

It is to the great credit of Mao Zedong that he formulated the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through a cultural revolution in order to combat revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism.

Mao Zedong's critique of modern revisionism is now fully vindicated by the turmoil and crisis in socialist countries and by the disintegration of the ruling revisionist cliques. The theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship can now be seen as truly his greatest contribution to socialist theory.

The failure of the great proletarian cultural revolution because of ultra-Left excesses, ultra-democracy, anarchy and factionalism, which would produce a right-wing backlash and allow the capitalist roaders in China to bounce back, does not invalidate the theory of continuing proletarian revolution in the same way that the failure of the Paris Commune of 1871 never invalidated the theory of proletarian revolution and dictatorship. What needs to be done is to learn from the mistakes in the application of the theory and further develop its principles and methods.

The growth and disintegration of modern revisionism

Yugoslavia under the leadership of Tito had the distinction of being the pioneer on the road of modern revisionism. Private entrepreneurs have had their way under the cover of "cooperatives" and state managers and private traders were

allowed the benefits of autonomy in state enterprises under the cover of "workers self-management".

Yugoslavia was ahead of all socialist countries in establishing close economic relations with the capitalist powers. But the result of such relations are dismal. All the evils of capitalism are rampant. In fact, Yugoslavia has a far worse per capita foreign debt than the Philippines.

Although the Soviet Union was dominant over other members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the Warsaw Pact and applied coercive measures on them in the most dramatic incidents, such as those in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, from the time of Khrushchev onward it allowed fraternal countries to promote private enterprise and autonomization of management in state enterprises in urban and rural areas and the development of economic relations with the capitalist powers.

However, there were so many unsettled hot issues in the Cold War. The United States and the rest of the Western alliance continued to be hostile to the Soviet Union and what was then touted as the socialist camp. It was only in the early 1970s that the United States dangled the bait of the most-favored-nation treatment in trade to no less than the Soviet Union as a result of the conspicuous capitalist crisis of overproduction.

The United States pulled back the bait but was able to further encourage the East European countries to develop economic relations with the West. On their own account, Poland, Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia developed such relations even as the only accommodation that the Soviet Union could get was for grain importation and related trade credit.

Poland and Hungary went the farthest in so-called economic reforms that favored consumption ahead of production and in freewheeling economic relations with the West. Without developing comprehensive and well-balanced self-reliant economies, Poland and Hungary incurred large foreign debts far more burdensome than those incurred by the Philippines. East Germany made better use of its foreign borrowing by building up its industrial capacity; and Czechoslovakia further developed economically without incurring large foreign debt.

Also in the early seventies, China became attracted to the expressed willingness

of the United States to develop economic and trade relations with it. Even while denouncing the two superpowers, especially the Soviet Union, China laid the groundwork for diplomatic and trade relations with the United States. It was on this ground that the advocates of the capitalist road could reinvigorate themselves and counterattack the great proletarian cultural revolution.

It was only after the death of Mao Zedong that Deng Xiaoping could vigorously push the line of four modernizations, economic reforms and opening up to the capitalist powers. The influence of Mao had been so great that it was only in 1979 that the Dengist policy could be fully adopted by the Communist Party of China and in the 1980s that this could be carried out full scale.

China was really in need of technology transfer and the trade and loans to get foreign funds for the technology transfer. The kind of technology that China had was mainly of pre-1949 vintage supplemented by shoddy equipment delivered by the Soviet Union up to the break of Sino-Soviet cooperation in 1959.

To gain access to technology as the best possible thing from the capitalist powers, China had to modify domestic economic policy in correspondence with the demands of the United States. For one thing, it had to take into account the Vannik-Johnson amendment requiring a "non-market economy" in the country to be entitled to the most-favored-nation treatment by the United States. This was the amendment that torpedoed the US-Soviet trade agreement in 1972. Thus, China has undertaken a series of measures to privatize and marketize the economy.

For another thing, China also had to take into account the political satisfaction of the United States so that there could be an incremental unbanning of technology in the list of Coordinating Committee (COCOM) that control exports which may be used for military purposes. Thus, China has had to mute its firmly militant anti-imperialist and proletarian internationalist stand and has had to avoid confrontations with the United States and other capitalist powers in accordance with the avowed line of economic construction in a peaceful international environment.

China became a member of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariff (GATT) and the Asian Development Bank. This also served to further isolate the regime in Taiwan after China recovered its seat in the United Nations and its Security Council.

A law to attract foreign investments was adopted because that was supposed to facilitate technology transfer in combination with what the Chinese state and private entrepreneurs could acquire. If foreign investors could enjoy bourgeois rights in China, such as to privately own means of production and form their own business associations, why not the Chinese themselves be allowed to enjoy the same bourgeois rights in their own country. The only inconsistency there is in the bourgeois liberal frame of mind is that despite the recommodification of labor power and the revival of the free labor market, the working class is under strict labor discipline and have no right to form unions outside of official ones and are deprived of the right to strike and take other concerted actions to achieve collective bargaining and arrive at the value of labor power in the free market.

The bourgeois liberalization of the economy meant the return to the Chinese bourgeoisie of its frozen capital, the prerogative to enlarge this private capital by getting loans and supply contracts from the state, the privatization of rural industries which were set up by the communes and the dissolution of the communes and the privatization of agriculture (through the so-called contract responsibility system). Despite the resurgence of the bourgeoisie, the abolition of classes and class struggle was proclaimed. Proletarian politics in command was set aside in favor of sheer economism. The line of building the forces of production (especially the means of production) was exaggerated at the expense of the socialist relations of production.

As early as 1981, Poland like Yugoslavia in the past was already in serious economic mess as a result of its bourgeois economic reforms and subservient linkage with Western investors and creditors. But the Chinese advocates of economic reforms and opening to the capitalist powers were determined to pursue a similar road. They denied making a gigantic Poland out of China. Among the East European countries, they admired most of Hungary which still looked smart and flashy then. But of course, the capitalist powers were admired for their affluence.

The point was to look up to the capitalist powers and mute any criticism of the oppressive and exploitative methods by which they achieved their affluence. The reverberating slogan was to get rich ahead of others. Deng Xiaoping continued to pontificate that it did not matter whether the cat was black or white so long as it caught mice. Hu Yao-bang dared to say that Marxism was outdated and Adam's Smith invisible hand of self-interest would make material and spiritual progress. Anti-communists like Fang Lizhi and the stalwarts of the so-called pro-

democracy movement now subsidized by the CIA and the Taiwan regime were allowed to join the Communist Party and they occupied high positions in the Party and the state. Their best recommendation was their claim to persecution during the great proletarian cultural revolution and their vigorous anti-Mao position. Coupled with the attacks on Mao Zedong, the promotion of capitalism and its values promptly generated all the evils of capitalism in both the economic base and the superstructure of Chinese society.

There were lots of funds for the special economic zones for Hongkong-type manufacturing and trading. But there were not enough funds for education and educational facilities. Worse, tuition fees were increased to the detriment of students. Teachers who enjoyed salary increases in the early stage of the so-called economic reform found their fixed income eaten up by inflation. The student demonstrations in several Chinese cities were bound to happen.

Instead of seeing the root cause of the student unrest, Hu Yao-bang tried to make the demonstrations as an occasion to push forward the bourgeois liberalization of the superstructure. He ran afoul of the Dengist line that the bourgeois liberalization of the economy must be promoted but there must be no threat to the incumbent political authority and no blatant opposition to the four cardinal principles of adhering to the socialist road, people's democratic dictatorship, leadership of the Communist Party and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong thought.

Following the removal of Hu Yaobang, Zhao Ziyang was supposed to promote the economic reforms and at the same time education on the four cardinal principles strictly within the institutional channels and not through a mass movement. The Dengist leadership has a phobia for the mass movement because of the experience of excesses during the GPCR.

Zhao Ziyang prated even louder than Deng and Hu about the abolition of classes and class struggle and pushed further for the bourgeois liberalization of the economy by calling for the privatization of the state enterprises, the shutdown of inefficient ones, more funds and contracts for private entrepreneurs, marginalization of central state planning and the complete deregulation of prices. Milton Friedmann was lionized as the guru of the conceived Chinese free enterprise economy.

Even a bureaucratic or catechetical type of education on the four cardinal

principles was forgotten. The schools, the mass media, the marketplace and the streets continued to be channels for anti-communist, antisocialist, pro-capitalist and even anti-Chinese propaganda.

The bourgeois liberalism seeped into the superstructure as the very evils of capitalism such as rampant bureaucratic corruption, unemployment, inflation, scarcities, profiteering and deterioration of social services began to be blamed on the state and the Communist Party.

The gross misallocation of resources in favor of consumption far ahead of production and in favor of non-productive construction projects were definitely profitable for the foreign investors and creditors as well as for the Chinese bourgeoisie, corrupt bureaucrats and the rich peasants but these led to austerity measures. At this point, the social unrest exploded. The unprecedentedly large demonstrations in Beijing and other cities eventually took the form of violent rebellion against the Chinese ruling party and state.

Chinese socialism is at the crossroads. Will it be undermined and destroyed ultimately as the Chinese leadership swing from free spending to austerity and vice versa within the framework of the International Monetary Fund and under the economic and political pressures of the capitalist powers? Will the Chinese leadership continue to consider revolutionary mass movement as unnecessary and allow the imperialists, the bourgeoisie and other reactionary forces to continue generating and taking hegemony over an anti-communist and antisocialist mass movement and convert China into a neo-colony of capitalism?

The Chinese leadership is resisting the most blatant forms of political and economic pressures from the United States and other capitalist powers. But within China, the proponents of capitalism in the name of socialism continue to be strong. Education on the four cardinal principles is being undertaken without any revolutionary mass movement being generated. Thus, the so-called pro-democracy movement of the reemergent Chinese bourgeoisie is confidently declaring that in due time China can be turned into a capitalist country through peaceful evolution as in Eastern Europe.

Deng Xiaoping has by far outstripped Khrushchev in adopting and implementing economic reforms, involving the notion of building socialism through capitalism. But as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, Khrushchev is the pioneer in putting his huge country on the road of capitalism in the name of

accelerating socialist construction.

To obscure the necessity of proletarian class dictatorship and the proletarian character of party and the state as bearers of the historic mission of building socialism, he used populist rhetoric and spoke of the CPSU as the "party of the entire people" and the state as the "state of the entire people". It may really be the inclination of a one-party state to make wrong assumptions because there are no other parties and no organs of multiparty cooperation by which the interest of the entire people is encompassed, activated and reflected.

To reject the teachings of Lenin on proletarian state and revolution, Khrushchev used universalist, pacifist and economic terms such as peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition and peaceful transition to socialism as the overriding general line not only in the relations of states but also in all types of relations in what is still the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. He was obviously too far ahead of his time and even of our time. His terms will probably apply after socialism gains the upper hand over capitalism on a world scale.

Insofar as reintroducing capitalism into the Soviet Union is concerned, he succeeded in reviving the kulaks in Soviet agriculture, in breaking up some collectives and giving 100 to 200 hectares to "groups" in promoting the free markets, tolerating the entrepreneurs in the informal economy and in effecting the autonomization of enterprises, with the managers having power to hire and fire and much leeway in increasing their own salaries and bonuses in the process of autonomous cost-profit accounting.

Khrushchev did not stay in power long enough to be able to completely disorganize the foundations of socialism established under Stalin before World War II and re-established after. But he implemented enough of "new economic policy" as to mess up Soviet agriculture and prepare the ground for his revisionist successors to do more in creating imbalances and cutting down the economic growth rate. Way deep into the Brezhnev period, the Soviet Union still enjoyed a fair rate of economic growth higher than that in most capitalist countries until in the 1970s military overspending as a result of the arms race began to tell on the Soviet economy.

If Khrushchev is better known for completely negating Stalin and decentralizing the economy, Brezhnev is better known for putting Stalin back on the pedestal and recentralizing the economy. But it is completely wrong to say that Brezhnev

reversed the "economic reforms" of Khrushchev. These were continued and expanded. The impression that Brezhnev was as bureaucratic as he was a neo-Stalinist is also wrong. The modern revisionists from Khrushchev through Brezhnev to Gorbachov have all been bureaucrats par excellence.

From his grave, Stalin can retort that though he was a bureaucrat and he had started the tendency to solve problems by administrative means and command, he was still a builder of socialism and not its wrecker in favor of capitalism.

In the Brezhnev period, the Soviet workers were subjected to a double squeeze. In the enterprises, they were under the squeeze of managers who had the power to hire and fire. At the same time, the central authorities of the state were squeezing resources chiefly in the effort to achieve overall military parity with the United States and for all sorts of foreign commitments—some good and others bad.

While the Soviet Union was locked in superpower rivalry with the United States and was channelling large amounts of resources to military research and production, the maintenance of Soviet military forces in Eastern Europe and fulfilment of both good and bad commitments in the third world, the capitalist powers (especially Western Europe and Japan) were taking rapid strides in the development and application of high technology on civil production in the 1970s and 1980s.

The misallocation of resources rather than the bureaucratism supposedly inherent in socialism is the biggest factor for the economic stagnation of the Soviet Union in the Brezhnev period. This has adversely affected the production and distribution of civil producer and basic consumer goods. Furthermore, the scarcity of high-grade consumer goods—like modern home appliances, electronic products and cars—deprived the workers of incentive to work harder and earn more. What if they earn more, if they cannot acquire the things which have become commonplace and accessible (through easy credit) to people in the West.

The clamor for market socialism exaggerates the importance of the market over planned production. If a socialist country misallocates its resources and does not build the capacity to produce the basic and non-basic consumer goods, then no amount of singing paeans to the market can produce these. Where these can be produced but are not produced, these can be imported and dissipate resources

that should otherwise be put into building the capacity to produce them. But worship of the domestic? and capitalist world market has its limits, even if it is only the consumerism of the privileged stratum that is served.

Gorbachov became the darling of the capitalist powers after Deng. He is supposed to have the edge over the latter in so-called political reforms rather than economic reforms. But accomplishing the objectives of glasnost domestically and in Eastern Europe as well as those of "new thinking" and detente in foreign policy have simply run ahead of perestroika or economic restructuring.

Glasnost has inspired not just the condemnation of Stalin and Brezhnev but more significantly attack on Lenin and the basic principles of socialism. Contrary to the media hype in the West that there is debate and democracy under the Gorbachov period, the Soviet mass media and academic institutions have one-sidedly become the platform for advocates of modern revisionism, outright capitalism and reaction. Those who adhere to the basic principles of socialism are ostracized as conservatives and those who are in the capitalist counterrevolution are called "radicals" and "progressives" in a perversion of language.

To the extent of 70 percent, the Party leading organs at all levels have been systematically purged of so-called conservatives and obstructionists to perestroika. In the shift from the USSR Supreme Soviet (1984) to the Congress of People's Deputies (1989), deputies who are workers, collective farmers and ordinary office employees have fallen from 46 percent to 23 percent of the total number of deputies. The bureaucrats and the intellectuals are in the overwhelming majority.

Despite the fact that Gorbachov is secure in his position as general secretary of the CPSU and as president of the Congress of People's Deputies, he has used the chaos and instability within the Soviet Union and the antisocialist upheavals in Eastern Europe as excuses for acquiring autocratic power as president who can ignore the highest leading organs of the CPSU and who can issue decrees in the name of emergency. Thus, the CPSU has been rendered impotent in favor of a new tsar; and it is now in the process of splitting and disintegrating.

Glasnost in the first place has caused the conditions of chaos and instability in the Soviet Union and the antisocialist upheavals in Eastern Europe. It has

released the political forces of capitalism in combination with the forces of nationalism, religion and other reactionary forces to overthrow what were anyway forces of bureaucrat revisionism. Neither Gorbachov himself nor any other presidential candidate of the CPSU can hope to win if elections are held now.

So far, it is in Eastern Europe that the ruling revisionist renegades have resoundingly been overthrown by a mass movement under the hegemony of the forces of capitalism and their reactionary allies. They tried to dance to the tune of glasnost in the hope of winning back the people and they conceded to the liquidation of the leading role of the proletariat and the proletarian party. After all, they were no longer proletarian revolutionaries and builders of socialism. They tried to play to the crowd that was no longer theirs in the first place. They split and disintegrated and their parts became marginalized in subsequent elections despite their contortions? and changing of names and slogans.

Even Ceaucescu of Romania was overthrown most unceremoniously although he was the least revisionist, played on nationalist sentiments, seemed to adhere to the basic principles of socialism and confined to the traditional bureaucratic way of staying in power. But he had long overstrained the people's capacity to endure the pain of paying back the foreign loans incurred mainly from the West when he was still the darling of the West for standing up to the Soviet Union.

The antisocialist upheavals in Eastern Europe were possible and successful because it became obvious to the forces of outright reaction that the Soviet Red Army would not intervene. The capitulation in Poland and the more forthright ascendance of capitalism and bourgeois democracy in Hungary stimulated the upheavals in Czechoslovakia and East Germany even if these countries had the highest standards of living in Eastern Europe.

The Warsaw Pact in effect is inoperative. The desire of most East European countries to be rid of Soviet occupation forces corresponds to that of the Soviet Union to save on resources by withdrawing its forces. But the rapid weakening of the Soviet Union within its own borders and in Eastern Europe has only encouraged the United States and NATO to maintain its own military strength at a far superior level and to develop the capacity to intervene in the Soviet Union in case Soviet nuclear weapons fall into hands other than those of the much-acclaimed Gorbachov.

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance is also in effect inoperative. As a matter of fact, its members agreed to go their separate ways in developing their economic relations with the capitalist countries and in getting themselves integrated into the multilateral agencies of the world capitalist system. The Soviet Union has also served notice that it will start to charge hard currency at world market prices for the oil and natural gas it supplies to its CMEA partners and on which the latter have been dependent; and to seek imports wherever these are of better quality and cheaper.

In fact, the Soviet Union and its CMEA and Warsaw Pact partners have in a way gotten fed up with each other. In the first two decades of their four-decade relationship, the Soviet Union supplied fuel and equipment at prices that its partners silently considered excessive. In the last two decades, the business-minded Soviet bureaucrats rankled that they were not getting the world market price for their fuel supply and were getting shoddy manufactures and rotten agricultural products in payment. Most likely, the East Europeans were not really retaliating against their Soviet partners. They were simply using outdated and worn-out equipment (mostly of Soviet make) for industrial production and transport.

The banal objective of restoring capitalism in a socialist country is always couched in saccharine terms that make good advertising copy. The language of Gorbachov is supra-class, ahistorical, pacifist, universalist and humanistic. It has been the job of the "neoliberals" around him as well as the loyal opposition leaders like Boris Yeltsin who proclaim more stridently that class struggle, socialism and anti-imperialism are the biggest mistake of the Soviet Union because they are costly and confrontational.

Within the first years of his regime, the most conspicuous achievements attributable to him in promoting capitalism is the growth and spread of private enterprises called cooperatives. These are mainly in the services and in trading. They are notorious for buying cheap in some places and selling dear in others, hoarding, price manipulation and the like. They have been the subject of workers' strikes and mass demonstrations. The biggest and most influential of these cooperatives buy cheap from state enterprises and sell dear to the public or even sell any type of commodity in whatever volume abroad.

It is only after becoming the so-called executive president that Gorbachov is supposed to be able to push the economic restructuring effectively. The main

points are to privatize the state enterprises and form new joint stock companies. Foreign investors can buy shares of stock. So do managers and workers according to their capacity and willingness to invest. Soviet citizens with large savings and access to state banks are expected to invest in joint stock companies and become the backbone of the new bourgeoisie.

The prices of commodities are to be deregulated and promote the free market and profitable environment for the foreign and domestic investors. The foreign investors are expected to bring in the much-desired technology although the foreign transnational corporations are finding it much cheaper to hire scientists and technologists in Soviet research institutes than those in capitalist countries.

In consonance with its economic restructuring, the Soviet Union is supposed to get the most-favored-nation treatment in trade relations with the United States and other capitalist countries, gain access to high technology from them, take loans freely from capitalist creditors abroad and enter the IMF, World Bank and GATT. Gorbachov is supposed to catch up with and possibly surpass Deng Xiaoping in the economic field. It is a wonder how the Soviet Union can make the most out of its integration into the world capitalist economy in view of the fact that its exports are mainly raw materials and that it has no competitive manufactures, except weapons.

Meanwhile, Poland and Hungary are bogged down in imported consumerism for the few and foreign indebtedness from which they cannot extricate themselves. Under the direction of IMF, they are undertaking austerity measures, offering state enterprises for sale to foreign investors, closing down losing enterprises and bringing about mass unemployment, raising prices of consumer products, removing subsidies and cutting back social welfare benefits and services and so on.

East Germany is decided on being reunited with West Germany. What has been the strongest economy in Eastern Europe has been turned into a beggar by the outflow of its professionals and highly skilled workers and of hard currency. Czechoslovakia continues to fare relatively well in economic terms but will find it increasingly difficult to adjust to new conditions.

Romania, Bulgaria and, farther East in Asia, Mongolia will find far worse conditions in the company of nonsocialist countries in the third world, especially when the Soviet Union starts to demand world market prices for fuel and other

supplies.

For the time being, the former socialist countries will discover difficulties as third-rate capitalist countries. They will rediscover the fact why capitalism has not brought about paradise in most the third world.

Prospects of the socialist cause

The Communist Party of the Philippines should have no big problem with regard to comprehending the rejection of the leading role of the working class and its party, the abandonment of the socialist cause and adoption of the capitalist road in a number of former socialist countries. Filipino communists re-established their party on a theoretical ground that included a critique of modern revisionism in the Philippines and abroad. The antirevisionist critique was militantly propagated, especially in the 1960s and 1970s.

However, the CPP scaled down its criticism of modern revisionism in favor of stressing the principle that every working-class party has the right to apply the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism on the concrete conditions of its own country in the concrete practice of revolution. Each party knows how best to carry out socialist revolution and construction in its own country.

The CPP stressed the above principle, expressly shared by all communists and workers' parties the world over, especially because the international communist movement was coming forward from a background of bitter ideological dispute and, worse, taking opposing sides in violent conflicts. This new current was healthy and conducive for working class parties in conflict in the past to reconcile, restore and improve their relations. This coincided with the desire of the CPP to expand its international relations in order to bring about a wider and stronger international support for the Filipino people's revolutionary struggle, notwithstanding the emphasis placed by most ruling parties in socialist countries on state-to-state relations.

With regard to the domestic conditions of socialist countries, the CPP took the modest and prudent line of being ready to send out study and research teams to observe and understand these. But developments in and about the countries that remain socialist or have abandoned socialism are so conspicuous and tumultuous that the CPP is bound to be accused of being deaf and blind if it remained silent and without opinion on these developments.

In its desire to expand friendly or fraternal relations with the ruling parties in socialist countries, the CPP adopted a minimal definition of what constitutes a socialist country—one where the ruling party is a working-class party, the major means of production are publicly owned and the people enjoy extensive social benefits.

By this definition, there are countries that remain socialist, others are in the process of becoming nonsocialist and still others have definitely become nonsocialist. To categorize countries as nonsocialist or even antisocialist is not a matter of judgment by outsiders but a matter of a recognition of facts as reflected by the proclamations of the anti-communist and antisocialist forces that have taken power and are seeking to completely liquidate socialism.

Even before the tumults and upheavals in socialist countries in 1989 and onward, the CPP consistently affirmed the basic principles of socialism and pointed to the unhealthy anti-communist and antisocialist currents in socialist countries. A review of CPP documents on international affairs bears this out.

By taking the road of capitalism, under the guise of reforming socialism through capitalist and bourgeois democratic reforms, several ruling parties that take the name of the working class in vain have already fallen and have become marginalized. It is appropriate that the blatant forces of capitalism rise to power and replace those forces of modern revisionism that have been pushing capitalism in the name of socialism.

Responsibility for capitalism and all its evils, such as unemployment, inflation, breakdown of production and social services, bureaucratic corruption, criminality and so on is now clearly in the hands of blatant forces of capitalism. In backward countries of Eastern Europe, such as Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and the like, there is absolute certainty that the economy, politics and culture will further deteriorate.

In these countries, the revisionist ruling cliques previously adopted so-called reforms that had ruined the conditions of socialism, sunk their economies into foreign indebtedness worse than that of the Philippines and ultimately resulted in the disintegration of modern revisionism itself.

Now, the blatant capitalist forces in power using in the main anachronistic neoliberal slogans of free enterprise and free market are reeling from austerity

measures dictated by the International Monetary Fund and the Western transnational firms and banks.

Massive unemployment soaring inflation, worse scarcities and the breakdown of social services are the lot of the proletariat and people. The new rulers are already being rapidly discredited. But those who in the past took the name of the working class and socialism in vain remain even more discredited. Thus, the resurgent bourgeoisie is preparing to shift its language from neoliberalism to social democracy. But social-democratic slogans without their material basis as in the West would not be sufficient and effective enough to mislead the people.

The unavoidable maintenance of armed forces and other coercive apparatuses of the state and the retention of state enterprises, whose lack or low level of profitability discourages foreign and domestic investors from acquiring, will promote bureaucrat capitalism and even fascism. After the total discredit of neoliberal and social-democratic slogans, the currents of nationalism, politicized religion and racism can give rise to fascism.

Most European countries will suffer from the double squeeze: from the West as it promotes consumerism rather than the comprehensive development of their productive capacities; and from the Soviet Union as it charges world market prices for its supply of fuel and industrial products.

East Germany and Czechoslovakia are the countries which are relatively in the best position to take advantage of integration into the world capitalist economy. Between the two, East Germany is favored by integration with or absorption into a united Germany. West Germany makes its first priority the use of its surplus capital to absorb East Germany. Czechoslovakia has to hang on to a united Germany and be a junior partner in the exploitation of Eastern Europe.

The big problem for the new capitalist (they may be capitalist oriented but not yet capitalist) rulers of Eastern Europe is that they do not have competitive goods to earn the hard currency to be able to satiate the high consumption of the bourgeoisie (to pay for the high-grade consumer goods from the West) and at the same time bring about better socioeconomic conditions for the broad masses of the people. For their previous overconsumption of imported goods, most countries of Eastern Europe have already been exhausted as loan clients of Western finance capitalism.

There is a rule which the economists of the new bourgeoisie in Eastern Europe should have realized a long time ago. As in the case of the third world countries and in that of the earliest clients of Western finance capitalism in Eastern Europe (Yugoslavia, Poland and Hungary), there is a limit to credit. The capitalist lenders cannot indefinitely give loans to countries that cannot pay back. There is no such thing as giving away money, goods and services indefinitely.

Actually, it is the Soviet Union that is the new and biggest possible loan-client of finance capitalism in Eastern Europe. As a matter of fact, it is the last frontier for the predatory activities of Western and Japanese finance capital, after the exhaustion of the third world and some East European countries as loan clients.

Khrushchev and then Brezhnev in the past wanted to have access to the world capitalist market and foreign technology and, therefore, the capitalist credit system. But because they did not want to capitulate politically and militarily, the US-Soviet confrontation in the Cold War continued, adversely affecting the fullscale development of US-Soviet economic relations. At the same time, the Soviet Union allowed some of its East European wards to develop their own economic and financial relations with the West so long as they did not make any political breakaway from the Soviet Union. (Repetition of previous section)

Gorbachov became the darling of the United States and the capitalist powers because of his willingness to comply with the Jackson-Vanik amendment and adopt privatization and the "free market"; open the floodgates of pro-capitalist and anti-communist ideas; spin off Eastern Europe to the capitalist sphere; and unilaterally disarm under the concept of "sufficient defense".

But it is completely and illusion for any socialist country to imagine that the United States or any of the major capitalist powers would ever agree to provide it with the economic, financial and technological facilities to supplant the supply of goods and services by the multinational firms and become one more major competitor in the world capitalist market. The new bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union is prone in the first place to the satisfaction of its high consumerist demands rather than improve the socio-economic conditions of the people. Overconsumption may as well be the replacement of Brezhnev's military overspending.

The United States and the world capitalist alliance (the summit of seven, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD and the

NATO) have seen to it that the Soviet Union together with Eastern Europe must retreat, capitulate and go awry before any substantial concession can be granted. Thus, capitalist subversion; the political rampage of anti-communist forces; the adoption of political, economic and legal infrastructure for foreign investors and creditors; and the disintegration of the CMEA and Warsaw Pact have run far ahead of the Soviet Union being able to get the most-favored-nation trading status and access to technology, foreign investments, new market and credit.

The politico-military drawdowns by the Soviet Union are not being reciprocated by the United States and its NATO allies. In fact, US strategy planners are now boasting that because the Soviet Union is in political and economic shambles, the United States has won the entire South and East as the free ground for its imperial will and must pursue the retreating Soviet Union in its own ground to make sure that the nuclear arsenals do not fall into the wrong hands.

The deterioration of the Soviet economy, politics and culture is running far ahead of any kind of help the Soviet Union can derive from any improvement of its relations with the United States and the rest. This deterioration has already discredited Gorbachov and to stay in power he has taken the initiative of blaming the CPSU as the obstruction, doing away with its leading role and making himself the autocratic source of authority without the benefit of popular election.

Even the Soviet Union were to be eventually given free play in the capitalist world (an impossibility because not only monopolies but super monopolies rule), the only kind of competitive goods it has is mainly fuel in the old compass of the CMEA and mainly military weapons.

Neither can the Soviet Union have the hard currency to purchase the latest technology from nor willingness of the West to sell it. The transfer of technology through foreign investments in the Soviet Union will always be restricted by technological overcapacity in other parts of the capitalist world. It is more likely that the capitalist countries and their multinational firms will acquire the cheap expertise of the Soviet scientists and technologists. As regards technologies of the 1970s and 1980s in idled plants in capitalist countries, the Soviet Union will probably buy some of what is left by previous Chinese shopping.

Already at great ideological, political and economic cost to the cause of socialism, the Soviet Union is seeking to do what China has done under Deng

Xiaoping since 1979.

China has succeeded in effecting some transfer of new technology as a result of economic reforms so-called and opening up to the capitalist countries. This technology transfer is certainly helpful to the further economic development of China.

But there have been heavy socioeconomic costs as well as ideological and political costs. The re-emergence of private capitalists, bureaucrat capitalists and rich peasants have siphoned off funds not only from the state and working people but from the entire country. The biggest problem for China now is how to reaccommodate the working people displaced from the farms and now again displaced from non-productive construction projects which have to be scaled down. The workers, peasants, intelligentsia and the rest of the people are disaffected by unemployment, inflation, corruption and other evils of capitalism.

There have been gross imbalances in the use of domestic and foreign funds. Consumption by the privileged and high-earning few has far outpaced the raising of China's productive capacity. Economic and financial relations with the capitalist countries have favored these. The multinational firms have extracted super profits and the multinational banks, tremendous amounts of debt service. The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have gained levers for economic and political pressure on behalf of the United States in China.

Tiananmen demonstrations, culminating in the counterrevolutionary rebellion in June 1989 and the continuing so-called pro-democracy movement pose a serious threat to the Chinese socialist state and the Chinese Communist Party. Preparatory to the counterrevolutionary rebellion, both socioeconomic base and superstructure of China was subjected to bourgeois liberalization.

The anti-communist and antisocialist forces in China are hoping to be able to achieve what eventually transpired in Eastern Europe. However, the Chinese leaders are hopeful that they can stave off the deterioration of the situation through austerity measures for the sake of the "economic reforms" and education on the four cardinal principles within institutional channels and without a revolutionary mass movement.

There are still major factors of socialism in the two biggest socialist countries, China and the Soviet Union. And there are socialist countries which resolutely

stay on the road of socialism like the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, Cuba and the like. In former socialist countries, as in socialist countries, there are still elements among the proletariat and people who can effectively serve as the seed of the resurgence of the socialist cause upon the further failure of capitalism.

But these elements must learn well with the proletariat and people through revolutionary mass movement the lessons from the previous failure of socialism and what is to be done in order to bring about socialism at a new and higher level. As a matter of fact, in certain countries, the genuine Marxist-Leninist and scientific socialists will probably have to contend first with the forces of nationalism and fascism after the failure of the new bourgeoisie that shall have exhausted the language of neoliberalism and social democracy.

Reduced to the status of third-rate capitalist countries or the impoverished countries of the third world, the former socialist countries at one point or another can choose to stand up against the intolerable foreign debt and outflow of their resources; join up with the third world in a general debtors' strike against the capitalist creditors; and demand more effectively than ever before a new international economic order as well as a new international political order.

There are those who call themselves Marxists and yet are overwhelmed by the economic and political power of the capitalist super monopolies and by the high technology at the disposal of these to hold the people under their command in a single world economy. They argue that such super monopolies—which they describe as country-less as they are ruthless, can crush any anti-imperialist or socialist resistance anywhere in the world. And finally they conclude that Lenin was wrong with his theory of an era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution and that Kautsky was correct after all in viewing capitalism as the unlimited bringer of economic progress to the backward countries until the world shall be ripe for socialism.

What is obscured by those who are anti-Marxist as they are anti-Leninist is the unchangeable historical fact that the first socialist country arose as a result of the crisis of overproduction and world war among capitalist countries and that several socialist countries arose as a result once more of a worse crisis of overproduction and world war among capitalist countries.

Even if capitalist monopolies have become super monopolies, they are still

within the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. Their capital structures and operations are more international, complex and shifting than ever before. But they have major national groundings simply because their economic depredations must be backed up by the power of definite capitalist states which must deploy their resources diplomatic and military forces. Thus, the United States, Japan and the West European countries (especially Germany) are the complex of states that back up the super monopolies.

The conditions for world peace and avoidance of nuclear war, attended by local and regional armed conflicts, have so far been guaranteed by the existence of socialist countries, other anti-imperialist forces and nuclear stalemate. The implications and consequences of the disintegration of some socialist societies, the capitulation of the Soviet Union in the Cold War and the momentary loss of cohesion in the world anti-imperialist movement may result in the further rise of a multipolar world, better conditions for socialist revolution within national boundaries and the lesser weight of intervention by the two old superpowers.

But another obvious result has been the encouragement to the United States and other capitalist powers to push their advantage, further subvert the existing socialist countries and intervene in situations that can become volatile and violent in the former socialist countries. There can be a limit to the pro-capitalist and antisocialist and self-disintegrative trends in the remaining socialist countries. Guarantees for economic progress and global peace for the benefit of the proletariat and the people can re-emerge with the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist forces at a new and higher level.

The world capitalist system has been in severe crisis since the late 1960s, after the reconstruction of the war-ruined capitalist economies. It is the crisis of overproduction which has driven the capitalist countries to extend large amounts of loans to the chronically deficit-ridden client states by way of disposing surplus capital and surplus manufactures. It is the same crisis of overproduction that is involved in the deteriorating terms of trade, crushing debt burden and severe austerity measures for the underdeveloped raw-material producing countries. This crisis of the capitalist system must not be obscured by the crisis of modern revisionism. In fact, the social unrest and turmoil in the third world countries, China and Eastern Europe are directly connected with their burdensome economic and financial relations with the capitalist countries.

The high technology in the hands of capitalism has the capacity to wipe out

poverty and underdevelopment in the world. But it is subordinated to the rules of the capitalist game and is used to maximize profits. The absurdity of giving loans to countries that eventually cannot pay them is preferred but has its limits.

Inexorably, the high technology of the strongest capitalist countries has speeded up and will further speed up the crisis of overproduction. The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe cannot last long as the new outlets for surplus capital and manufactures. All of them can be exhausted as loan clients in a matter of five years. Of the capitalist powers, Western Europe (especially Germany) will benefit from the economic subordination of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe) to the world capitalist system.

If China, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe can really acquire new technology and produce competitive goods, whether these countries remain socialist or become capitalist, the world market will become tighter for capitalism. The crisis of overproduction will worsen for capitalism. As a matter of fact, to any extent that Western Europe exploits the cheap labor and cheap raw materials in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe there can be an adverse consequence to the position of Japan and the newly industrializing economies.

The United States has accumulated a huge domestic and foreign debt due to overconsumption and military overspending. If the United States were to boost its productive capacity in tradable goods, the crisis of overproduction for the world capitalist system would accelerate.

The huge trade surpluses of Japan, West Germany and the newly industrializing economies have been made possible mainly by the huge trade deficits of the United States. The latter is now under pressure by the American people to use the so-called peace dividend to revive its competitiveness in trade and attend to domestic social programs. Like the Soviet Union, the United States has undermined its economy by military overspending in the arms race.

The capitalist crisis of overproduction, much worsened by the exhaustion of all loan-clients, is bound to create far more favorable conditions for the advance of the anti-imperialist and socialist cause. The world is on the eve of social upheavals unprecedented in scale in the neo-colonial appendages and in the advanced capitalist countries themselves. It is to be hoped that the development of a multipolar world can make easier the victory of social revolutions within national boundaries and without the disaster of a global war.

IV. Lessons for the Philippine revolution

The advance of capitalism from feudalism took a long time. And even after the decisive political victory of the bourgeoisie over the feudalists, the bourgeoisie went through ups and downs to develop its political and economic system in various forms.

The cause of socialism is not exempted from the rough course of history. The revolutionary proletariat must take a tortuous road, suffering setbacks, learning lessons and winning greater victories. The proletarian revolutionary party must develop its subjective ability to lead the revolutions as the objective conditions—the worsening crisis of capitalism—becomes favorable for revolution.

It was a long way from the Communist Manifesto and the Europe-wide uprisings of 1848, when proletarians in effect assisted the bourgeoisie in its further rise, to the Paris Commune in 1871, when the proletariat seized political power for the first time. The Paris Commune failed but the theory of proletarian revolution and class dictatorship was never invalidated. The experience yielded lessons for the proletariat.

It was again a long way from 1871 to 1917 before the first socialist state was established by the proletariat. Before then, capitalism grew in strength and passed from the stage of free competition to monopoly in each of several countries and then to imperialist on a wide scale. For quite a while, it looked like there was no socialist future for the working class.

The prospect for proletarian revolution looked ever bleaker when the classic revisionists of the Second International prevailed and supported the war budgets of the capitalist powers. Upon the outbreak of World War I in 1914, the Second International collapsed and it looked as if socialism had no future. Lenin was isolated. But he eventually led the Bolsheviks to victory in 1917, proving that the crisis and war of the capitalist powers would lead to social revolution.

When the fascists came to power in Europe, destroyed the working class parties (especially the German Communist Party which was the largest) and eventually attacked the Soviet Union, it looked as if socialism would be extirpated from the face of the earth. But the aftermath of World War II saw the emergence of several socialist countries and the resurgence of national liberation movements as never before to decolonize the third world.

After failing to dominate the world by long discredited methods of colonial and imperialist control, including nuclear blackmail and localized wars of aggression such as the Korean and Vietnam wars, the United States and other capitalist powers have used the arms race and low-intensity conflict to sap the strength of the Soviet Union and at the same time use methods of finance capitalism to attract the newly liberated and socialist countries to neo-colonial arrangements.

Once more the cause of socialism is under severe attack. The wiles of finance capital have coincided with the growth of modern revisionism in socialist countries for several decades (since the 1950s); and have already succeeded in effecting the conversion of some socialist countries into capitalist ones.

However, the triumphalist propaganda of capitalism obscures the essential point. The neo-colonial methods of exploitation, chiefly the expansion of non-productive capital or the extension of loans to countries that increasingly become incapable of paying back these loans, are actually methods of desperation in the capitalist crisis of overproduction and are ultimately destructive of capitalism. The world is on the eve of social revolution within national boundaries but on a widescale as peoples in third world countries, former socialist countries and an increased number of socialist countries suffer the crushing debt burden, deteriorating terms of trade and the ever-tightening austerity measures. The crisis of overproduction will conspicuously hit the capitalist powers themselves as they intensify their competition and the ground for exploitation abroad becomes the narrower.

The Filipino people have experienced for a long time the neo-colonial methods of exploitation. The Philippines has been the US laboratory for neocolonialism. The Filipino people can therefore see as pitiable some socialist countries going into the framework of neocolonialism. But the people can learn from the experience of socialist societies that in the first place have degenerated from inside under pressures from outside.

To comprehend the fundamental reasons for the development and eventual disintegration of modern revisionism, it is necessary to review the ideological debate in the international communist movement from the late fifties to the seventies. After Tito, Khrushchev used the complete negation of Stalin as the pretext for laying the ground for modern revisionism in the Soviet Union and in the entire international communist movement.

In contrast, Mao Zedong made a serious Marxist critique of bureaucratism, for which the revisionists blamed Stalin in order to conceal their own bureaucratism. He made a distinction of the contradictions among the people and those between the enemy and the people in criticism of the worst errors of Stalin and in the spirit of strengthening the socialist cause.

At the same time, the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Mao recognized both the merits and demerits of Stalin. Obviously, he could be credited among others with leading the socialist construction in the Soviet Union; the patriotic defense of the Soviet Union against the Nazi invaders; the socialist reconstruction after World War II; and the resolute stand against US imperialism and its capitalist allies.

The Chinese communists saw the errors of Stalin in prematurely declaring the end of classes and class struggle in 1936 but at the same time they acknowledged that in 1951, he recognized this error. The records show that those who promote the road of capitalism always harp on the demise or dying out of classes and class struggle in order to lull the proletariat in the face of the actual scheme to restore capitalism. The critique of modern revisionism by the Chinese and Albanian communists was replete with concrete proof.

Mao was not satisfied with making a critique of modern revisionism. He put forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism. Under this theory, he launched the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR). This was originally conceived as a peaceful mass movement to revolutionize the superstructure and guarantee the socialist character of the socio-economic base, counter the imperialist hope of peaceful evolution to capitalism in China, overthrow the capitalist roaders in the bureaucracy and give revolutionary experience to the youth as successors to the revolutionary cause.

The cultural revolution was the first major instance in which the mass movement overthrew bureaucrats who advocated the capitalist road. But the mass movement became ultrademocratic, anarchistic, functionalistic, persecutory and at worst violent. The cultural revolution failed because of mistakes and excesses. It resulted in a rightist backlash which prompted the return to power and re-infiltration of the party and the state by capitalist roaders.

The failure of the cultural revolution does not invalidate the theory of continuing

revolution under proletarian dictatorship in the same way that the failure of the Paris Commune did not invalidate the theory of proletarian revolution and dictatorship. Without the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship, there is no theory in sight to keep the proletarian party and state on the socialist road and closely link with the broad masses of the people. It is already clear that the bureaucratization of the proletarian party and state and their alienation from the people are fatal to socialism. What needs therefore to be done is to learn both the positive and negative lessons from the pioneering practice of the theory.

Those who wish to make socialist revolution should recognize that the proletarian class dictatorship (the state power of the working class) is absolutely necessary in order to start it. Emerging from semicolonial and semifeudal conditions upon the basic completion of the national democratic revolution, state power may take the form of a people's democracy but at the core of this is proletarian class dictatorship in order to decisively end the joint class dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class.

Proletarian class dictatorship is one face of a coin. The other is socialist democracy. Socialist democracy for the broad masses of the people is possible only because there is the state power of the working class to make sure that the defense exploiting classes. But the validity is only up to a certain point, especially when bureaucratism emerges as a plague of society. The freedom of individuals and groups, whether or not they are directly led by the Party must be fully realized within the frame of socialist revolution.

The constitution of people's democracy or socialism must differentiate itself from the bourgeois liberal constitution by requiring the freedom of the entire sovereign nation and people from imperialism and the exploited from the exploiters; but must also carry over from the bourgeois liberal constitution the guarantees of civil and political liberties for individuals and groups. The people must enjoy the utmost freedom to express themselves and exercise their rights in a socialist society.

The capitalist powers and their camp followers in the neo-colonial make much out of the direct, secret and universal suffrage in the election of officials, especially at the national level, as the hallmark of democracy. Since the French revolution, it had taken the bourgeoisie quite a long time to come up with this electoral system. There had been massive exclusion of people from the right to

vote because of property and literacy requirements, anti-women and racial discrimination, antisocialist laws and so on. There also had been revivals of autocracy through monarchist restorations and fascist regimes which suppress and exclude proletarian and other progressive parties from legal politics and electoral competition.

At this point in time, it can still be said that the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie never allowed a proletarian party or a combination of progressive political parties to win elections and go all the way in carrying out the socialist transformation of society. In the neo-colonial appendages of capitalism, the most brutal forms of suppression as well as rigging of electoral processes have been carried out against anti-imperialist and antifeudal parties to prevent them from taking power through elections. It remains to be seen whether the bourgeoisie will allow working class parties to win power through elections in the advanced capitalist countries when a severe crisis similar to that before each of the two world wars and not resort to blatant class war and fascism.

It must be recognized though that the bourgeoisie in capitalist countries and quite a number of neo-colonial has mastered the art of creating the illusion of democracy by staging and manipulating the electoral process with the use of money due to its private ownership of the means of production; control of the mass media, educational system, church and other conservative institutions; predetermination of the electoral rules in favor of the bourgeois parties; and relentless use of the coercive apparatuses of the state against progressive leaders and parties. The bourgeoisie has also employed parties with a dazzling array of names like liberal democratic, social democratic, Christian democratic, nationalist and ad nauseam.

In face of the false claims of the bourgeoisie to democracy through the electoral politics it controls and manipulates, the CPP must create in a people's democracy or socialist state the reality of a truly democratic electoral process in which the leading role of the party is guaranteed, there is a pluralism of political forces that offers a wide range of ideas and candidates and the broad masses of the people are satisfied that they enjoy participation and choice in the process.

In the period of consolidating the newly won political power of the working class, probably lasting for some ten years and depending on circumstances like the threat of imperialism and the requirements of rehabilitation and reconstruction, the CPP can proceed from a people's consultative assembly to a

national people's congress involving multiparty cooperation. If we refer to the experience of the socialist countries, the Chinese offer the best example, which is definitely better than the one-party system that prevailed in Eastern Europe until lately.

The East European ruling parties had stuck too long to a one-party system and yet the ruling revisionist cliques leaped all of a sudden to the liquidation of the concept, if no longer the reality, of the leading role of the proletarian party and a free-fight liberal multiparty system. There had never been a more disastrous about-face in the entire political history of the world.

But even the Chinese model of multiparty cooperation may not be suitable to be emulated after some time. As soon as possible, there can be elections for a parliamentary system in which the seats in the National People's Congress can be divided according to a constitutionally guaranteed three-thirds arrangement.

The first third is for representatives of the CPP; the second third, for those of the basic mass organizations led by the CPP; and the third, for those of parties, organizations and individuals independent of the CPP. One-third of the Congress independent of the CPP will be a sure source of different ideas and debate. Another third will also be a sure source of varied views according to the different sectoral interests. In the face of these two-thirds, the representatives of the CPP are stimulated to engage in lively discussion and debate. Thus, the Congress does not become a mere rubber stamp. Although of course the representatives of the CPP and the mass organizations led by the Party will tend to defend the basic principles of socialism.

Several candidates for every seat in every third of the Congress can be offered to the electorate. Thus, the people will have the opportunity to choose what they think are the best candidates for the entire Congress. It will not suffice for the CPP candidates to prove themselves within their party but they have to undergo choice by the electorate.

There may eventually be an upper house of the proletariat and a lower house of the national people's congress. The upper house may stress the leading role of the working class and may consist of nationally elected representatives of the CPP, those of the trade unions and those of other mass organizations led by the Party. The lower house may stress its character as the legislative body of the entire people and the representatives may be elected at the district level in

accordance with the three-thirds arrangement already. The functions of the two chambers of the house may be clearly delineated.

In the history of socialist countries that have so far arisen, the establishment and initial operation of organs of political power at the lower levels of state power have not posed the problem of bureaucratism and rigidification. The problem has usually arisen first at the national level and downward in time. At the moment, while conducting the armed revolution, the CPP is already establishing organs of political power at the grassroots in accordance with the three-thirds arrangement of representatives of the CPP, mass organizations led by the CPP, and allied forces and elements. These representatives are at first appointive; and subsequently elected upon the consolidation of the area.

There has been a tradition of Communist Party leaders staying in office until they die, for as long as they do not commit grave errors warranting their removal. There should be a set age limit. Seventy years of age is good enough for retirement and joining the council of elders. The way for the young and middle-aged cadres to rise should not be blocked.

There should be a limit to how long the chairman of the Party and the chief of state should stay in office. They should not stay there for more than fifteen years in a row, which are equivalent to three five-year economic plans.

The scheme of remuneration and pension for cadres should not differ from that of the working class. The facilities of cadres should be provided only as they are necessary and appropriate for their functions.

There should be prohibitions against nepotism, cliquism, factionalism, regionalism and other practices that go against merit on the basis of competence or reason. There should be well-defined criteria and system of merit in the nomination for election or appointment of officials by any organ of the Party or state.

Socialist revolution and construction is a process that is more protracted than the national democratic revolution. But proletarian cultural revolution is a far more protracted process. It has to be led by a Marxist-Leninist party. The cultural revolution can make steady advances only on the basis of promoting a national, scientific and democratic culture among the broad masses of the people.

It is absolutely necessary to conduct the proletarian cultural revolution as a

protracted and persuasive process because to rush it is to turn the revolutionary mass movement into a tool of persecution that can create martyrs out of counterrevolutionaries and bring about a rightist backlash. China's proletarian cultural revolution and Gorbachov's glasnost are different in class standpoint and objective. But both have resulted in anarchy. The ultra-Leftists in China's proletarian cultural revolution ran down the cadres for the slightest claim to incorrectness or error and sapped the strength of the Party from within. Thus, the mass movement rushed away from a firm Party leadership; and counterrevolutionaries and revisionists could join in generating factional strife within the mass movement in order to discredit it.

In the case of glasnost, the Soviet ruling clique has allowed the forces of capitalist counterrevolution to rise up and generate an anarchic mass movement of reactionary forces and honest people discontented due to deteriorating socio-economic and political conditions. Thus, in the Soviet Union there are growing conditions of instability and anarchy. Order might eventually have to be established by some kind of a disciplinarian or authoritarian force before there can be a re-emergence of proletarian revolutionaries.

In socialist society, the propagation of Marxism-Leninism is at the core of promoting a national, scientific and democratic culture just as the Party is at the core of a broad revolutionary mass movement in a cultural revolution.

At every step in this cultural revolution, the advanced section of the mass movement must always unite with the middle section in order to win over more adherents from the backward section. The method should be educative and persuasive; and never coercive and persecutory. The cultural revolution must promote production and participation in political affairs; and must rouse the revolutionary support of the masses to strengthen the cause of socialism, the socialist state and the Party. The cultural process has to be properly inspiring, educative and entertaining.

At no point should the cultural revolution be disruptive of production and political institutions. Corrective measures should be taken whenever destructive and anarchist trends begin to arise. Educational, cultural and related institutions must be able to work with the mass movement in carrying out cultural revolution.

Certainly, the cultural revolution will have to contend with counterrevolution as

there will be both internal and external enemies. However, the mass movement must not usurp the functions of political and judicial institutions. No individual in society should be arbitrarily arrested, judged and punished by the mass movement. Civil and political rights must be guaranteed. Due process and rules of evidence should be observed to in proving that someone is a counterrevolutionary criminal or deserving of recall or demotion from office.

The law of uneven development operates both in the Party and in society. There are varying levels of consciousness and conscientiousness in work and struggle. The general level can be raised essentially through ideological, political and cultural work and not rushed by bureaucratic means or by the force of the mass movement.

Within the Party and among the people, there must be a free and frank discussion of ideas and facts. There must be debates in order to clarify and determine what is correct and what is wrong. There must be criticism and self-criticism on the facts pertaining to ideas, policies, work, performance and results.

Notwithstanding the determination of the Party and the socialist state to promote Marxism-Leninism and a national, scientific and democratic awareness, individuals and organizations of whatever character in society are entitled to civil and political liberties and must be able exercise these.

No individual or organization can be deprived of its rights or penalized without due process. Any penalty must be based on evidence presented and proven in court that a crime violative of the rights of others and/or the laws of the socialist state has been committed. Individuals and organizations holding views critical of or contrary to those of the Party and the state should be able to enjoy freedom. But the moment they use libel, slander and grave threats, or commit sedition, rebellion or any kind of public disorder, then the corresponding action is taken as in any civil society where no one can violate the right of citizens nor overthrow the very state that guarantees freedom.

Socialist states that have evolved into bourgeois states have had a record of a low tolerance level and of meting out severe punishments not only for proven counterrevolutionary criminals but also for merely dissatisfied elements. The socialist state should be able to tolerate those holding contrary ideas so long as they do not reach the point of being criminal. When a criminal is proven guilty, the degree of punishment should be commensurate to the crime. Otherwise, the

counterrevolutionaries gain the ground to claim repression.

The weapons of criticism and satire, often effectively used by counterrevolutionaries, can as well be used by proletarian revolutionaries. The proletarian revolutionaries come to power by using these weapons against the reactionaries. Why can they not use the same weapons against those who oppose the revolutionary line and the achievements of socialism, instead of unduly using immediately the coercive apparatuses of the state.

In a socialist society, the proletarian revolutionaries have to be vigilant and militant against counterrevolutionaries. But they must also trust their powers of persuasion and must not lose their sense of humor and proportion. It is a different matter though if a series of revisionist renegades have already succeeded in subverting socialism from within the Party.

When the conditions of socialist society deteriorate because revisionists have brought them about over a protracted period of time, blatant advocates of capitalism emerge from the Party, the state and the Party-led institutions and mass organizations. They get support from nationalist and religious organizations that can generate a powerful mass movement overnight. A ruling revisionist clique, long inured to bureaucratism and divorced from the people, will fail to raise its own mass movement and will have to contend with a crowd that is already determined to boot it out of power.

The traditionally dominant church has been used effectively as the rallying point for large numbers of people against revisionist ruling cliques in Eastern Europe. In view of this experience, the constitution of the socialist society in the Philippines should prohibit the organization of a religious party and the use of the church as a political instrument of counterrevolution in accordance with the principle of separation of church and state and the anticlerical tradition bequeathed by the liberal democratic revolution of 1896.

But the most important guarantee against counterrevolution is the socio-economic, political and cultural satisfaction of the people under socialism and under the leadership of the CPP. No amount of church-state separation can prevent counterrevolution if in the first place those who proclaim socialism subvert it and redirect society toward capitalism.

What has proven to be more destructive of socialism -far more than imperialist

wars, military encirclement, economic blockade, electronic propaganda, inflow of high-grade consumer goods and the revival of reactionary institutions and movement -has been the degeneration of communists into revisionists, their divorce from the people and their dream of consumerist affluence through capitalism.

Filipino communists should learn from the fact that under extremely difficult conditions, in the aftermath of world wars and civil wars, socialist countries have been able to rehabilitate and reconstruct their economies, build the basic industries and promote agricultural cooperation.

The Philippines is fortunate to have a rich comprehensive natural resource base and a population of more than sixty million people. It has a fertile and extensive agricultural base to produce food and raw materials for local industry and export. It has rich fishing grounds and firmly good animal husbandry. It has the mines to produce the ores. It has a manufacturing enterprise, although dependent on fuel, industrial equipment, spare parts from abroad.

The Filipino people can be economically independent and self-reliant. Upon the seizure of political power, bourgeois democratic reforms like land reform, protection of the national bourgeoisie from foreign monopolies and incentives for the petty commodity producers can be fully undertaken. At the same time, the socialist transformation of the economy can be started by nationalizing and converting into public ownership the strategic means of production and distribution and the sources of raw materials. Consequently, basic industrialization and agricultural cooperation can be advanced.

There must be economic planning. The central plan should be based on the data and proposals from below; and the plans at lower levels of the economy must be guided by the central plan. The objective is to muster precious limited resources, maximize their use for the development of the economy and give priority to production of goods and services for the soonest possible satisfaction of basic human needs such as food, clothing, shelter, health care and education.

In economic planning, there must be a good balance of investments for heavy industry, light industry and agriculture. Heavy industry is necessary to make the backbone of the economy but investments here must be made at a pace that does not deprive the people of a better life than before. Light industry must be developed in order to bridge heavy industry and agriculture and provide the

people soonest with the basic manufactures for consumption; and promote the ever-increasing levels of production in agriculture through the delivery of producer and consumer goods to the peasants in fair exchange for what they produce. Mechanization and the development of rural industries will facilitate the development state farms and peasant cooperatives.

Initially, there is no way for the Philippines but to continue exporting agricultural and mineral products in order to earn foreign exchange. But the fundamental difference between the comprador economy and socialist economy would be that in the latter foreign exchange earned will be used by state trading firms rather than big comprador firms to import a good balance of producers' goods for the industrialization of the economy and some basic consumer goods that are not as yet produced by the country. What is to be prevented is the misappropriation of the export income by the big bourgeoisie, use of it for luxury consumption and, worst of all, removal of the resources from the country.

The economy will avail itself of foreign credit but only to accelerate industrial development and will refuse loans with conditions that distort economic planning and development and waste resources in favor of the demand of the upper income stratum for high-grade consumer goods. The Philippine economy should be able to produce an increasing amount and variety of this type of goods, without neglecting the production of basic consumer goods. Any amount of high-grade consumer goods to be imported should be used only to mop up excess income of the upper income group and encourage them to be more productive.

The system of wage and salary differentials will be maintained to provide economic incentives. But differentials must not be so large as to create social injustice. Everyone in society should be assured of basic subsistence. Social services like housing, medical care and education must be properly priced so that these can be easily expanded, improved or renewed. Those with higher incomes due to hard work and competence must have access to high-grade consumer goods. Higher income is no incentive if these are not available on top of the provision of sufficient basic consumer goods.

More important than economic incentives are the moral, ideological and political incentives and the democratic mechanism within the economy to insure that these are realized. There must be Party organizations to take the lead in work in industrial workplaces, farms and offices in ideological and political work. But

there must also be trade unions and other mass organizations to protect and promote the interests of the masses. And, of course, there must be the managerial and technical experts. There must be a three-way combination of the representatives of the Party, the masses and experts in the leading organ of every workplace, farm or office and such organ and its personnel is subject to election and supervision by the masses.

With publicly owned large-scale production and with the use of computers for data gathering and planning, the socialist economy should be far more efficient than capitalism in apportioning the social profit for reinvestment, administration, wages, social services and defense.

The law of value can be observed not by subjecting the economy to the blind market, which in fact is no longer the case especially under super-monopoly capitalism and computerized planning, but by a combination of the planned and rated use of labor power to satisfy social needs, the degree of intercourse with the world capitalist economy and the indexing of the prices of comparable goods in the domestic and world market.

The Soviet Union's economic stagnation under Brezhnev (is) may be more a result of wastage of resources through overlarge military expenditure and adventures than of bureaucratism. Even the United States, with all its economic and financial advantages domestically and abroad has actually undermined its own economy through overspending in the arms race and overconsumption of foreign goods.

The Communist Party of the Philippines must learn from the entire history of the way the modern revisionists have subverted and destroyed socialist economies. They deny the existence of classes and class struggle in order to deny the need for proletarian class dictatorship and revolutionary mass movement. They attack the builders of socialism and advocate a return to and enlargement of concessions to the bourgeoisie and even after the full socialist transformation of the economy. They uphold the primacy of the market over production as if the market could, by itself, produce the high-grade consumer goods they actually wish to import from abroad in unreasonable amounts.

In an era of capitalist super monopolies and computers, they denigrate the public ownership of the means of production and central economic planning and revert to Adam Smith's "invisible hand of self-interest" (the blind forces of the market)

to stimulate production. They misrepresent socialism as sheer bureaucratism in order to conceal their own bureaucrat revisionism. They confuse and adulate both nineteenth century free competition and twentieth century monopoly capitalism. They put forward the absurd idea that socialism can advance only through capitalism in already socialist countries.

They assure the people that if there is a re-emergence of capitalism and reintegration into the world capitalist economy, resulting economic imbalances, super-profit remittances, debt burden and bureaucratic corruption would be manageable by administrative means. They allow the foreign and domestic bourgeoisie to enjoy bourgeois rights to form joint stock companies and exploit the workers whose labor power is once more treated as mere commodity. But they place the workers under the severest form of labor discipline so-called, especially hire-and-fire powers from above and prohibit them from seeking the market value of their labor power through self-organization and concerted action independent of the bureaucratic control of revisionists.

By legal fiction, the land is considered under public ownership. But agricultural cooperation has been broken up and agriculture has been privatized. At artificially reduced prices, tractors, farm implements, work animals and improvements on the land previously accumulated by collective labor are sold away to favored households. And yet the rich peasant economy and the urban comprador economy do not provide stable employment to the displaced peasants.

It is advantageous to Filipino communists that, before winning total victory in the national democratic revolution, they have witnessed the full play of modern revisionism and the disastrous outcome to the revisionist ruling cliques in several socialist countries. They would know what to prevent and avoid.

At the same time, by the time that Filipino communists consolidate political power, world conditions shall have changed drastically. It is to be hoped that some socialist countries shall have become economically stronger; that the third world and other heavily indebted countries shall have risen up against the old economic order; that the attempt of the United States to recover from its deficits shall have exacerbated the crisis of overproduction among the capitalist countries; and that a multipolar world of major socialist countries, several capitalist power and an assertive third world shall have become more effective.

In a multipolar world, the Filipino people will find a better international economic environment for maneuver in building socialism. But before winning political power and before consolidating power, the Filipino people will still have to contend with all sorts of interventions and blockade by the United States, Japan and other capitalist powers. Only after overcoming these and consolidating the socialist state and economy will the Filipino people be able to take full advantage of a multipolar world.

Stand for Socialism Against Modern Revisionism

January 15, 1992

Revisionism is the systematic revision of and deviation from Marxism, the basic revolutionary principles of the proletariat laid down by Marx and Engels and further developed by the series of thinkers and leaders in socialist revolution and construction. The revisionists call themselves Marxists, even claim to make an updated and creative application of Marxism but they do so essentially to sugarcoat the bourgeois anti-proletarian and anti-Marxist ideas that they propagate.

The classical revisionists who dominated the Second International in 1912 were in social-democratic parties that acted as tails to bourgeois regimes and supported the war budgets of the capitalist countries in Europe. They denied the revolutionary essence of Marxism and the necessity of proletarian dictatorship, engaged in bourgeois reformism and social pacifism and supported colonialism and modern imperialism. Lenin stood firmly against the classical revisionists, defended Marxism and led the Bolsheviks in establishing the first socialist state in 1917.

The modern revisionists were in the ruling communist parties in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. They systematically revised the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism by denying the continuing existence of exploiting classes and class struggle and the proletarian character of the party and the state in socialist society. And they proceeded to destroy the proletarian party and the socialist state from within. They masqueraded as communists even as they gave up Marxist-Leninist principles. They attacked Stalin in order to replace the principles of Lenin with the discredited fallacies of his social democratic opponents and claimed to make a “creative application” of Marxism-Leninism.

The total collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, has made it so much easier than before for Marxist-Leninists to sum up the emergence and development of socialism and the peaceful evolution of socialism into capitalism through modern revisionism. It is necessary to trace the entire historical trajectory and draw the correct lessons in the face of the ceaseless efforts of the detractors of Marxism-Leninism to sow ideological and political confusion within the ranks of the revolutionary movement.

Among the most common lines of attack are the following: “genuine” socialism never came into existence; if socialism ever existed, it was afflicted with or distorted by the “curse” of “Stalinism”, which could never be exorcized by his anti-Stalin successors and therefore Stalin was responsible even for the anti-Stalin regimes after his death; and socialism existed up to 1989 or 1991 and was never overpowered by modern revisionism before then or that modern revisionism never existed and it was an irremediably “flawed” socialism that fell in 1989/1991.

There are, of course, continuities as well as discontinuities from the Stalin to the post-Stalin periods. But social science demands that a leader be held responsible mainly for the period of his leadership. The main responsibility of Gorbachov for his own period of leadership should not be shifted to Stalin just as that of Marcos, for example, cannot be shifted to Quezon. It is necessary to trace the continuities between the Stalin and the post-Stalin regimes. And it is also necessary to recognize the discontinuities, especially because the post-Stalin regimes were anti-Stalin in character. In the face of the efforts of the imperialists, the revisionists and the unremolded petty bourgeois to explain everything in anti-Stalin terms and to condemn the essential principles and the entire lot of Marxism-Leninism, there is a strong reason and necessity to recognize the sharp differences between the Stalin and post-Stalin regimes. The phenomenon of modern revisionism deserves attention, if we are to explain the blatant restoration of capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship in 1989-91.

After his death, the positive achievements of Stalin (such as the socialist construction, the defense of the Soviet Union, the high rate of growth of the Soviet economy, the social guarantees, etc.) continued for a considerable while. So were his errors continued and exaggerated by his successors up to the point of discontinuing socialism. We refer to the denial of the existence and the resurgence of the exploiting classes and class struggle in Soviet society; and the

unhindered propagation of the petty-bourgeois mode of thinking and the growth of the bureaucratism of the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie in command of the great mass of petty-bourgeois bureaucrats.

From the Khrushchov period through the long Brezhnev period to the Gorbachov period, the dominant revisionist idea was that the working class had achieved its historic tasks and that it was time for the Soviet leaders and experts in the state and ruling party to depart from the proletarian stand. The ghost of Stalin was blamed for bureaucratism and other ills. But in fact, the modern revisionists promoted these on their own account and in the interest of a growing bureaucratic bourgeoisie. The general run of new intelligentsia and bureaucrats was petty bourgeois-minded and provided the social base for the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie. In the face of the collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes, there is in fact cause for the Party to celebrate the vindication of its Marxist-Leninist, antirevisionist line. The correctness of this line is confirmed by the total bankruptcy and collapse of the revisionist ruling parties, especially the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the chief disseminator of modern revisionism on a world scale since 1956. It is clearly proven that the modern revisionist line means the disguised restoration of capitalism over a long period of time and ultimately leads to the undisguised restoration of capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship. The supra-class sloganeering of the petty bourgeoisie has been the sugarcoating for the anti-proletarian ideas of the big bourgeoisie in the Soviet state and party.

In the Philippines, the political group that is most embarrassed, discredited and orphaned by the collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes is that of the Lavas and their successors. It is certainly not the Communist Party of the Philippines, re-established in 1968. But the imperialists, the bourgeois mass media and certain other quarters wish to confuse the situation and try to mock at and shame the Party for the disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes. They are barking at the wrong tree.

There are elements who have been hoodwinked by such catchphrases of Gorbachovite propaganda as “socialist renewal”, “perestroika”, “glasnost” and “new thinking” and who have refused to recognize the facts and the truth about the Gorbachovite swindle even after 1989, the year when modern revisionism started to give way to the open and blatant restoration of capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship. There are a handful of elements within the Party who continue to follow the already proven anti-communist, antisocialist and pseudo-

democratic example of Gorbachov and who question and attack the vanguard role of the working class through the Party, democratic centralism, the essentials of the revolutionary movement, and the socialist future of the Philippine revolutionary movement. Their line is aimed at nothing less than the negation of the basic principles of the Party and therefore the liquidation of the Party.

I. The Party's Marxist-Leninist stand against modern revisionism

The proletarian revolutionary cadres of the Party who have continuously adhered to the Marxist-Leninist stand against modern revisionism and have closely followed the developments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe since the early 1960s are not surprised by the flagrant antisocialist and antidemocratic outcome of modern revisionism. The Party should never forget that its founding proletarian revolutionary cadres had been able to work with the remnants of the old merger Party of the Communist and Socialist parties since early 1963 only for so long as there was common agreement that the resumption of the anti-imperialist and antifeudal mass struggle meant the resumption of the new-democratic revolution through revolutionary armed struggle and that the old merger party would adhere to the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism and reject the Khrushchovite revisionist line of bourgeois populism and pacifism and the subsequent Khrushchovism without Khrushchov of the Brezhnev regime.

So, in April 1967 when the Lava revisionist renegades violated the common agreement and ignored the Executive Committee that had been formed in 1963, it became necessary to lay the ground for the reestablishment of the Party as a proletarian revolutionary party. Everyone can refer to the diametrically opposed proclamations of the proletarian revolutionaries and the Lava revisionist renegades which were disseminated in the Philippines and published respectively in Peking (Beijing) Review and the Prague Information Bulletin within the first week of May 1967.

The reestablishment of the Party on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism on December 26, 1968 necessarily meant the criticism and repudiation of all the subjectivist and opportunist errors of the Lava revisionist group and the modern revisionism practiced and propagated by this group domestically and by one Soviet ruling clique after another internationally.

The criticism and repudiation of modern revisionism are a fundamental

component of the reestablishment and rebuilding of the Party and are inscribed in the basic document of rectification, “Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party” and the Program and Constitution of the Party. These documents have remained valid and effective. No leading organ of the CPP has ever had the power and the reason to reverse or reject the criticism and repudiation of modern revisionism by the Congress of Reestablishment in 1968.

In the late 1970s, the Party decided to expand the international relations of the revolutionary movement in addition to the Party’s relations with Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations abroad. The international representative of the National Democratic Front began to explore possibilities for the NDF to act like the Palestinian Liberation Organization, African National Congress and other national liberation movements in expanding friendly and diplomatic relations with all forces abroad that are willing to extend moral and material support to the Philippine revolutionary struggle on any major issue and to whatever extent. This line in external relations was in consonance with the Marxist-Leninist stand of the Party and the international united front against imperialism.

In 1983, a definite proposal to the Central Committee came up that the NDF or any of its member organizations vigorously seek friendly relations with the ruling parties in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe as well as with parties and movements closely associated with the CPSU. However, this proposal was laid aside in favor of the counterproposal made by the international liaison department (ILD) of the Party Central Committee that the Party rather than the NDF explore and seek “fraternal” relations with the ruling parties of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and other related parties.

Veering Away from the Anti-revisionist Line

This counterproposal disregarded the fact that the Lava revisionist group had already preempted our Party from the possibility of “fraternal” relations with the revisionist ruling parties. More significantly, the counterproposal did not take into serious consideration the Marxist-Leninist stand of the Party against modern revisionism.

Notwithstanding the ill-informed and unprincipled basis for seeking “fraternal” relations with the revisionist ruling parties and the absence of any congress withdrawing the correct antirevisionist line, the staff organ in charge of international relations proceeded in 1984 to draft and circulate a policy paper,

“The Present World Situation and the CPP’s General International Line and Policies” describing the CPSU as a Marxist-Leninist party, the Soviet Union as the most developed socialist country and as proletarian internationalist rather than social-imperialist, as having supported third world liberation movements and as having attained military parity with the United States. This policy paper was presented to the 1985 Central Committee Plenum and the latter decided to conduct further studies on it.

In 1986, the Executive Committee of the Central Committee commissioned a study of the Soviet Union and East European countries. The study was superficial. It was done to support the predetermined conclusion that these countries were socialist because their economies were still dominated by state-owned enterprises and these enterprises were still growing and because the state still provided social guarantees to the people. The study overlooked the fact that the ruling party in command of the economy was no longer genuinely proletarian and that state-owned enterprises since the time of Khrushchov had already become milking cows of corrupt bureaucrats and private entrepreneurs who colluded under various pretexts to redirect the products to the “free” (private) market.

By this time, the attempt to deviate from the antirevisionist line of the Party was clearly linked to the erroneous idea that total victory in the Philippine revolution could be hastened by “regularizing” the few thousands of NPA fighters with importations of heavy weapons and other logistical requisites from abroad, by skipping stages in the development of people’s war and in building the people’s army and by arousing the forces for armed urban insurrection in anticipation of some sudden “turn in the situation” to mount a general uprising.

There was the notion that the further development of the people’s army and the people’s war depended on the importation of heavy weapons and getting logistical support from abroad and that the failure to import these would mean the stagnation or retrogression of the revolutionary forces because there is no other way by which the NPA could overcome the enemy’s “blockhouse” warfare and control of the highways except through the use of sophisticated heavy weapons (antitank and laser-guided missiles) which necessarily have to be imported from abroad.

In the second half of 1986, with the approval of the Party’s central leadership, a drive was started to seek the establishment of “fraternal” relations with the

CPSU and other revisionist ruling parties as well as nonruling ones close to the CPSU. A considerable amount of resources was allotted to and expended on the project.

In late 1986, some Brezhnevites within the CPSU and some other quarters made the suggestion that the Communist Party of the Philippines merge with the Lava revisionist group in order to gain “fraternal” relations with the CPSU. But such a suggestion was tactfully rejected with the counter-suggestion that the CPSU and other revisionist ruling parties could keep their fraternal relations with the Lava group while the CPP could have friendly relations with them. We stood pat on the Leninist line of proletarian party-building.

Up to 1987 the failure to establish relations with the revisionist ruling parties was interpreted by some elements as the result of the refusal on the part of our Party to repudiate its antirevisionist line. These elements had to be reminded in easily understood practical terms that if the antirevisionist line of the Party had been withdrawn and the revisionist ruling parties would continue to rebuff our offer of “fraternal” or friendly relations with them, then the proposed opportunism would be utterly damaging to the Party.

By 1987, the Party became aware that the Gorbachov regime was already laying the ground for the emasculation of the revisionist ruling parties in favor of an openly bourgeois state machinery in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe by allowing his advisors, officials of the Academy of Social Sciences and the official as well as independent Soviet mass media to promote pro-imperialist, anti-communist and antisocialist ideas under the guise of social democracy and “liberal” communism. On the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, Gorbachov himself delivered a speech abandoning the anti-imperialist struggle and describing imperialism as having shed off its violent character in an integral world in which the Soviet Union and the United States and other countries can cooperate in the common interest of humanity’s survival.

In 1987, the chairman of the Party’s Central Committee made an extensive interview on the question of establishing relations with the ruling parties of the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and elsewhere. This was made in response to the demand from some quarters within the Party that the Party repudiate its line against revisionism and apologize to the CPSU for having criticized the Soviet Union on the question of Cambodia and Afghanistan. The interview clarified that the Party can establish friendly relations with the ruling parties even while

the latter maintained their “fraternal” relations with the Lava group.

Failed efforts at establishing relations

In June 1988, the “World Situation and Our Line” was issued to replace “The Present World Situation and the CPP’s General International Line and Policies”. The correct and positive side of the new document reiterated the principles of national integrity, independence, equality noninterference and mutual support and mutual benefit to guide the Party’s international relations; and upheld the basic principles of socialism, anti-imperialism and proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence as a diplomatic policy. Furthermore, it noted and warned against the unhealthy trends of cynicism, anti-communism, nationalism, consumerism, superstition, criminality and the like already running rampant in the countries ruled by the revisionist parties.

The negative side included accepting at face value and endorsing the catchphrases of Gorbachov; describing the revisionist regimes as socialist under a “lowered” definition; and diplomatic avoidance of the antirevisionist terms of the Party.

In the course of trying to establish friendly relations with the revisionist ruling parties in 1987 and onward, Party representatives were able to discern that Gorbachov and his revisionist followers were reorganizing these parties towards their eventual weakening and dissolution. Despite Gorbachov’s avowed line of allowing the other East European ruling parties to decide matters for themselves, Soviet agents pushed these parties to reorganize themselves by replacing Brezhnevite holdovers at various levels with Gorbachovites and subsequently paralyzed the Party organizations. However, it would be in 1989 that it became clear without any doubt that all the revisionist ruling parties and regimes were on the path of self-disintegration, blatant restoration of capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship under the slogans of “multiparty democracy” and “economic reforms”.

It is correct for the Party to seek friendly relations with any foreign party or movement on the basis of anti-imperialism. But it is wrong to go into any “fraternal” relations involving the repudiation of the Party’s Marxist-Leninist stand against modern revisionism.

In this regard, we must be self-critical for wavering or temporarily veering away

from the Party's antirevisionist line and engaging in a futile expedition. The motivation was to seek greater material and moral support for the Filipino people's revolutionary struggle. Although such motivation is good, it can only mitigate but cannot completely excuse the departure from the correct line. The error is a major one but it can be rectified through education far more easily than other errors unless ideological confusion over the developments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe is allowed to continue. Most comrades assigned to do international work were merely following the wrong line from above.

The worst damage caused by the unconsummated and belated flirtation with the revisionist ruling parties in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe is not so much the waste of effort and resources but in the circulation of incorrect ideas, such as that these parties were still socialist and that the availability or non-availability of material assistance from them, especially heavy weapons, would spell the advance or stagnation and retrogression of the Philippine revolutionary movement. It should be pointed out that the Lava group had the best of relations with these parties since the sixties but this domestic revisionist group never amounted to anything more than being an inconsequential toady of Soviet foreign policy and the Marcos regime.

At this point, the central leadership and entirety of the Party must renew their resolve to adhere to Marxism-Leninism and to the antirevisionist line. We are in a period which requires profound and farsighted conviction in the new democratic revolution as well as the socialist revolution. This is a period comparable to that when the classical revisionist parties disintegrated and it seemed as if socialism had become a futile dream and the world seemed to be merely a helpless object of imperialist oppression and exploitation. But that period was exactly the eve of socialist revolution.

II. The legacy of Lenin and Stalin

The red flag of the Soviet Union has been brought down. The czarist flag of Russia now flies over the Kremlin. It may only be a matter of time that the body of the great Lenin is removed from its mausoleum in the Red Square, unless Russia's new bourgeoisie continue to regard it as a lucrative tourist attraction for visitors with hard foreign currency.

The Soviet modern revisionists, from Khrushchov to Gorbachov, had invoked the name of Lenin to attack Stalin. But in fact, the total negation of Stalin was

but the spearhead of the total negation of Lenin and Leninism, socialism, the Soviet Union and the entire course of Bolshevik and Soviet history. The bourgeoisie in the former Soviet Union was not satisfied with anything less than the open restoration of capitalism and the imposition of the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

It is necessary to refresh ourselves on the legacy of Lenin and Stalin in the face of concerted attempts by the imperialists, the modern revisionists, the barefaced restorationists of capitalism and the anti-communist bourgeois intelligentsia to slander and discredit it. The greatness of Lenin lies in having further developed the three components of the theory of Marxism: philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism. Lenin is the great master of Marxism in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution.

He delved further into dialectical materialism, pointed to the unity of opposites as the most fundamental law of material reality and transformation and contended most extensively and profoundly with the so-called “third force” subjectivist philosophy (empirio-criticism). He analyzed modern imperialism and put forward the theory of uneven development, which elucidated the possibility of socialist revolution at the weakest point of the world capitalist system. He elaborated on the Marxist theory of state and revolution. He stood firmly for proletarian class struggle and proletarian dictatorship against the classical revisionists and actually led the first successful socialist revolution.

The ideas of Lenin were tested in debates within the Second International and within the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party (RSDLP). The proletarian revolutionary line that he and his Bolshevik comrades espoused proved to be correct and victorious in contention with various bourgeois ideas and formations that competed for hegemony in the struggle against czarist autocracy.

We speak of the socialist revolution as beginning on November 7, 1917 because it was on that day that the people under the leadership of the proletariat through the Bolshevik party seized political power from the bourgeoisie. It was at that point that the proletarian dictatorship was established. For this, Lenin is considered the great founder of Soviet socialism. Proletarian dictatorship is the first requisite for building socialism. Without this power, socialist revolution cannot be undertaken. By this power, Lenin was able to decree the nationalization of the land and capital assets of the exploiting classes and take over the commanding heights of the economy.

Proletarian class dictatorship is but another expression for the state power necessary for smashing and replacing the state power or class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, for carrying out the all-rounded socialist revolution and for preventing the counterrevolutionaries from regaining control over society.

Proletarian dictatorship is at the same time proletarian democracy and democracy for the entire people, especially the toiling masses of workers and peasants. Without the exercise of proletarian dictatorship against their class enemies, the proletariat and the people cannot enjoy democracy among themselves. Proletarian dictatorship is the fruit of the highest form of democratic action-the revolutionary process that topples the bourgeois dictatorship. It is the guarantor of democracy among the people against domestic and external class enemies, the local exploiting classes and the imperialists.

The Bolsheviks were victorious because they resolutely established and defended the proletarian class dictatorship. They had learned their lessons well from the failure of the Paris Commune of 1871 and from the reformism and treason of the social democratic parties in the Second International.

Wielding proletarian dictatorship, the Bolsheviks disbanded in January 1918 the Constituent Assembly that had been elected after the October Revolution but was dominated by the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, because that assembly refused to ratify the Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People. The Bolsheviks subsequently banned the bourgeois parties because these parties engaged in counterrevolutionary violence and civil war against the proletariat and collaborated with the foreign interventionists. In his lifetime, Lenin led the Soviet proletariat and people and the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers to victory in the civil war and the war against the interventionist powers from 1918 to 1921. He consolidated the Soviet Union as a federal union of socialist republics and built the congresses of soviets and the nationalities. As a proletarian internationalist, he established the Third International and set forth the anti-imperialist line for the world proletariat and all oppressed nations and peoples.

In 1922 he proclaimed the New Economic Policy as a transitory measure for reviving the economy from the devastation of war in the quickest possible way and remedying the problem of “war communism” which had involved requisitioning and rationing under conditions of war, devastation and scarcity. Under the new policy, the small entrepreneurs and rich peasants were allowed to

engage freely in private production and to market their products.

The Record of Stalin

Lenin died in 1924. He did not live long enough to see the start of full-scale socialist economic construction. This was undertaken by his successor and faithful follower Stalin. He carried it out in accordance with the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin: proletarian dictatorship and mass mobilization, public ownership of the means of production, economic planning, industrialization, collectivization and mechanization of agriculture, full employment and social guarantees, free education at all levels, expanding social services and the rising standard of living.

But before the socialist economic construction could be started in 1929 with the first five-year economic plan, Stalin continued Lenin's New Economic Policy and had to contend with and defeat the Left Opposition headed by Trotsky who espoused the wrong line that socialism in one country was impossible and that the workers in Western Europe (especially in Germany) had to succeed first in armed uprisings and that rapid industrialization had to be undertaken immediately at the expense of the peasantry.

Stalin won out with his line of socialism in one country and in defending the worker-peasant alliance. If Trotsky had his way, he would have destroyed the chances for Soviet socialism by provoking the capitalist powers, by breaking up the worker-peasant alliance and by spreading pessimism in the absence of any victorious armed uprisings in Western Europe.

When it was time to put socialist economic construction in full swing, the Right opposition headed by Bukharin emerged to argue for the continuation of the New Economic Policy and oppose Soviet industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture. If Bukharin had had his way, the Soviet Union would not have been able to build a socialist society with a comprehensive industrial base and a mechanized and collectivized agriculture and provide its people with a higher standard of living; and would have enlarged the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois nationalists in the various republics and become an easier prey to Nazi Germany whose leader Hitler made no secret of his plans against the Soviet Union.

The first five-year economic plan was indeed characterized by severe difficulties

due to the following: the limited industrial base to start with in a sea of agrarian conditions, the continuing effects of the war, the economic and political sanctions of the capitalist powers, the constant threat of foreign military intervention, the burdensome role of the pioneer and the violent reaction of the rich peasants who refused to put their farms, tools and work animals under collectivization, slaughtered their work animals and organized resistance. But after the first five-year economic plan, there was popular jubilation over the establishment of heavy and basic industries. To the relief of the peasantry there was considerable mechanization of agriculture, especially in the form of tractor stations. There was marked improvement in the standard of living.

In 1936, a new constitution was promulgated. As a result of the successes of the economic construction and in the face of the actual confiscation of bourgeois and landlord property and the seeming disappearance of exploiting classes by economic definition, the constitution declared that there were no more exploiting classes and no more class struggle except that between the Soviet people and the external enemy. This declaration would constitute the biggest error of Stalin. It propelled the petty-bourgeois mode of thinking in the new intelligentsia and bureaucracy even as the proletarian dictatorship was exceedingly alert to the old forces and elements of counterrevolution.

Two ramifications of the error

The error had two ramifications. One ramification abetted the failure to distinguish contradictions among the people from those between the people and the enemy and the propensity to apply administrative measures against those loosely construed as enemies of the people. There were indeed real British and German spies and bourgeois nationalists engaged in counterrevolutionary violence. They had to be ferreted out. But this was done by relying heavily on a mass reporting system (based on patriotism) that fed information to the security services. And the principle of due process was not assiduously and scrupulously followed in order to narrow the target in the campaign against counterrevolutionaries and punish only the few who were criminally culpable on the basis of incontrovertible evidence. Thus, in the 1936-38 period, arbitrariness victimized a great number of people. Revolutionary class education through mass movement under Party leadership was not adequately undertaken for the purpose of ensuring the high political consciousness and vigilance of the people.

The other ramification was the promotion of the idea that building socialism was

a matter of increasing production, improving administration and technique, letting the cadres decide everything (although Stalin never ceased to speak against bureaucratism) and providing the cadres and experts and the toiling masses with ever increasing material benefits. The new intelligentsia produced by the rapidly expanding Soviet educational system had a decreasing sense of the proletarian class stand and an increasing sense that it was sufficient to have the expertise and to become bureaucrats and technocrats in order to build socialism. The old and the new intelligentsia were presumed to be proletarian so long as they rendered bureaucratic and professional service. There was no recognition of the fact that bourgeois and other antiproletarian ideas can persist and grow even after the confiscation of bourgeois and landlord property.

To undertake socialist revolution and construction in a country with a large population of more than 100 nationalities and a huge land mass, with a low economic and technological level as a starting point, ravaged by civil war and ever threatened by local counterrevolutionary forces and foreign capitalist powers, it was necessary to have the centralization of political will as well as centralized planning in the use of limited resources. But such a necessity can be overdone by a bourgeoisie that is reemergent through the petty bourgeoisie and can become the basis of bureaucratism, decreasing democracy in the process of decision-making. The petty bourgeoisie promotes the bureaucratism that gives rise to and solidifies the higher levels of the bureaucrat bourgeoisie and that alienates the Party and the state from the people. Democratic centralism can be made to degenerate into bureaucratic centralism by the forces and elements that run counter to the interests of the proletariat and all working people.

In world affairs, Stalin encouraged and supported the communist parties and anti-imperialist movements in capitalist countries and the colonies and semi-colonies through the Third International. And from 1935 onward, he promoted internationally the antifascist Popular Front policy. Only after Britain and France spurned his offer of antifascist alliance and continued to induce Germany to attack the Soviet Union did Stalin decide to forge a nonaggression pact with Germany in 1939. This was a diplomatic maneuver to forestall a probable earlier Nazi aggression and gain time for the Soviet Union to prepare against it.

Stalin made full use of the time before the German attack in 1941 to strengthen the Soviet Union economically and militarily as well as politically through patriotic calls to the entire Soviet people and through concessions to conservative institutions and organizations. For instance, the Russian Orthodox

Church was given back its buildings and its privileges. There was marked relaxation in favor of a broad antifascist popular front.

In the preparations against fascist invasion and in the course of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45, the line of Soviet patriotism further subdued the line of class struggle among the old and new intelligentsia and the entire people. The Soviet people united. Even as they suffered a tremendous death casualty of 20 million and devastation of their country, including the destruction of 85 percent of industrial capacity, they played the pivotal role in defeating Nazi Germany and world fascism and paved the way for the rise of several socialist countries in Eastern Europe and Asia and the national liberation movements on an unprecedented scale. In the aftermath of World War II, Stalin led the economic reconstruction of the Soviet Union. Just as he succeeded in massive industrialization from 1929 to 1941 (only 12 years) before the war, so he did again from 1945 to 1953 (only eight years) but this time with apparently no significant resistance from counterrevolutionaries. In all these years of socialist construction, socialism proved superior to capitalism in all respects.

In 1952, Stalin realized that he had made a mistake in prematurely declaring that there were no more exploiting classes and no more class struggle in the Soviet Union, except the struggle between the people and the enemy. But it was too late, the Soviet party and state were already swamped by a large number of bureaucrats with waning proletarian revolutionary consciousness. These bureaucrats and their bureaucratism would become the base of modern revisionism.

When Stalin died in 1953, he left a Soviet Union that was a politically, economically, militarily and culturally powerful socialist country. He had successfully united the Soviet people of the various republics and nationalities and had defended the Soviet Union against Nazi Germany. He had rebuilt an industrial economy, with high annual growth rates, with enough homegrown food for the people and the world's largest production of oil, coal, steel, gold, grain, cotton and so on.

Under his leadership, the Soviet Union had created the biggest number of research scientists, engineers, doctors, artists, writers and so on. In the literary and artistic field, social realism flourished while at the same time the entire cultural heritage of the Soviet Union was cherished.

In foreign policy, Stalin held the US forces of aggression at bay in Europe and Asia, supported the peoples fighting for national liberation and socialism, neutralized what was otherwise the nuclear monopoly of the United States and ceaselessly called for world peace even as the US-led Western alliance waged the Cold War and engaged in provocations. It is absolutely necessary to correctly evaluate Stalin as a leader in order to avoid the pitfall of modern revisionism and to counter the most strident anti-communists who attack Marxism-Leninism under the guise of anti-Stalinism. We must know what are his merits and demerits. We must respect the historical facts and judge his leadership within its own time, 1924 to 1953.

It is unscientific to make a complete negation of Stalin as a leader in his own time and to heap the blame on him even for the modern revisionist line, policies and actions which have been adopted and undertaken explicitly against the name of Stalin and have -at first gradually and then rapidly -brought about the collapse of the Soviet Union and the restoration of capitalism. Leaders must be judged mainly for the period of their responsibility even as we seek to trace the continuities and discontinuities from one period to another.

Stalin's merits within his own period of leadership are principal and his demerits are secondary. He stood on the correct side and won all the great struggles to defend socialism such as those against the Left opposition headed by Trotsky; the Right opposition headed by Bukharin, the rebellious rich peasants, the bourgeois nationalists, and the forces of fascism headed by Hitler. He was able to unite, consolidate and develop the Soviet state. After World War II, Soviet power was next only to the United States. Stalin was able to hold his ground against the threats of US imperialism. As a leader, he represented and guided the Soviet proletariat and people from one great victory to another.

III. The process of capitalist restoration

The regimes of Khrushchov, Brezhnev and Gorbachov mark the three stages in the process of capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union, a process of undermining and destroying the great accomplishments of the Soviet proletariat and people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. This process has also encompassed Eastern Europe.

The Khrushchov regime laid the foundation of Soviet modern revisionism and overthrew the proletarian dictatorship. The Brezhnev regime fully developed

modern revisionism for a far longer period of time and completely converted socialism into monopoly bureaucrat capitalism. And the Gorbachov regime brought the work of modern revisionism to the final goal of wiping out the vestiges of socialism and entirely dismantling the socialist facade of the revisionist regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. He destroyed the Soviet Union that Lenin and Stalin had built and defended.

To restore capitalism, the Soviet revisionist regimes had to revise the basic principles of socialist revolution and construction and to go through stages of camouflaged counterrevolution in a period of 38 years, 1953 to 1991. It is a measure of the greatness of Lenin and Stalin that their accomplishments in 36 years of socialist revolution and construction took another long period of close to four decades to dismantle. Stalin spent a total of 20 years in socialist construction. The revisionist renegades took a much longer period of time to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union.

In the same period of time, the revisionist regimes cleverly took the pretext of attacking Stalin in order to attack the foundations of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice and eventually condemn Lenin himself and the entire course of Soviet history and finally destroy the Soviet Union. The revisionist renegades in their protracted “de-Stalinization” campaign blamed Stalin beyond his lifetime for their own culpabilities and failures. For instance, they aggravated bureaucratism in the service of capitalist restoration but they still blamed the long-dead Stalin for it.

Tito of Yugoslavia had the unique distinction of being the pioneer in modern revisionism. In opposing Stalin, he deviated from the basic principles of socialist revolution and construction in 1947 and received political and material support from the West. He refused to undertake land reform and collectivization. He preserved and promoted the bourgeoisie through the bureaucracy and private enterprise, especially in the form of private cooperatives.

He considered as key to socialism not the public ownership of the means of production, economic planning and further development of the productive forces but the immediate decentralization of enterprises; the so-called workers’ self-management that actually combined bureaucratism and anarchy of production; and the operation of the free market (including the goods imported from Western countries) upon the existent and stagnant level of production. In misrepresenting Lenin’s New Economic Policy as the very model for socialist economic

development, he was the first chief of state to use the name of Lenin against both Lenin and Stalin.

First Stage: The Khrushchov regime, 1953-1964

To Khrushchov belongs the distinction of being the pioneer in modern revisionism in the Soviet Union, the first socialist country in the history of mankind, and of being the most influential in promoting modern revisionism on a world scale.

Khrushchov's career as a revisionist in power started in 1953. He was a bureaucratic sycophant and an active player in repressive actions during the time of Stalin. To become the first secretary of the CPSU and accumulate power in his hands, he played off the followers of Stalin against each other and succeeded in having Beria executed after a summary trial. He depended on the new bourgeoisie that had arisen from the bureaucracy and the new intelligentsia.

In 1954, he had already reorganized the CPSU to serve his ideological and political position. In 1955, he upheld Tito against the memory of Stalin, especially on the issue of revisionism. In 1956, he delivered before the 20th Party Congress his "secret" speech against Stalin, completely negating him as no better than a bloodthirsty monster and denouncing the "personality cult". The congress marked the overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship. In 1957, he used the armed forces to defeat the vote for his ouster by the Politburo and thereby made the coup to further consolidate his position.

In 1956, the anti-Stalin diatribe inspired the anti-communist forces in Poland and Hungary to carry out uprisings. The Hungarian uprising was stronger and more violent. Khrushchov ordered the Soviet army to suppress it, chiefly because the Hungarian party leadership sought to rescind its political and military ties with the Soviet Union.

But subsequently, all throughout Eastern Europe under Soviet influence, it became clear that it was alright to the Soviet ruling clique for the satellite regimes to adopt capitalist-oriented reforms (private enterprise in agriculture, handicraft and services, dissolution of collective farms even where land reform had been carried out on a narrow scale and, of course, the free market) like Yugoslavia along an anti-Stalin line. The revisionist regimes were, however, under strict orders to remain within the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance

(CMEA) and the Warsaw Pact.

The unremolded social-democratic and petty-bourgeois sections of the revisionist ruling parties in Eastern Europe started to kick out genuine communists from positions of leadership in the state and party under the direction of Khrushchov and under the pressure of anti-communist forces in society. It must be recalled that the so-called proletarian ruling parties were actually mergers of communists and social-democrats put into power by the Soviet Red Army. At the most, there were only a few years of proletarian dictatorship and socialist economic construction before Khrushchov started in 1956 to enforce his revisionist line in the satellite parties and regimes.

The total negation of Stalin by Khrushchov was presented as a rectification of the personality cult, bureaucratism and terrorism; and as the prerequisite for the efflorescence of democracy and civility, rapid economic progress that builds the material and technological foundation of communism in twenty years, the peaceful form of social revolution from an exploitative system to a non-exploitative one, detente with the United States, nuclear disarmament step by step and world peace, a world without wars and arms.

Khrushchov paid lip service to proletarian dictatorship and the basic principles of socialist revolution and construction but at the same time introduced a set of ideas to undermine them. He used bourgeois populism, declaring that the CPSU was a party of the whole people and the Soviet state was a state of the whole people on the anti-Marxist premise that the tasks of proletarian dictatorship had been fulfilled. He used bourgeois pacifism, declaring that it was possible and preferable for mankind to opt for peaceful transition to socialism and peaceful economic competition with the capitalist powers in order to avert the nuclear annihilation of humanity; raising peaceful coexistence from the level of diplomatic policy to that of the general line governing all kinds of external relations of the Soviet Union and the CPSU; and denying the violent nature of imperialism.

In the economic field, he used the name of Lenin against Lenin and Stalin by misrepresenting Lenin's New Economic Policy as the way to socialism rather than as a transitory measure towards socialist construction. He carried out decentralization to some degree, he autonomized state enterprises and promoted private agriculture and the free market. The autonomized state enterprises became responsible for their own cost and profit accounting and for raising the

wages and bonuses on the basis of the profits of the individual enterprise. The private plots were enlarged and large areas of land (ranging from 50 to 100 hectares) were leased to groups, usually households. Many tractor stations for collective farms were dissolved and agricultural machines were turned over to private entrepreneurs. The free market in agricultural and industrial products and services was promoted.

In the same way that the revisionist rhetoric of Khrushchov overlapped with Marxist-Leninist terminology, socialism overlapped with capitalist restoration. The socialist system of production and distribution was still dominant for a while. Thus, the Soviet economy under Khrushchov still registered high rates of growth. But the regime took most pride in the higher rate of growth in the private sector which benefited from cheap energy, transport, tools and other supplies from the public sector and which was credited with producing the goods stolen from the public sector.

In the autonomization of state enterprises, managers acquired the power to hire and fire workers, transact business within the Soviet Union and abroad; increase their own salaries, bonuses and other perks at the expense of the workers; lessen the funds available for the development of other parts of the economy; and engage in bureaucratic corruption in dealing with the free market.

With regard to private agriculture, propaganda was loudest on the claim that it was more productive than the state and collective farms. The reemergent rich peasants were lauded. But in fact, the corrupt bureaucrats and private farmers and merchants were colluding in underpricing and stealing products (through pilferage and wholesale misdeclaration of goods as defective) from the collective and state farms in order to re-channel these to the free market. In the end, the Soviet Union would suffer sharp reductions in agricultural production and would be importing huge amounts of grain.

The educational system continued to expand, reproducing in great numbers the new intelligentsia now influenced by the ideas of modern revisionism and looking to the West for models of efficient management and for quality consumer goods. In the arts and in literature, social realism was derided and universal humanism, pacifism and mysticism came into fashion.

The Khrushchov regime drew prestige from the advances of Soviet science and technology, from the achievements in space technology and from the continuing

economic construction. All of these were not possible without the prior work and the accumulated social capital under the leadership of Stalin. Khrushchov went into rapid housing and office construction which pleased the bureaucracy.

The CPSU and the Chinese Communist Party were the main protagonists in the great ideological debate. Despite Khrushchov's brief reconciliation with Tito, the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and the Moscow Statement of 1960 maintained that modern revisionism was the main danger to the international communist movement as a result of the firm and vigorous stand of the Chinese and other communist parties.

Khrushchov extended the ideological debate into a disruption of state-to-state relations between the Soviet Union and China. In the Cuban missile crisis, he had a high-profile confrontation with Kennedy. He first took an adventurist and then swung to a capitulationist position. With regard to Vietnam, he was opposed to the revolutionary armed struggle of the Vietnamese people and grudgingly gave limited support to them.

The deterioration of Soviet industry and the breakdown of agriculture and bungling in foreign relations led to the removal of Khrushchov in a coup by the Brezhnev clique. Brezhnev became the general secretary of the CPSU and Kosygin became the premier. The former would eventually assume the position of president.

Second Stage: The Brezhnev Regime, 1964-1982

While Khrushchov was stridently anti-Stalin, Brezhnev made a limited and partial "rehabilitation" of Stalin. If we link this to the recentralization of the bureaucracy and the state enterprises previously decentralized and the repressive measures taken against the pro-imperialist and anti-communist opposition previously encouraged by Khrushchov, it would appear that Brezhnev was reviving Stalin's policies.

In fact, the Brezhnev regime was on the whole anti-Stalin, with respect to the continuing line of promoting the Khrushchovite capitalist-oriented reforms in the economy and the line of developing an offensive capability "to defend the Soviet Union outside of its borders". It is therefore false to say that the 18-year Brezhnev regime was an interruption of the anti-Stalin line started by Khrushchov.

There is, however, an ideological error that puts both Khrushchov and Brezhnev on board with Stalin. This is the premature declaration of the end of the exploiting classes and class struggle, except that between the enemy and the people. This line served to obfuscate and deny the existence of an already considerable and growing bourgeoisie in Soviet society and to justify repressive measures against those considered as enemy of the Soviet people for being opposed to the ruling clique.

Under the Brezhnev leadership, the Khrushchovite capitalist-oriented reforms were pushed hard by the Brezhnev-Kosygin tandem. Socialism was converted fully into state monopoly capitalism, with the prevalent corrupt bureaucrats not only increasing their official incomes and perks but taking their loot by colluding with private entrepreneurs and even criminal syndicates in milking the state enterprises. On an ever-widening scale, tradeable goods produced by the state enterprises were either underpriced, pilfered or declared defective only to be channeled to the private entrepreneurs for the free market.

Sales and purchase contracts with capitalist firms abroad became a big source of kickbacks for state officials who deposited these in secret bank accounts abroad. There was also a thriving black market in foreign exchange and goods smuggled from the West through Eastern Europe, the Baltic and southern republics.

The corruption of the bureaucrat and private capitalists discredited the revisionist ruling party and regime at various levels. At the end of the Brezhnev regime, there was already an estimated 30 million people engaged in private enterprise. Among them were members of the families of state and party officials. Members of the Brezhnev family themselves were closely collaborating with private firms and criminal syndicates in scandalous shady deals.

The state enterprises necessary for assuring funds for the ever-expanding central Soviet bureaucracy and for the arms race were recentralized. A military-industrial complex grew rapidly and ate up yearly far more than the conservatively estimated 20 percent of the Soviet budget. The Brezhnev regime was obsessed with attaining military parity with its superpower rival, the United States.

The huge Soviet state that could have generated the surplus income for reinvestment in more efficient and expanded civil production of basic and nonbasic consumer goods, wasted the funds on the importation of the high grade

consumer goods for the upper five per cent of the population (the new bourgeoisie), on increasing amounts of imported grain, on the military-industrial complex and the arms race, on the maintenance and equipment of half a million troops in Eastern Europe and on other foreign commitments in the third world. Among the commitments that arose due to superpower rivalry was the assistance to the Vietnamese people in the Vietnam war, Cuba, Angola and Nicaragua. Among the commitments that arose due to the sheer adventurism of Soviet social-imperialism was the dispatch of a huge number of Soviet troops and equipment to Afghanistan at the time that the Soviet Union was already clearly in dire economic and financial straits.

The hard currency for the importation of grain and high-grade consumer goods came from the sale of some 10 percent of Soviet oil production to Western countries and the income from military sales to the oil-producing countries in the Middle East.

The Brezhnev regime used “Marxist-Leninist” phrase mongering to disguise and legitimize the growth of capitalism within the Soviet Union. Repressive measures were used against opponents of the regime, including the pretext of psychiatric confinement. These measures served the growth of bureaucrat monopoly capitalism and constituted social fascism. The Brezhnev regime introduced to the world a perverse reinterpretation of proletarian dictatorship and proletarian internationalism, with the proclamation of the Brezhnev doctrine of “limited sovereignty” and Soviet-centered “international proletarian dictatorship” on the occasion of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. It was also on this occasion that the Soviet Union came to be called social-imperialist, socialism in words and imperialism in deed.

With the same arrogance, Brezhnev deployed hundreds of thousands of Soviet troops along the Sino-Soviet border.

The Soviet Union under Brezhnev tried to keep a tight rein on its satellites in Eastern Europe within the Warsaw Pact. Thus, it had to expend a lot of resources of its own and those of its satellites in maintaining and equipping half a million Soviet troops in Eastern Europe. Clearly, the revisionist ruling parties and regimes were not developing the lively participation and loyalty of the proletariat and people through socialist progress but were keeping them in bondage through bureaucratic and military means in the name of socialism.

The Soviet Union under Brezhnev promoted the principle of “international division of labor” within the CMEA. This meant the enforcement of neocolonial specialization in certain lines of production by particular member-countries other than the Soviet Union. The relationship between the Soviet Union and the other CMEA member-countries was no different from that between imperialism and the semi-colonies. This stunted the comprehensive development of national economies of most of the member countries although some basic industries had been built and continued to be built.

Eventually, the Soviet Union started to feel aggrieved that it had to deliver oil at prices lower than those of the world market and receive off-quality goods in exchange. So, it continuously made upward adjustments on the price of oil supplies to the CMEA client states. At the same time, among the East European countries, there had been the long-running resentment over the shoddy equipment and other goods that they were actually getting from the Soviet Union at a real overprice.

Before the 1970s, the Soviet Union encouraged capitalist-oriented reforms in its East European satellites but definitely discouraged any attempt by these satellites to leave the Warsaw Pact. In the early 1970s, the Soviet Union itself wanted to have a detente with the United States, clinch the “most favored nation” (MFN) treatment, gain access to new technology and foreign loans from the United States and the other capitalist countries. However, in 1972, the Brezhnev regime was rebuffed by the Jackson-Vannik amendment, which withheld MFN status from the Soviet Union for preventing Jewish emigration. The regime then further encouraged its East European satellites to enter into economic, financial and trade agreements with the capitalist countries.

During most of the 1970s, these revisionist-ruled countries got hooked to Western investments, loans and consumer goods. In the early 1980s, most of them fell into serious economic troubles as a result of the aggravation of domestic economic problems and the difficulties in handling their debt burden, which per capita in most cases was even worse than that of the Philippines. Being responsible for the economic policies and for their bureaucratic corruption, the revisionist ruling parties and regimes became discredited in the eyes of the broad masses of the people and the increasingly anti-Soviet and anti-communist intelligentsia. The pro-Soviet ruling parties in Eastern Europe had always been vulnerable to charges of political puppetry, especially from the direction of the anti-communist advocates of nationalism and religion. In the

1970s and 1980s these parties conspicuously degenerated from the inside in an all-round way through bourgeoisification and became increasingly the object of public contempt.

The United States kept on dangling the prospect of MFN status and other economic concessions to the Soviet Union. Each time the United States did so, it was able to get something from the Soviet Union, like its commitment to the Helsinki Accord (intended to provide legal protection to dissenters in the Soviet Union) and a draft strategic arms limitation treaty but it never gave the concessions that the Soviet Union wanted. The United States simply wanted the Cold War to go on in order to induce or compel the Soviet Union to waste its resources on the arms race. The only significant concession that the Soviet Union continued to get was the purchase of grain and the commercial credit related to it.

When the CPP leadership decided to explore and seek relations with the Soviet and East European ruling parties in the middle of the 1980s, there was the erroneous presumption that the successors of Brezhnev would follow an anti-imperialist line in the Cold War of the two superpowers. Thus, the policy paper on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe praised the Brezhnev line in hyperbolic terms.

Although the Gorbachov regime would pursue worse revisionist policies than those of its predecessor, it would become a good source of information regarding the principal and essential character of the Brezhnev regime on a comprehensive range of issues. By using this information from a critical Marxist-Leninist point of view, we can easily sum up the Brezhnev regime and at the same time know the antisocialist and anti-communist direction of the Gorbachov regime in 1985-88.

The Third and Final Stage: The Gorbachov Regime, 1985-91

The Gorbachov regime from 1985 to 1991 marked the third and final stage in the anti-Marxist and antisocialist revisionist counter-revolution to restore capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship.

It involved the prior dissolution of the ruling revisionist parties and regimes in Eastern Europe, the absorption of East Germany by West Germany and finally the banning and dispossession of the CPSU and the disintegration of the Soviet

Union no less, after a dubious coup attempt by Gorbachov's appointees in the highest state and party positions next only to his.

The counterrevolution was carried out in a relatively peaceful manner. After all, the degeneration from socialism to capitalism proceeded for 38 years. Within the last six years, the corrupt bureaucrats masquerading as communists were ready to peel off their masks, declare themselves as ex-communists and even anti-communists overnight and cooperate with the longstanding anti-communists among the intelligentsia and the aggrieved broad masses of the people in setting up regimes that were openly bourgeois and antisocialist.

Because they were manipulated and directed by the big bourgeoisie and the anti-communist intelligentsia, the mass uprisings in Eastern Europe in 1989 cannot be simply and totally described as democratic although it is also undeniable that the broad masses of the people, including the working class and the intelligentsia, were truly aggrieved and did rise up. The far bigger mass actions that put Mussolini and Hitler into power or the lynch mobs unleashed by the Indonesian fascists to massacre the communists in 1965 do not make a fascist movement democratic. In determining the character of a mass movement, we take into account not only the magnitude of mass participation but also the kind of class leadership involved. Otherwise, the periodic electoral rallies of the bourgeois reactionary parties which exclude the workers and peasants from power or even the Edsa mass uprising cum military mutiny in 1986 would be considered totally democratic, without the necessary qualifications regarding the class leadership involved.

It is possible for nonviolent mass uprisings to arise and succeed when their objective is not to really effect a fundamental change of the exploitative social system, when one set of bureaucrats is simply replaced by another set and when the incumbent set of bureaucrats does not mind the change of administration. It was only in Romania where there was bloodshed because it was not completely within the reorganizing that had been done by the Gorbachovites in 1987 to 1989 in Eastern Europe. Ceausescu resisted change as did Honecker to a lesser extent. In the dissolution of the CPSU and the Soviet Union, the anti-communist combination of Gorbachov and Yeltsin simply issued the decrees and did not even bother to conjure any semblance of popular demand in the form of huge mass uprisings. As the last revisionist ruler of the Soviet Union, Gorbachov could accelerate the destruction of the CPSU and the Soviet Union because of the previous work of Khrushchov and Brezhnev. What he did in the main in his

brief regime was to engage in a systematic campaign of deception. He described his regime as being engaged in socialist renewal and at the same time encouraged the forces of capitalist restoration to do their work under the slogans of democracy and economic reform.

From time to time, he paid lip service to Marxism-Leninism and socialism and made frequent protestations that he was a convinced communist. But in the end he came out openly as an anti-communist. In his final message as President of the Soviet Union on December 25, 1991, he used the language of the imperialists in the Cold War to describe his principal achievement, which is “giving freedom” to the people from “totalitarianism” and “civilizing” what he implied as the “uncivilized” Soviet state and people.

In laying the ideological premises of his regime, Gorbachov went back to the strident anti-Stalinism of Khrushchov and described the Brezhnev period as an interruption of the work initiated by Khrushchov. He rehabilitated Bukharin and put him up as a source of wisdom for “economic reforms”.

It became the fashion for Gorbachov and his colleagues at various levels of the CPSU and the state to describe themselves as “liberal communists” and to attack—under the guise of being completely anti-Stalin and depicting Stalin as being worse than Hitler—the entire course of Soviet history. They put forward propositions in abstract supraclass, universalistic, humanistic and ahistorical terms and drew from social democracy and bourgeois liberalism in order to denigrate, deviate from and attack Marxist-Leninist theory and the proletarian revolutionary standpoint.

Gorbachov and his colleagues systematically adopted barefaced anti-communist “advisers” and placed the anti-communists in the various branches of government, the Congress of People’s Deputies, the institutes and mass media in order to churn out a constant stream of anti-communist propaganda. Gorbachov himself took the lead in ridiculing the proletarian revolutionary stand as outdated and Marxism-Leninism as having no monopoly of the truth and won the adulation of the officials, ideologues and publicists of the United States and other capitalist countries as he used the language of social democracy and bourgeois liberalism and ultimately US Cold War terminology.

“Glasnost”

The main and essential feature of “glasnost” (openness) was the crescendo of anti-communist propaganda. The field of propaganda was monopolized by anti-communism. This was expressed in a variety of ways, modern revisionist, social-democratic, bourgeois-liberal, populist, nationalist, fascist, religious, racist and purely cynical terms. The pluralism of anti-communist ideas, including the most antidemocratic ones, was described as democracy. But the key idea in the welter of anti-communist propaganda was the advocacy of capitalism and bourgeois liberalism. Gorbachov attacked Stalin to be able by implication to attack Lenin, Marxist-Leninist theory and the entire course of Soviet history. But his subalterns explicitly attacked all these in the entire course of the Gorbachov period.

After eliminating the Brezhnevite holdovers in the Politburo in the most undemocratic manner, replacing them when they were on foreign trips or knocking them down at lower levels of the Party and state bureaucracy, Gorbachov played the middle between the “conservative” Ligachev who accepted “perestroika” but not “glasnost” and the “radical progressive” Yeltsin who went gung-ho for both “glasnost” and “perestroika”. Then, he used Ligachev in 1987 to push out Yeltsin from the Politburo only to let the latter continue as his cooperator in attacking the CPSU from the outside.

In the years leading up to 1989, the anti-communist followers of Gorbachov invented all kinds of lies against the socialist course of Soviet history and its great proletarian leaders and clamored for the rehabilitation of counterrevolutionaries and the freedom of all kinds of monsters. The people were fed with all kinds of illusions about a better life under capitalism. In 1989, he had a new Soviet Congress of People’s Deputies dominated by an anti-communist intelligentsia most of whom were at first formally communists but would eventually declare themselves as ex-communists and even anti-communists. The congress included from the very start prominent anti-communists of longstanding.

In early 1990, Gorbachov used the congress to disempower the CPSU and to give him autocratic presidential powers. In the autumn of 1990, he took the posture of siding with the “conservatives” in the CPSU and the state against the “radical progressives” Yakovlev and Schevernadze. But at the same time, he agreed to putting the sovereignty of the Soviet Union under question through a referendum in early 1991.

The popular voting in the referendum was for the retention of the Soviet Union. But again, he agreed with the nationalist forces in the various republics to make a new “union treaty” whose terms (like having separate armies and currencies, etc.) meant the breakup of the Soviet Union. In this period before the alleged coup to save the Soviet Union, Gorbachov announced that it was wrong to stress the role of the proletariat and that he was going to dissolve the CPSU and establish a social-democratic party.

Although the alleged coup of Gorbachov appointees from August 19 to 22, 1991 involved only a few plotters by its very nature, Gorbachov and Yeltsin collaborated in using it as a pretext for dissolving the entire CPSU and the Soviet Congress of People’s Deputies. Although the Soviet Constitution and the Soviet Union were still existing and Gorbachov himself had a presidential term extending to 1995, he decreed the dissolution of the Soviet Union and resigned in favor of a commonwealth of independent states (CIS) still on the planning board. Thus, mouthing the slogan of democracy, the anti-communist duo of Gorbachov and Yeltsin autocratically issued decrees, committed the most antidemocratic acts and carried out their own coup against the Soviet state.

In the first place and in the final analysis, “glasnost” was devised by the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie to pave the way for openly installing the bourgeois class dictatorship. The din of the petty bourgeoisie about “democracy” is waning after all the drumbeating for the restoration of capitalism and the bourgeois class dictatorship. The monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie remains in control of the levers of political power and the economy while the petty bourgeoisie is being relegated to a worse life of massive unemployment, frustration and misery.

“Perestroika”

Perestroika in reality meant capitalist restructuring and the disorganization and breakdown of production, despite the avowals of renewing socialism and raising production through better management, a campaign against alcoholism and absenteeism, higher wages and availability of domestic and imported consumer goods, higher profits for the private entrepreneurs, the expansion and retooling of the means of production and the conversion of military enterprises to civilian uses.

The main line of perestroika is the privatization and marketization of the

economy by domestic and foreign investors. One plan after another (the 500-day Shatalin Plan, the Grand Bargain, etc.) was considered and made dependent on foreign direct investments and loans as domestic savings disappeared and the real income of the people was cut down by inflation due to the wanton printing of money by Moscow and the price gouging in the free market. The free marketeers bought cheap or stole from the state enterprises and emptied the state stores. Thus, the people were compelled to buy from the free market.

The most favored among the private businesses were the joint ventures (joint stock companies) with foreign investors and the private cooperatives. Going into joint ventures with foreign investors mainly in the importation of consumer goods and in the repackaging or assembly of these, the high bureaucrats of the ruling party and the state and their family members appropriated for themselves state assets and drew from foreign loans in what may be considered as one of the biggest insider operation and management theft in the entire history of capitalism. These joint ventures were no different from the big comprador operations of high bureaucrats in the Philippines and many other countries in the third world. However, the most widespread form of business was the private cooperatives of varying scales in industry, agriculture and services. Their operations included the rechanneling of goods and services from the state to the private sector, small and medium private manufacturing and the private export of whatever Soviet goods, including oil and weapons, and the importation of high-grade consumer goods like cars, computers, video recorders, etc. At least 50 million people out of a population of 290 million were registered as members of small, medium and big private cooperatives. Many people joined these private cooperatives if only to gain access to basic commodities which disappeared from the much cheaper state stores.

The capitalist restructuring or economic reforms did not stimulate production and improve the quality of goods but aggravated the breakdown of production and brought about scarcity of the most essential goods. Yet, it was the long-dead Stalin who got blamed by revisionist and imperialist propaganda for the economic chaos brought about by perestroika. The corrupt bureaucrats who continued to call themselves communists connived with private businessmen more scandalously than ever before in plundering the economy.

From 1988 to 1990, Gorbachov increased the money supply by more than 50 percent even as from year-to-year production had fallen by 10 to 20 percent or worse and in 1991 alone he increased the money supply by more than 100

percent amidst a production fall of more than 20 percent. The Gorbachov regime had to keep on printing money to maintain the central bureaucracy and the military in view of inflation, corruption, the nationalist refusal of the republics to send up taxes and foreign exchange to the center, the ethnic conflicts and the justifiable workers' strikes.

At the beginning of the Gorbachov regime, the Soviet foreign debt was only US\$ 30 billion. The previous regimes had not been able to borrow more because of the US-Soviet rivalry in the Cold War. But in the period of only six years, the Gorbachov regime was able to raise the foreign debt level to US\$81 billion (according to the Soviet Central Bank report to the International Monetary Fund) or to US\$ 100 billion (according to the Soviet Central Bank report to the Group of Seven). In the final year of 1991, the Soviet Union borrowed US\$44 billion. In view of the production breakdown, the foreign funds were used mainly to finance the importation of consumer goods and the sheer bureaucratic thievery under the cover of the joint ventures. The Soviet Union practically became a neocolony of Germany which had become its main creditor and supplier. Germany accounted for the biggest bulk of foreign supplies and investments (at least 30 percent as of 1991) in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The ghost of Hitler can never be happier with the success of the German big bourgeoisie. There was a chain reaction of closures of state enterprises due to the lack of fuel, spare parts and raw materials; the diversion of funds to import foreign products; the lack of purchase orders; and the private appropriation of state assets and funds through real or fake joint ventures. Agriculture also suffered from the lack of inputs and transport. Conversion of military to civilian enterprises was negligible. The military-industrial complex continued to suck up large amounts of resources. As in Eastern Europe, the economy fell apart in the Soviet Union, with each part throwing away past advantages of cooperation and trying to strike disadvantageous deals with the bourgeoisie abroad.

Massive unemployment surfaced. Hyperinflation started to run at more than 200 percent before the break up of the Soviet Union and was expected to run faster after the decontrol of prices scheduled by Yeltsin for January 2, 1992. Even then more than 100 million Soviet people were living below the poverty line. Most victimized were the pensioners, children, the youth, the women, the unemployed and the low-income people. The shortage or absence of basic necessities was widespread. As in 1990, the leaders of capitalist restoration shamelessly begged for food aid from abroad in 1991. On each occasion, the handling of food aid was attended by corruption as the food was diverted to the free market.

“New thinking”

The key element in Gorbachov’s “new thinking” in international relations was “de-ideologization”, which actually meant doing away completely with the proletarian class stand and proletarian internationalism and capitulating to imperialism under the guise of cooperation. Gorbachov asserted that imperialism’s violent nature had changed to peaceful and that humanity has integral interests and a supraclass concern about weapons of mass destruction, ecology and other issues. Gorbachov’s “de-ideologization” actually meant the total rejection of the proletarian class stand and the adoption of the bourgeois class stand. All Marxists recognize the common interests of mankind and the march of human civilization; and at the same time the fact that the world and particular societies are dominated by imperialist and local reactionary classes and that the historic class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is still going on. What Gorbachov did was to use abstract, universalistic and supraclass terms in order to obscure that historic class struggle and find common cause with imperialism.

He considered “legitimate national interests” of states as the most important building material in international relations. After the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, he scaled down the international activities of the Soviet Union related to cooperating with third world countries and anti-imperialist organizations and movements. Prominent advisers of his also proposed that the international people’s organizations financed by Soviet organizations could unite with their counterparts financed by the forces of capitalism to form bigger “nonideological” organizations. What they meant of course was outright capitulation to imperialist ideology.

Gorbachov touted the principle of peaceful coexistence among states, irrespective of ideology and social system. He repudiated the Brezhnev Doctrine and stressed that other countries as well as communist parties could decide for themselves. But he was being hypocritical because Gorbachovite agents busied themselves in reorganizing and then scuttling the ruling parties and regimes in Eastern Europe.

He called for an end to the Cold War, for accelerated nuclear disarmament and reduction of conventional forces and for the dissolution of the NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Arms reduction treaties were forged faster than at any previous period in the Cold War. The Gorbachov regime undertook all these in the vain

hope of attracting foreign investments and new technology to shore up the Soviet economy. But the Group of Seven took the firm position that they would not throw good money after bad and shore up an increasingly decrepit and corrupt bureaucratic economy.

Under the Gorbachov leadership, the Soviet Union collaborated with the United States and other countries in the settlement of so-called regional armed conflicts such as those centered in Iran and Iraq, Afghanistan, Angola and Nicaragua. The Soviet Union committed itself to unilateral withdrawal of military forces in Eastern Europe and to German reunification in exchange for economic assistance from the West in the form of direct investments, loans, technology transfer and trade accommodations. Among the capitalist powers, Germany gave the most assistance in the form of loans, consumer supplies and housing aid for Soviet troops returning from Eastern Europe. But even the funds advanced for housing these troops became the object of Soviet mismanagement and theft.

As early as 1987, the revisionist ruling parties and regimes in Eastern Europe were already being pushed to reorganize themselves and to put Gorbachovites on top of the Brezhnevites. The word also went around within and outside the ruling parties and regimes that the Soviet Union was decided on withdrawing its forces from Eastern Europe and not interfere in what would happen in the region. Thus, the anti-communist forces had advance notice of what they could do under the new circumstances. They could play on the real grievances of the people and bring down the already much-discredited ruling parties and regimes.

The socioeconomic and political crisis of the various revisionist regimes and the wide-open knowledge that the Soviet Union was no longer interested in the preservation of the Warsaw Pact and the rouble-controlled CMEA were sufficient ground for the anti-communist forces to activate themselves and grow. The increasingly clear message from 1987 to 1989 that the Soviet Union would not intervene in any popular action against the local regimes gave the anti-communist forces the confidence to aim for their toppling. Most important of all, the overwhelming majority of the revisionist bureaucrats in the ruling party and the state (with the exception of a few like Ceausescu who was relatively independent of the CPSU and Honecker and Zhikhov who were longtime Brezhnevites) were just too willing to drop off their communist masks, retain their privileges, exploit the new opportunities and avoid the wrath of an already aggrieved people.

In the critical references of this discussion to the responsibilities of the Gorbachov regime and the East European satellite regimes in the collapse of the latter, there should be no misunderstanding that we wish a certain policy or a certain flow of events to have gone another way. We are merely describing at this point the final stage of the unmasking and self-destruction of the revisionist parties and regimes.

Next only to the destruction of the CPSU and the Soviet Union, the biggest service done by the Gorbachov regime to the capitalist powers was the rapid delivery of Eastern Europe to them and the destruction of the Warsaw Pact and the CMEA.

Within the final year of its existence, the Soviet Union under Gorbachov supported the United States in carrying out a war of aggression in the Gulf region and in asserting itself as the unrivaled policeman of the world.

Gorbachov fully revealed himself in 1991. The destructive consequences to the Soviet Union of his kind of leadership became very clear. It is untenable for any revolutionary to make an apologia for him and to try to make him out as a hero. Those who had been deceived into believing that Gorbachov was engaged in socialist renewal should take a long hard look at the incontrovertible fact that he completed the process of capitalist restoration started by Khrushchov and presided over the destruction of the Soviet Union.

The officials, ideologues and propagandists of imperialism and reaction continue to hail Gorbachov as one of the greatest men of the 20th century for bringing about “democracy” in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Indeed, they have cause to rejoice. He has brought about the flagrant restoration of capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship. The peoples of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are now thrown open to further capitalist exploitation and oppression, suffer the pangs of hunger and greater loss of freedom and face increased political turmoil, widening civil war and military fascism.

The commonwealth of independent states

The commonwealth of independent states (CIS) that has replaced the Soviet Union is dominated by Russia, which is flaunting the old czarist flag of Great-Russian chauvinism, and is afflicted with serious contradictions between Russia and the other republics, among republics with common borders, between

Russian enclaves and local nationalities in non-Russian republics and among different nationalities within each of the republics. The contradictions involve political, economic, financial, security, ethnic and border issues. There is political chaos all over the so-called commonwealth. Serious differences between Russia and Ukraine have already arisen regarding economic and financial issues and on the question of dividing the Soviet army, navy and air force, the handling of nuclear weapons and border issues on land and sea. There are independence movements among minority nationalities in Russia and civil wars in Georgia and between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

The economic chaos has been aggravated by liberalizing prices on January 2. The prices of many basic commodities have multiplied up to more than twenty times. The state stores are being emptied by backdoor sales to the free market. Even food aid from abroad has flowed into the free market. More than half of the population have fallen below the poverty line and are in danger of starving. Ninety per cent of the population is expected to fall below the poverty line. Under these circumstances, street demonstrations and workers' strikes are occurring against the openly capitalist regimes. The trade unions are agitated by the severely oppressive and exploitative conditions and have begun to conduct strikes on a wide scale. The Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals, the United Front of the Working People, the Russian Workers' Communist Party and the Communist Party of Bolsheviks in Leningrad (St. Petersburg) have been among the most militant in staging mass actions against the Russian bourgeois regime of Yeltsin.

In the Soviet Union, more than 90 percent of the major industries are still owned by the state. This is also true in the case of the East European countries, with the exception of Poland whose privatization has gone fastest and whose state-owned enterprises are still about 65 percent, according to one report. This continuing predominance of state-owned enterprises does not mean socialism. Since a long time ago, many of these enterprises have acquired a capitalist character. They have long come under the control and have become instruments of the bureaucrat capitalists and the private entrepreneurs although these are state-owned. The ongoing privatization of these state enterprises is slowed down by the dearth of genuine private venture capital, the disappearance of savings among the people and the lack of foreign interest in acquiring outmoded plants and investing in new ones.

The ex-communist bourgeoisie and the foreign investors are most interested in

acquiring at scandalously low prices those state assets that yield quick and large profits. Inefficient and decrepit state enterprises are maintained only as they are still needed and continue being the milking cows of private entrepreneurs (e.g., steel and other metals, energy and other raw materials, transport, etc.) Closures and reduced production are continuing at an accelerated pace. In the process, millions of workers are laid off. There is a process of de-industrialization throwing back the former Soviet Union or the republics of the so-called CIS and Eastern Europe into the quagmire of third world capitalism.

A strong political and economic center is absent in the CIS. But in the meantime, there is a strong military center because the central command of the former Soviet armed forces is retained. Even the leaders of the capitalist countries who are worried about the nuclear and other strategic weapons insist that these be under a single military command. However, the political and economic chaos can induce the military officers to take matters into their hands as the military rank and file and the broad masses of the people are already gravely discontented.

It is still a matter of conjecture for outside observers whether there will be a social upheaval in the tradition of the Bolsheviks (the military rank and file linking up with the workers' organizations) or a coup to install military fascism over the entire scope of the so-called commonwealth or in a series of republics (like now in Georgia). The prevalent view is that the new bourgeoisie inside and outside the armed forces is so powerful that for the time being the likelihood for military fascism to rise is greater than the return to the socialist road if there is going to be any new drastic development.

IV. Certain lessons from the collapse of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

It is of crucial importance to make a precise description of the ruling parties and regimes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the crisis that conspicuously beset them since the early 1980s and their collapse from 1989 to 1991. These ruling parties and regimes were revisionist. Their crisis and collapse are not those of socialism but of modern revisionism or capitalist restoration masquerading as socialism. The blatant restoration of capitalism and the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie are the indubitable proof. The unraveling of the revisionist systems and the unfolding of the truth in the few years before the collapse occurred right before our eyes.

There is ideological and political confusion if the crisis and collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes are described as those of socialism or Stalinism rather than of modern revisionism. Such a description would continue to pass off modern revisionism as socialism. All Marxist-Leninists must firmly recognize the fact that modern revisionism had undermined and prevailed over socialism long before the former itself plunged into a crisis and led to the collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes from 1989 to 1991.

One may speak of a crisis of socialism only in the thinking of some of those who presume modern revisionism to be socialism and observe the crisis and collapse of the ruling revisionist parties and regimes. The imperialists, the revisionists themselves and the bourgeois intelligentsia simplistically call the crisis and collapse of these anti-Stalin parties and regimes as the “crisis of Stalinism” or the “Stalinist model of socialism”. Stalin has been dead for 38 years and a process of “de-Stalinization” has been going on for the last 35 years. It is preposterous that long after his death Stalin is still being blamed for what his detractors have done or not done all these years in order to promote modern revisionism and restore capitalism. This is pure obscurantism and personality cult in reverse! The merits and demerits of any leader must be considered only within his period of responsibility, unless the objective is not to make a historical assessment but to demonize a leader and use psywar to attack Marxism-Leninism and socialism in a bourgeois personalistic manner. The modern revisionists should not be allowed to cover up their responsibility within their own period of rule. As a matter of fact, Stalin’s great achievements in socialist construction and defense of the Soviet Union are diametrically opposed to the restoration of capitalism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union by the modern revisionists.

We must draw the correct lessons from the betrayal and sabotage of socialism by the modern revisionists from Khrushchov through Brezhnev to Gorbachov. We must combat those forces and elements that wish to destroy the Party and the revolutionary movement from within by aping Gorbachov and the like and opposing the basic revolutionary principles of the Party.

The Anti-Revisionist Line

The reconsideration of the revisionist ruling parties as Marxist-Leninist and the revisionist regimes as socialist since 1982 by certain elements within the Party has generated misunderstanding of scientific socialism and a deviation from the

antirevisionist line of the Party. This must be rectified in view of the undeniable fact of the collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes and in connection with the correction of the exaggerated, incorrect and futile notion that these parties and regimes could extend assistance for accelerating the victory of the Philippine revolution.

As a result of the collapse of these parties and regimes, the CPP is ever more resolved to adhere to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism and to pursue the antirevisionist line and persevere in armed revolution. The anti-communists who seek to use the collapse of modern revisionism as an invalidation and complete negation of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism deserve nothing but contempt.

The CPP upholds the fact that Marxist-Leninist theory has correctly guided the proletarian revolutionaries and more than a billion people to victory in new-democratic revolution and in socialist revolution and construction. As far as the Philippines is concerned, the working class is the leading class in the new-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution. The advanced detachment of this class is the CPP. Without this party, the revolutionary mass movement of the people would not have resurged in Philippine history along the anti-imperialist and antifeudal line, with a socialist perspective. The petty bourgeois groups that seek to confuse, discredit, weaken and destroy the CPP can only continue being servitors of the oppressors and exploiters without the Party and the toiling masses of workers and peasants carrying out the revolution most determinedly.

What the CPP considers now as the greatest challenge in theoretical work among all proletarian revolutionaries, including Filipino communists, is learning lessons from the long-term and peaceful restoration of capitalism in socialist countries and understanding the way of continuing the revolution, combating modern revisionism and preventing the restoration of capitalism in socialist society as well as of fighting for socialism wherever it has been replaced by capitalism.

In countries where modern revisionism has had its way and restored capitalism, the challenge in theoretical and practical work among proletarian revolutionaries is to bring back socialism and bring it to a new and higher level. The forces of socialism can probably win again only after undergoing the violence of capitalist oppression and exploitation and defeating this through revolutionary violence. There is yet no historical example of a non-exploiting society replacing an exploiting class society without revolutionary violence although it has been

demonstrated repeatedly in history that a higher form of society can degenerate into a lower form through peaceful evolution.

In the course of both the new-democratic and socialist stages of the Philippines, the basic factors of counterrevolution (big bourgeoisie and landlord class) are never obliterated completely (especially in the sphere of ideology and social psychology) by the main factors of revolution (working class and peasantry). And there are inter-mediate factors (urban petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie) that operate between the two poles of revolution and counter-revolution. The main factors of revolution can come on top of those of counterrevolution and in the process win over the intermediate factors, which in turn exert both positive and negative influences on the main factors of revolution.

In the complexity of waging the new-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution, the proletarian party must uphold its revolutionary integrity through adherence to Marxism-Leninist theory, from philosophy down to strategy and tactics, and must always conduct concrete analysis of concrete conditions in order to lead the broad masses of the people from victory to victory.

Marxism-Leninism is on the high road of human civilization, cherishing the heritage from the past, availing of all current factors that make for progress; and always aiming for a better future. But it is wrong to use such terms of idealism as universal humanism, classless populism, supra-class state, pacifism and such other abstract terms in order to obscure and negate the proletarian class stand and in fact give way to the hegemony of the bourgeoisie and other backward forces in the real world.

It is wrong to declare prematurely the end of exploiting classes and class struggle while in fact they continue to exist both domestically and internationally during the entire historical epoch of socialism. The seeming disappearance of the exploiting classes by socioeconomic definition does not mean that the proletarian character of the ruling party and the state has become unnecessary and that the intelligentsia automatically becomes proletarian in socialist society. In fact, the bourgeoisie first reemerges through the bureaucracy and the intellectual sphere as petty bourgeois and then in the social economy as bureaucrat capitalists colluding with the private capitalists.

It is wrong to propagate, under the cover of idealist and metaphysical terms,

mechanical materialism, specifically in the form of the theory of productive forces which posits that the development of the “productive forces” can one-sidedly and automatically bring about socialist progress. Revolution in the relations of production as well as in the superstructure must take the lead over production. Otherwise, the idea gains ground that socialism with a low technological and economic level can advance only through domestic capitalist-oriented economic reforms and submission to the industrial capitalist countries.

The proletarian dictatorship

Upon the basic completion of the new-democratic revolution through the seizure of political power in the Philippines, the people’s democratic government is established. This is the form that the proletarian dictatorship takes in consonance with the basic worker-peasant alliance under proletarian leadership. Thus, the socialist revolution can begin in every aspect of society. The building of a socialist society and not a “national democratic society” begins, even if there are still transitory bourgeois democratic measures to undertake.

The people’s democratic government or socialist state must of course serve the entire people. But it cannot be really classless or supra-class. There is a definite class hegemony, either proletarian or bourgeois. For communists to waiver about this is to concede to the initiative of the bourgeoisie and its intellectual and political agents. The socialist state is categorically a class dictatorship of the proletariat to preclude the counterrevolution of the exploiting classes and make instantly possible the substance and process of democracy for the entire people. The party must never relinquish its leadership over the entire state and the people’s army and must retain its Party organization therein until the time comes for the state to wither away, after a whole historical epoch of building socialism, defeating imperialism and neocolonialism and preparing the way for communism.

The modern revisionist bureaucrats systematically opposed the concept of proletarian dictatorship under the cover of populism and “no more exploiting classes and no more class struggle” or the “dying out of the class struggle” in order to resurrect the bourgeoisie within the bureaucracy as well as in society through capitalist-oriented reforms. Proletarian dictatorship should comprehensively guarantee national freedom of the people against imperialism; class freedom of the exploited against the exploiting classes; and individual freedom against the ever-potential alienation and abuse of state power.

The socialist constitution and the proletarian dictatorship must guarantee the civil rights of individuals and organizations that adhere to socialism, promote public participation in the affairs of the state and put restraints on the possible abuse of power by the state and its officials. These restraints include the basic freedoms, electoral process, popular power of recall, definite terms of office, age limits and restrictions on personal incomes and privileges and against any kind of privilege or favor which is not based on merit.

No elective national leader may be elected for a period longer than two five-year terms and all officials may retire optionally at 65 and obligatorily at 70. Any individual or organization has the right to express anything in any legal way, be this criticism or constructive proposal without fear of reprisal. Due process is guaranteed. A person is presumed innocent, unless proven guilty in a court of law on the basis of evidence and through a fair trial. Thus, in the popular struggle against counterrevolution, the target is narrowed and the danger of abuse is averted.

But as already demonstrated in the collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes, it is incorrect to promote individual freedom outside of the clear framework of anti-imperialism (national freedom) and socialism (freedom from the exploiting classes). Individual freedom should not become the license for the imperialists and the local bourgeoisie and other reactionaries to oppose socialism and regain control over society.

In the entire historical epoch of socialism, the proletariat must see to it that the leading role of the proletariat is upheld in the constitution. Subsequent to the democratic coalition government by consensus, there can be an upper house of congress as the house of the working people under proletarian leadership and a lower house of congress as the house of the district representatives of the people. Retired but still mentally able revolutionary leaders can be in advisory councils enjoying high moral authority, most useful in any moment of constitutional crisis that may threaten the revolution.

The proletarian revolutionary party should never be thought of as just any party, comparable to any party in the multiplicity of permitted parties in the bourgeois political system as in the current multiparty system of the Philippines which is actually monopolized by political factions of the exploiting classes. The Party is a revolutionary party that seeks and effects a radical rupture from private ownership of the means of production and all exploiting societies which have

existed in various forms for millennia.

Notwithstanding the radical rupture sought and the mission of the working class to build socialism in a whole historical epoch, working class parties which come to power have limited their memberships to a small part of society (typically five to ten percent of the population), with the Party expanding its influence in society through mass organizations and state agencies. It is understandable that the Party is a small part of society in the course of the fierce struggle to seize power because of the coercive power of the reactionary state and the dangers to life, limb and liberty to Party members and that there is a limit to the expansion of Party membership soon after the seizure of political power to avert the avalanche of overnight communists and opportunists coming into the Party. But after the consolidation of political power and proletarian control of all aspects of society, especially the educational and cultural system, there is no reason why the Party should not increase its membership up to the point of including the majority of the people.

The Party has a cadre and mass character now. It should continue to be so after the seizure of political power. The cadres can ensure the high quality of the Party and the mass membership, the strong democratic foundation formed by workers and peasants. The Party cannot automatically ensure its high revolutionary quality by simply remaining small. On the other hand, it is liable to be swamped by an excessively high proportion of intelligentsia, including fictitious communists. Worse, the party will be increasingly regarded as a small and privileged part of society. If the Party remains small, it can be challenged any time by any political group or movement which has a comparatively large or even larger membership; or by the traditionally dominant church which registers most or much of the population as its members and claims the religious or moral allegiance of these people.

In accordance with the historic mission of the working class to build socialism, the representatives of the Party must be assured of at least one third of elective positions in the state alongside the representatives of the mass organizations of the working people and other sections of society. But within every slot allotted to the major components of society, the people inside and outside the Party must be able to choose candidates from a list in an electoral process.

With a large mass membership, the Party can confidently engage in multiparty cooperation along the united front line. The worst kind of model is a political

system of only one party which includes only a small fraction of society. The socialist society must be able to allow the existence and cooperation of several parties which offer lists of candidates subject to the consensus in the socialist united front, the electoral will of the people and the constitutional framework of socialist revolution and construction.

Socialist revolution and construction

Upon the basic completion of the new-democratic revolution through the seizure of political power, the proletariat and the people under the leadership of the Party can begin socialist revolution and construction. The means of production and distribution owned by the imperialists, big compradors and landlords are put under public ownership. The strategic enterprises and the main lines of production and distribution are nationalized. These comprise the initial base for socialist construction. Then the socialist state sector of the productive system can be expanded with further investments from the available domestic capital, export income and productive foreign borrowing.

But there are bourgeois-democratic economic reforms that still need to be undertaken as transitory measures, such as land reform and concessions to peasants of all strata and petty and middle bourgeois non-monopoly commodity producers. These reforms and concessions do not mean the building of a “national-democratic economy” in lieu of a socialist economy. The cooperativization of agriculture and nonagricultural enterprises as well as joint state-private ownership can be carried out from one stage to a higher one in conjunction with socialist construction and further industrialization.

In view of the fact that so far in history socialist economies have been established upon a low economic and technological level and worse after a ruinous war, the proletarian revolutionary party is obliged to adopt transitory measures. How long these measures should run depends on the concrete conditions. In the Soviet Union, Lenin had to adopt the New Economic Policy. And Stalin subsequently pioneered in drawing up and implementing the series of five-year plans of socialist construction. He succeeded in building a socialist industrial economy. But even after a socialist industrial economy had been established, the modern revisionists misrepresented Lenin’s New Economic Policy as the way to socialism rather than as a mere transitory measure. Thus, Khrushchov, Brezhnev and Gorbachov made this misrepresentation by using the name of Lenin against Lenin. They justified the retrogression to capitalist-

oriented reforms by counterposing Lenin's transitional policy to Stalin's program to build publicly-owned heavy and basic industries and collectivize agriculture in a planned way. After the New Economic Policy served its purpose, Stalin carried out full-scale socialist construction. It was prompt and absolutely necessary to do so in the face of the growth of capitalism threatening the socialist revolution. Antisocialist critics decry overinvestment in heavy and basic industries, the suppression of the rebellious rich peasants and the exploitation of the peasantry. But they fail to mention that the hard work, the struggle against the counterrevolutionaries and the sacrifice resulted in the raising of production and standard of living, the mechanization of agriculture and the expansion of urban life in so short a period of time. If Bukharin had had his way and prolonged the NEP, the Soviet Union would have generated an uncontrollable bourgeoisie and a widespread rich peasantry to overpower the proletariat, would have had less economic well-being and less defense capability, would have been an easier prey to Hitler and would have been attacked earlier by Nazi Germany.

After World War II, China under the leadership of Mao Zedong and the Communist Party of China was able to demonstrate that there could be a well-balanced growth of agriculture as the foundation of the economy, heavy industry as the leading factor and light industry as the bridging factor between the first two. The line of Mao was to provide as quickly as possible the producer and consumer goods for the people, especially the peasant masses. But even Mao was unfairly accused by modern revisionists of industrial overinvestment and premature cooperativization. At any rate, the Chinese example under the leadership of Mao bettered the Soviet example under the leadership of Stalin in well-balanced development in a poor country engaged in socialist construction. The theory and practice of scientific socialism, therefore, is ever developing.

All modern revisionists are carried away by the theory of "productive forces" and economism. They prate about the law of value but at the same time they obscure the critical Marxist theory of surplus value and the creative line of using what is otherwise private profit as social profit and of converting what is otherwise an anarchic yet monopolistic production for private profit into a system of planned production for use and for the benefit of the entire society.

Marxists have always agreed with Adam Smith and his followers that the value of a commodity is equivalent to the average socially necessary labor time and that the exchange value (price) is realized in the market. In the socialist system, there is a system of wage differentials paid according to quantity and quality of

work done. Within the system of public ownership of the means of production and economic planning, the new value created is allocated for the wages fund for consumption, economic reinvestment not only to cover depreciation but also expansion of production, general welfare (education, health, infrastructure, etc.), administration and national defense.

Aside from the wage system with differentials which corresponds to the system of commodity values, the commodities produced incorporate inputs which are bought from other parts of the domestic or world market at certain prices and which are taken into account in the market price of the commodities. Price comparisons can also be made with similar commodities produced abroad.

The socialist system of production has proven to be effective in creating full employment, attaining high rates of economic growth, responding to the basic needs of the people and providing social services until a new bourgeoisie starts to appropriate an increasing part of the surplus product and develops a taste for high-grade consumer goods which it at first acquires through institutional buying from abroad.

In addition to the high consumption and excessive privileges of the new bourgeoisie, another big drain is the misallocation of resources towards military expenditures because of the imperialist threat. This in fact constituted the biggest drain on the resources of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe under the long reign of Brezhnev. But this is obscured by imperialist propaganda whenever it asserts that socialism is inherently flawed or that the so-called Stalinist model pursued by the modern revisionists has failed. In going for the arms race, the Brezhnev regime deviated from the concepts of people's defense and all-round consolidation adhered to by Stalin when the Soviet Union was militarily weaker and faced bigger threats from the capitalist powers.

The fact is that the socialist economies progressed for a certain number of decades and it would take another number of decades for the modern revisionists to make these economies regress into capitalism, under such bourgeois notions as stimulating production and improving the quality of production through private enterprise and the free market.

The adoption of capitalist-oriented reforms to "supplement" and "assist" socialist economic development is thereby wrongly rationalized. But the bourgeoisie, the corrupt bureaucrats and rich peasants are recreated and

generated to undermine and destroy socialism from within. After a certain period of liberalization of the economy, the bourgeois forces can demand further privatization and marketization more vigorously and ultimately claim political power as in Eastern Europe and Soviet Union.

But usually at the beginning of their effort to subvert the socialist economy, when there are yet no significant number of private entrepreneurs within the country, they wage a campaign for learning “efficient management” from capitalist countries (unmindful of the wasteful business cycles and wars and the centuries of exploiting the proletariat, the colonies and the spheres of influence), for expanded trade with the capitalist countries, foreign investments, loans and technology transfer and therefore for an investment law attractive to the multinational firms and banks as well as to the domestic bourgeoisie which must be promoted if even the foreign bourgeoisie is allowed to enjoy the freedom of investing and owning assets in the country and hiring local people.

Without having to breach or abandon basic socialist principles and without having to enlarge domestic and foreign private ownership of the means of production, it is possible to use wage differentials and bonuses as incentives for raising the quantity and quality of goods according to reliable and accurate information on productive capacity and consumer demand and according to the resultant economic plan, to satisfy the basic needs of the people first and then to proceed to produce non-basic goods for improving the standard of living, to build one generation of better housing after another as a lifetime incentive and to decentralize economic activities with better results.

The production of both basic and non-basic consumer goods are complementary and interactive. When basic needs are satisfied and private savings mount, the people start looking for things to spend on in order to improve or make their lives more interesting. Some high-grade consumer goods can be locally produced. Others can be imported without prejudicing the priority given to the development of the entire economy and the importation of essential producer and consumer goods.

In the case of the Soviet Union, before there could be a Gorbachov, there was the prolonged period of Brezhnev in which the new bourgeoisie developed domestically and resources were wasted in the arms race and in the costly commitments abroad under the theory of defending the Soviet Union by developing the strategic offense capability and by being able to wage wars

abroad.

We have seen that the concept of people's defense or people's war against an aggressor, within the people's self-reliant capabilities, within their own national borders and without undermining the growth of the socialist economy, still constitutes the correct policy. The Soviet corps of research scientists, engineers and technologists was the largest in the world. They made great advances in basic research, experiments and prototyping. But only those advances suitable to the high technology requirements of the arms race were used in a big way. And because of disorientation and some false sense of economy in civil production, old and outmoded equipment tended to be kept and reproduced so that this exceedingly important area of the economy was deprived of the benefits of high technology.

In a socialist economy, the planners must adopt a reasonable measure for depreciation of productive equipment, durable consumer goods and infrastructures so that there is room for innovation and enlivening of production. It is not true that there has to be competition among capitalists in order to generate new and better products. The Soviet Union was able to keep on raising its military and space technology in a planned way.

In carrying out socialist construction, after the transitory period of reviving the economy from the ravages of war and completing the bourgeois-democratic reforms, we shall uphold the principle of instituting the socialist relations of production to liberate the productive forces and promote their growth; and after having advanced along the socialist line and gone beyond certain transitory measures, we shall never retrogress to the revisionist line of using capitalist-oriented reforms to push socialism forward.

Cultural revolution

In continuing the revolution, combating revisionism and other counterrevolutionary forces and preventing the restoration of capitalism in socialist society, the cultural revolution must be carried out coextensively and interactively with the political and socioeconomic revolution. If we are to avoid the errors which caused the failure of the great proletarian cultural revolution in China, we must grasp that the cultural revolution is a persuasive democratic process with Marxist-Leninist theory in the lead carried out along the general line of the people's revolutionary struggle, that the process is a protracted one

and so many times more protracted than either the people's war or socialist economic construction and should not be rushed in order not to be persecutory; and that to preempt anarchy institutions like the Party, the state, the people's organizations, the educational system, the mass media and so on should take on responsibility for leadership over the cultural mass movement, with due process rigorously followed and the rights of individuals and groups respected. The cultural revolution is an important process for keeping high the proletarian revolutionary consciousness and the spirit of selflessness and service to the people. As one generation after another draws away from the accomplished process of seizing political power from the reactionaries and the heroic efforts to establish a socialist society, those who are in the bureaucracy of the ruling party, the state and even in the mass organizations can degenerate into a new bourgeoisie and adopt modern revisionism and other retrograde ideas and policies. The youth and intelligentsia can adopt petty-bourgeois attitudes and grow cynical towards those in power and fall for anti-communist views and adulate the ideas and fashions of the domestic and international bourgeoisie.

Even while we are still engaged in the new-democratic revolution in the Philippines, we are already carrying out a cultural revolution among the people. We are promoting a cultural revolution with a national, democratic and scientific character. At the core of this revolutionary mass phenomenon are proletarian revolutionary cadres guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

Our cultural revolution of a new-democratic type is distinct from and yet continuous with the socialist cultural revolution. Like now, we shall continue to combine Party leadership, the mass movement and a strong sense of the rights of the individual within the anti-imperialist and socialist framework. We shall take all the necessary time, no matter how long, to raise the people's revolutionary consciousness from one level to another through formal and informal educational and cultural activities and to isolate and defeat the ideas that run counter to socialism.

In socialist society, we shall carry out the cultural revolution to promote the proletarian revolutionary stand and the spirit of service to the people. The cultural revolution shall ceaselessly put revolutionary politics (patriotic and proletarian) and moral incentive in command of production and other social activities. The revolutionization of the superstructure shall complement and interact with the revolutionization of the mode of production. When the bourgeoisie is deprived of its economic and political power, it seeks to make a

comeback at first in the ideological and cultural fields. When it succeeds at ideological revision and cultural pollution, then it can undertake the changes in political and economic policies which favor capitalist restoration. The bourgeoisie is most effective when it can work through unremolded and degenerate elements within the state and the ruling party. The proletarian revolutionaries have therefore to be ever vigilant and resolute in maintaining the correct line and in militantly waging the socialist cultural revolution.

The main contradiction in socialist society is the one between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The old bourgeois class and the landlord class are easy to identify and the people are vigilant towards them. So, the members of these defeated classes would rather encourage the intelligentsia and the bureaucracy to start adopting the petty-bourgeois mode of thinking and behavior. On the basis of this, the bourgeoisie can regain lost ground, especially in the ideological and cultural fields. When the proletariat loses the fight in these fields, the already pronounced bourgeois revisionists can push the anti-proletarian change of political and economic policies under the guise of transcending classes and class struggle.

By that time, the bourgeoisie shall have been well on the way of reimposing itself on the proletariat and the people and restoring capitalism. The restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe proves that the victory of socialism is not irreversible in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. All proletarian revolutionaries can learn important lessons from the way the bourgeoisie has come on top of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe through peaceful evolution from within the state and the party and by using the state against the party, particularly the dwindling proletarian revolutionaries in the party.

In building socialism as the long-term preparation for communism, we shall strive to reduce the gap and solve the contradictions between the proletariat and peasantry, between mental and physical labor and between urban and rural life. We shall do so by mustering the capabilities of the proletariat and the rest of the people, utilizing science and technology and fostering a socialist civilization.

We owe to Mao the theory of continuing revolution, combating modern revisionism and preventing capitalist restoration in socialist society; and the application of this theory in the great proletarian cultural revolution, which succeeded for a number of years until the errors accumulated and resulted in a

Rightist backlash. If the positive aspects are upheld and the negative aspects are corrected, then Mao's theory and practice of the cultural revolution can be the treasury of knowledge on the basic principles and methods for continuing the revolution in socialist society. The theoretical work on the cultural revolution is a wide and open field for study.

The failure of a revolution is never the permanent end of it. The Paris Commune of 1871 succeeded briefly and failed. But the theory of class struggle and proletarian dictatorship was never invalidated. After 46 years, the Great October Socialist Revolution triumphed. Then, the forces of fascism wiped out the working-class parties in many European countries and eventually invaded the Soviet Union. But soon after World War II, several socialist countries arose in Eastern Europe and Asia.

Modern revisionism would emerge to afflict a number of socialist countries. And finally, from 1989 to 1991, we witnessed the collapse of revisionist parties and regimes. This confirms the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist criticism and repudiation of modern revisionism and eliminates a certain number of revisionist parties and regimes which have caused theoretical and political confusion in the socialist and antiimperialist movement.

Unfortunately, the capitalist powers have become more arrogant and crueler upon the disappearance of the Soviet Union as a superpower rival of the United States. But they are beset by the crisis of overproduction and contradictions are growing between them and their client states in the imperialist and neocolonial framework. In fact, the continuing crisis of the countries in which capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship have been restored in a blatant manner, has all along been part of the global capitalist crisis. The former Soviet republics and the East European countries have become hotbeds of nationalism, ethnic conflicts, militarism and civil war and lay bare the rottenness of the capitalist system.

Upon the aggravation of capitalist oppression and exploitation, the anti-imperialist and socialist cause is bound to surge to a new and higher level. The high technology in the hands of the capitalist powers has already deepened and aggravated the crisis of overproduction. The trade war among the capitalist powers is developing in the wake of the end of the bipolar Cold War. The United States is disturbing the balance among the capitalist powers as it seeks to revive its productive capacity, expand its trade and solve its huge deficit and debt problems in an environment where the other capitalist powers are holding tightly

on to their productive and trade advantages and all neocolonial client states (except a few earners of export surplus due to US market accommodations) in the South and East are long depressed and find no relief from deficits, debt problem and austerity measures.

For some time, notwithstanding the disappearance of the two-superpower rivalry, the social turbulence and political violence will increase throughout the world. From these will reemerge the anti-imperialist and socialist movement at a new and higher level. The increased oppression and exploitation of the peoples of the world can only serve to generate the revolutionary movement. What has come about as a hostile environment for this movement is a precondition and a challenge for its resurgence.

Proletarian Internationalism

The ever-worsening crisis of the Philippine ruling system provides the fertile ground for the continuance and growth in strength of the revolutionary mass movement led by the Communist Party of the Philippines. But to gain total victory in the new-democratic revolution and proceed to the socialist revolution, the Party must take fully into account the international situation and draw further strength from the world proletariat and other positive forces abroad.

In international relations, we must be guided above all by the principle of proletarian internationalism. Especially in the current situation, we must unite and close ranks with the working-class parties and organizations that adhere to Marxism-Leninism and are waging revolutionary struggles in their respective countries.

The ever-worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and the ever-escalating oppression and exploitation are prodding the proletarian revolutionaries and peoples in countries to reaffirm the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. Even now, it is clear that the current decade is one of social turmoil in the world capitalist system and popular resistance to neocolonialism. It is not going to be a decade of Pax Americana and capitulation by the forces of revolutionary change.

More than a billion people (a quarter of humanity) continue to live and work in societies that consider themselves socialist and are led by parties that consider themselves communist. The crisis of world capitalist system shall have become far worse than now before the degree or semblance of socialism that exists in the

world can be erased.

The disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and their counterparts abroad is part of the crisis of the world capitalist system and is in fact a positive development in the sense that it provides alerting lessons to all proletarian revolutionaries, demonstrate the folly of straying from Marxism-Leninism and from the road of socialism and argues against the illusions that the modern revisionists have conjured for a long time on a world scale.

In accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism, the Communist Party of the Philippines is more than ever determined to engage in all possible ways to develop mutual understanding, fraternal relations, and mutual support and cooperation with all working-class parties and proletarian revolutionaries the world over.

The Party is grateful to all fraternal proletarian parties for the moral and concrete support that they extend to the resolute revolutionary struggle of the Filipino people and for recognizing the Party as one of the advanced detachments of the world proletariat which can contribute to the restrengthening of the world socialist and antiimperialist movement in theory and practice. Like today when it sincerely follows the slogan, “Workers of all countries, unite!” and gives uppermost importance to the world unity of workers through party-to-party relations, the Party shall uphold proletarian internationalism as the highest principle and general line of international relations when it is in power and shall give the uppermost importance to the world unity of workers through party-to-party relations as well as through the relations of the socialist state with other socialist states.

Fidelity to proletarian internationalism is a necessary measure of whether a party is Marxist-Leninist or not and whether a state is socialist or not. It is aimed at creating the world conditions for socialism to prevail over capitalism, for the working class to defeat the bourgeoisie and all reaction, and paving the way for communism; and therefore, at realizing the mutual support and cooperation of all proletarian revolutionary forces, without any party or state infringing on the independence and equality of others.

We have seen parties and states that start out as proletarian revolutionary but later degenerate and become revisionist and relate with other parties and states

only as these become subservient and become their foreign policy tools. They subordinate the principle of proletarian internationalism to diplomatic and economic relations with bourgeois states. They stop mentioning proletarian internationalism as if it were a dirty phrase as cosmopolitan relations with transnational corporations and banks gain the uppermost importance.

Learning lessons from recent history, the Communist Party of the Philippines is resolved that in the future the foreign policy of the new Philippines shall encompass relations with other socialist states, with working class parties, with peoples and revolutionary movements and with states (irrespective of ideology or social system) in that order of importance, under the guidance of proletarian internationalism in basic correspondence to the socialist character of the state and the proletarian revolutionary character of the ruling party.

The Party is confident that the ever-worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and the resurgence of the socialist and anti-imperialist movement will create the global conditions favorable for their winning total victory in the new-democratic revolution and for establishing a socialist society that requires the proletarian party and state to practice proletarian internationalism at a new and higher level.

On the Petty Bourgeoisie and the Future of Socialism

7 November 1992

Let me take up only two important questions: 1. What is the single most important class basis for the betrayal of socialism in the Soviet Union? 2. What is the future of socialism?

A. The petty bourgeoisie as the class basis for the betrayal of socialism

1. The petty bourgeoisie is the lowest stratum and most numerous part of the bourgeoisie. It possesses the intellectual, professional and technical capabilities utilized by the big bourgeoisie for the functioning of capitalism. The urban petty bourgeoisie, which receives the crumbs from the table of the big bourgeoisie, must be won over by the proletariat in order to disable and defeat the big bourgeoisie. Its capabilities must be put into the service of the revolution if the proletariat is to win victory.
2. The revolutionary party of the proletariat cannot strengthen itself, cannot seize power and cannot build socialism if it fails to win over the petty bourgeoisie in society and if it does not recruit into the Party those elements of petty bourgeois origin and socioeconomic status who are willing to remold themselves into proletarian revolutionaries and render service to the proletariat and people.
3. Availing themselves of their facility in learning Marxist-Leninist theory or book knowledge, the intelligentsia are usually able to gain membership in a proletarian revolutionary party in greater proportion than their part of the population and the part of the proletariat. Marxist-Leninists have to consider the proper proportioning of Party members according to their class origins and status, with the objective of making sure that Party members of worker and

peasant status are dominant within the proletarian party. At any rate, whatever is the proportion of party members of petty bourgeois origin and socioeconomic status, there are those who become genuine proletarian revolutionaries and there are others who fail to become so despite their nominal Party membership.

4. Even at its best, the proletarian revolutionary party contains a certain amount of unremolded petty bourgeois and a certain degree of petty bourgeois thinking. The unremolded petty bourgeois is the social base of subjectivist and opportunist errors which are either put under restraint, rectification and repudiation or allowed to thrive in a party that is bound to degenerate and disintegrate.

5. In Soviet history, the Left Opposition headed by Trotsky and the Right Opposition headed by Bukharin were petty bourgeois currents of thought within the Soviet party. At the same time, there were the old petty bourgeois retained in the reorganized state bureaucracy and in the economy under the New Economic Policy and the members of the old exploiting big bourgeois and landlord classes that lost properties but not their ideas and influence in society, which tended to conjoin with petty bourgeois thinking and even with the traditional social psychology of the politically backward section of the masses.

6. When it was prematurely declared in 1936 that there were no more exploiting classes and no more class struggle in Soviet society, except the one intensifying between the Soviet people and the external enemy, the tendency of the new intelligentsia and bureaucracy to become petty bourgeois was glossed over and allowed to grow. Thus, the petty bourgeoisie grew and proliferated within the ruling party and the state. Stalin himself observed that the most dangerous bureaucrat was the one that carried the title of communist but was not at all a genuine communist.

7. The petty bourgeoisie was generated by the dulled proletarian revolutionary stand and the waning sense of class struggle between the proletariat and bourgeoisie within Soviet society. It became the social base for bureaucratism, the repressiveness of the state security agencies and eventually the rise of modern revisionism and the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie to a predominant position. The bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie overthrew the proletariat in 1956 and converted socialism into state monopoly capitalism and social imperialism.

8. The petty bourgeoisification of the class consciousness of the new intelligentsia and the bureaucracy (most of whom were already children of the

working people) was accompanied by the abolition of the communist minimum (salaries of communists equivalent to the average of workers' wages) and communist maximum (equivalent to the highest wage of skilled workers) and upward adjustment in the salaries of communist cadres equal to the level of salaries received by non-communist professionals and technical experts (three times larger than those previously received by communist cadres). Communist bureaucrats in the party, state, public institutions and mass organizations, managers, engineers and technicians in state enterprises and collectives and personnel of academic, research and cultural institutions received privileges extra to their salaries. In the latter thirties, they started to get an overly large portion of the social product for their consumption.

9. In the undermining of socialism and restoration of capitalism, the petty bourgeoisie used two hands. One hand committed acts of arbitrariness and the other hand went for an egoistic sense of freedom. One hand reached out for higher rungs in the bureaucratic ladder and the other flailed against bureaucratism. One hand pretended to uphold socialism which was already state monopoly capitalism and the other hand demanded the free marketplace of goods, services and ideas amidst bureaucratic corruption and privateering. In the end, the new bourgeoisie within and outside the ruling party and state agreed openly on the premises of anti-communism.

10. The standard of living of the petty bourgeoisie is something to aim for as a general level of development, especially in countries where socialism has to rise from a low economic and technological level. In the course of socialist advance, the contradictions between physical and mental labor and between urban and rural life are resolved by uplifting the workers and peasants economically, socially and culturally. What is wrong is when the intelligentsia and bureaucracy become or remain petty bourgeois, instead of becoming proletarian in world outlook, and proceed to accumulate privileges and perks at the expense of the general level of socialist development and adopt the ideas and policies to restore capitalism and the bourgeois class dictatorship.

B. The future of socialism

1. The basic teachings of Marx and Engels about capitalism and scientific socialism, those of Lenin and Stalin about modern imperialism and classical revisionism and about the socialist revolution and construction and those of Mao about imperialism, neocolonialism. and modern revisionism and about socialist

revolution and construction and continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution have been proven correct in two ways: first by the great victories of socialist revolution and construction; and second by the disastrous conduct and consequences of the betrayal of socialism by the ideology of modern revisionism and the actual restoration of capitalism. Therefore, all Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations that now exist and will arise can be better armed than ever before with the correct principles and practical lessons to build socialism.

2. Mao's critique of modern revisionism and his theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship and combatting modern revisionism through proletarian cultural revolution to prevent the restoration of capitalism until imperialism is defeated and communism becomes possible deserve special attention. Without these, it would only be now that the Marxist-Leninist would be groping for the ideas about continuing the socialist revolution and preventing the restoration of capitalism through peaceful evolution. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was defeated at a certain point in time after succeeding, like the Paris Commune, but it is a great indispensable source of theoretical and practical lessons.

3. The disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and the sham socialist regimes and the collapse of the Soviet Union demonstrate so clearly that these have resulted from a certain sequence of events: the premature declaration of the end of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie within socialist society; the conversion of the new intelligentsia and bureaucracy into a huge mass of petty bourgeoisie; the role of this new petty bourgeoisie as the social base for the rise of bureaucratism, modern revisionism and the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie; and the adoption of political, economic and cultural policies of so-called reforms to restore capitalism and ultimately to disintegrate the revisionist ruling party and regime.

4. The worst evils of capitalism now afflict the former Soviet republics. The class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is now riding roughshod over the people and exacting a heavy toll on them in the form of unbridled bureaucratic corruption, privatization or closure of enterprises, mass unemployment, breakdown of production, soaring inflation, civil wars, ethnic conflicts, fascist currents, rampant criminality and so on. The very worst of the big bourgeoisie is still to come. But in the course of the worsening of the situation, the revolutionary proletariat and people can recover their bearings and uphold the Marxist-Leninist

legacy of Lenin and Stalin and wage the socialist revolution anew.

5. A special word on the great mass of petty bourgeois in the former Soviet bloc countries is called for. While they were the social base for the rise of the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie, their social conditions conspicuously deteriorated, especially since the late seventies. These would deteriorate without cease from the second half of the Brezhnev period to the Gorbachov period through the current period. The worsening conditions of the petty bourgeoisie in the former Soviet bloc countries are similar to those in the general run of third world countries. Their illusions of enjoying more material comforts and freedom under capitalism are proven false.

6. The social turmoil and the disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes in the 1989-1991 period were part of the crisis of the world capitalist system. The Soviet Union was a social imperialist and neocolonial power vis a vis other country under its control. But in fact it had become vulnerable to the manipulation of superior industrial capitalist powers, especially West Germany. The countries of Eastern Europe had fallen into the position of being like the countries of the third world, with over-consuming exploiters, deteriorating terms of trade and ever mounting debt burden, and had been subject to the manipulation of both Soviet and Western neocolonialism. But the long running depression of the East and South of the world has been recoiling upon the major industrial capitalist countries also in the 1989-1991 period and onwards.

7. The ongoing crisis of the world capitalist system is a crisis of overproduction. The production of surplus industrial and agricultural goods is now coming on top of a long-depressed South and East of the world, which had earlier suffered from the overproduction of raw materials and deteriorating terms of trade for these and are reeling from mounting deficits and foreign debt. The crisis of overproduction has been accelerated by the unprecedented internationalization of capital since the end of World War II and by the application of high technology in the production of surplus manufactures and raw materials which cannot be disposed of profitably. Now, there is a depression of the world market as a result of the overproduction and the massive amount of bad debts. Overconsumption by the US has made it the biggest deficit-spender and the biggest debtor country. The tighter integration of such huge markets as those of China, India and the Soviet Union in the world capitalist system in the eighties have only served to aggravate the crisis of overproduction.

8. Contradictions are intensifying between the capitalist powers and their client regimes on the one hand and the oppressed peoples and nations, among the industrial capitalist countries over questions about investment, trade, monetary, credit and military policies and between the monopoly bourgeoisie on the one hand and the proletariat and people in capitalist countries and throughout the world. Because of the falling rates of profit and the depression of the world economy, the capitalist powers tend to consolidate their national and regional positions. They tend to redivide the world and move towards a multipolar world.

9. Social turmoil is already raging in so many countries on an unprecedentedly wide scale and is taking the form of civil wars, protracted armed struggle, general strikes, one coup after another, mass uprisings and the like. These result from the depression of economies, the massive unemployment, inflation, the harsh austerity measures and social cutbacks, wider impoverishment, hunger and disease. There is gloom and disarray in the world capitalist system so soon after the euphoria and gloating over the so-called triumph of capitalism over socialism. Exactly at the point of unprecedented success in the employment of neo-colonial methods, capitalism is in a dismal, turbulent and desperate situation.

10. We are on the eve of social revolution on a global scale. Under the present world conditions, the Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations can arise and further strengthen themselves by taking advantage of the worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and by creating out of the widening and intensifying social turbulence a new and higher level of revolutionary struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism against imperialism and all reaction.

The Bankruptcy of Imperialist Globalization and Urgency of the Socialist Cause

**In Celebration of the 81st Anniversary of the Great October Socialist
Revolution, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 1998**

Introduction

I thank all the organizers for inviting me to speak in this celebration of the 81st anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The broad range of organizers and mass participants in this occasion is admirable. We are all interested in the historic mission of the working class and in the pursuit of the objectives of the October Revolution. We gather at a time that the crisis of the world capitalist system is extremely grave and the urgency of the socialist cause presses upon the proletariat and people of the whole world.

The October Revolution of 1917 remains significant and relevant. It brought about the first socialist state and society. It demonstrated the capability of the working class, in unison with the peasantry, to take power and build socialism in response to imperialist crisis and war. Lenin addressed the working people with the stirring call to turn the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war.

The Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin scored great achievements in an all-round way and inspired the proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations to wage revolution against imperialism and all reaction. But unfortunately, from 1956 onward, a long period of revisionist betrayal undermined and destroyed socialism.

Bureaucrat monopoly capitalism took the place of socialism and ultimately

brought about the complete destruction of the Soviet Union and the undisguised and unbridled privatization of public assets.

The imperialists headed by the US have gloatingly misrepresented the fall of the revisionist regimes in the Soviet-bloc countries as the permanent fall of socialism and have proclaimed that history cannot go beyond the stage of capitalism and liberal democracy. With overweening arrogance, they have trumpeted the dogma of “free market” as the essence of globalization and as the only way to economic growth and social progress.

However, in so short a time, the bankruptcy of imperialist globalization, is thoroughly exposed by the growing trend of global economic depression, social misery, political turmoil and wars. We witness today the massive destruction of productive forces in the entire world, in both the imperialist and dominated countries. The urgency of the socialist cause is clear.

Bankruptcy of imperialist globalization

The monstrous irrationality of imperialist globalization is that it has retrogressed to the most rapacious forms of capitalist appropriation, under the anachronistic slogan of the “free market”, exactly when the social character of production has increased to an unprecedentedly high level through high technology.

Since the beginning, the policy shift from Keynesianism to neoliberalism has wrought havoc on the lives of the proletariat and the people in both imperialist and dominated countries. The main thrust of monopoly capitalism is to accelerate the concentration of capital and maximize profit through deregulation, privatization and liberalization of trade and investments.

In the name of promoting economic growth and preventing inflation, monopoly capitalism has used its imperialist state to trample upon the hard-won rights of the proletariat, bring down the wage and living conditions of the people, provide tax cuts to the monopoly firms but raise the tax on basic consumer goods and services and cut down government spending for social benefits and social services. It has done so to accelerate the accumulation of capital, maximize profits and counter the general tendency of profit and growth rates to fall in the imperialist countries.

The inevitable result is that monopoly capitalism itself shrinks its own market by disemploying large numbers of the working people and robbing them of their

just wages and social benefits. The crisis of overproduction arises relative to the reduction of effective demand. Right now, amidst the shrinking market, overproduction is leading to production cutdowns, further mass layoffs and bankruptcies.

In all imperialist countries, the reality of mass unemployment is glossed over through sheer deception in official statistics. In certain imperialist countries, like the United States and the Netherlands, the illusion of employment is conjured through the generation of temporary part-time jobs in the service sector. In Japan and the whole of the European Union, monopoly capitalism is unable to conceal the chronic mass unemployment.

For some time, the illusion of growth has been conjured through the sheer abuse of finance capital. The most imaginative forms of making money on money have been devised. Real assets are overvalued through the securities market, through unbridled bank borrowings by corporations and hedge funds (speculative investment firms), through speculative mergers and through the practice of international usury at the expense of the dominated countries.

Every day, at electronic speed, trillions of dollars move around the world in financial transactions among multinational firms and banks. Central banks keep a blind eye to the private transactions until the financial collapse occurs and the IMF moves in to require the client states to assume responsibility for the private debts, raise interest rates and devalue the currency or until within the imperialist countries themselves public funds are used to bail out the private firms and banks.

Right now, the multinational firms and banks are hit hard by the economic collapses in East Asia, Russia and Latin America. Since last year, two big waves of stock market collapses have occurred on a global scale. From July to September this year, stock market collapses wiped out USD4.3 trillion. Investors shift to the bond market but yields are also falling here because of overcrowding and the pressures on the imperialist state to lower interest rates in a vain effort to stimulate production and market demand.

Under the neoliberal policy shift, the imperialist countries have dropped their pretense at aiding the economic development of the countries that they dominate. Since the 80s, they have selected only some ten countries to become the so-called emerging markets.

Some 80 percent of global direct investments flowed among the three global centers of capitalism, the United States, Japan and the European Union, chiefly to the US. Some 20 percent went to the “emerging markets”, chiefly those in East Asia. Since the currency devaluations and stock market collapses in July 1997, the net flow of imperialist funds to East Asia has dropped by more than half, as capital flight has caused a deep recession.

Neoliberalism is so far the worst form of neocolonialism. since the end of World War II. It freezes the “emerging markets” at their given levels of development and makes them dependent on exports, dumps on them speculative capital and surplus goods, further compradorizes them and destroys any self-reliant national industry. At the same time, the overwhelming majority of countries long depressed since the crisis of overproduction in raw materials in the late 70s are further deteriorating economically and socially.

The foreign debt burden of the third world and the former Soviet bloc countries has shot past the USD 2.0 trillion mark. Under “free market” globalization, it has increased at a far higher rate than under the previous Keynesian policy. The funds, some USD 350 billion in the last ten years, flowed to the “emerging markets”, in order to stimulate the high consumption of the exploiting classes by financing private construction booms and importation of cars and other consumption durables.

Until July last year, the multinational firms and banks extracted the highest rates of profit from the “emerging markets” in East Asia, which was being flattered as the fastest growing region in the world. Since then, the force of several nuclear bombs has hit the region. Currency and stock market collapses have occurred. Foreign capital took flight as the foreign exchange holdings of these East Asian economies became depleted by the accumulation of foreign trade deficits and debt burden. There is no way for the export income to beat the import payments and debt service because of the global overproduction of the types of goods produced for export.

Among the imperialist countries, Japan has been the hardest hit, with the problem of bad loans arising from operations in Southeast Asia and South Korea coming on top of those of Japanese companies since the bursting of the Japanese economic bubble (overvalued real estate and stocks) in the early 90s. Like Japan, the US and the European Union are now increasingly hard hit by loan defaults and market contraction in East Asia.

Before July last year, more than 40 percent of the finance-capital flow to East Asia came from Japan, some 40 percent from several West European countries and only about 20 percent from the US. Forty percent of Japanese exports, 30 percent of US and some 20 percent of European went to East Asia.

Now, the imperialists speak of a contagion among the “emerging markets”. They admit that a global recession is already in motion. The bankruptcies of Russia and several East European countries, Brazil and several Latin American countries, add to what is already a depression in East Asia. All major multinational banks have suffered severe losses and multinational firms have suffered big drops in sales and profit rates. Since then, there has been a sharp fall in stock markets all over the world. Values have been wiped out, ranging from 40 to 85 percent, in major multinational firms and banks in the period of July to September this year.

Under the neoliberal policy, specifically under the flexible labor policy, employment and income of the working people in the imperialist countries have been driven down, more so in the “emerging markets”. Current global unemployment rate has gone beyond 40 percent and poverty afflicts 90 percent of the people of the world.

There is chronic global overproduction in all types of goods, whether these be industrial and agricultural products of the imperialist countries, the basic industrial and reassembly products of South Korea, Taiwan and Brazil, the labor-intensive consumer semimanufactures of Southeast Asia and China or the oil and gas of Russia.

The worsening chronic crisis of overproduction is leading further to the destruction of productive forces in the form of production cutdowns, mass layoffs and bankruptcies. The crisis in the real economy is also collapsing the paper pyramids of finance capital.

The IMF itself has gone bankrupt and is faced with increasing difficulties in raising bailout funds for the “emerging markets”. It imposes austerity measures, high interest rates and devaluation on these economies and drive them to the ranks of the long-depressed countries of the third world.

At the same time, the US is pressing for the lowering of interest rates among the imperialist countries in order to revive their economies. But it does not want to

lower its own interest rates to a level lower than those in other imperialist countries so that it can continue to attract investments from them. Interest rates in Japan and most of the EU are already much lower than those in the US.

Departing from the neoliberal norm of the US, Japan has engaged in Keynesian public deficit spending for public works since the bursting of the Japanese bubble but has failed to rise from stagnation since 1991. On the other hand, the European Union has curtailed public spending to 3 percent of its GNP in complying with requirements for the European monetary union as well as falling in line with the predominant neoliberal policy.

The Group of Seven (G7) and all their multilateral agencies, the IMF, World Bank and WTO are at a loss as to how to revive the world capitalist economy. They have contradictory proposals and they doubt the efficacy of their own proposals. They estimate that the ongoing mega-bust will continue to worsen before the economy improves within the next two to three years.

Current crisis conditions allow the imperialist countries in the OECD to push more effectively than ever before the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI) on the dominated countries and trample on their economic sovereignty. But even among the imperialist countries, economic competition is sharpening in the face of the shrinking world market. The lesser imperialist powers are wary of the US breaking down the barriers to their own national economies and penalizing them for violating treaty obligations, such as national treatment to foreign investors.

In the absence of powerful revolutionary mass movements, monopoly capitalism can bounce back from a global recession and rise to a higher level of capital concentration at the expense of losing companies and the dominated countries. But an economic depression can be so severe as to lead to assertions of economic sovereignty, protectionism, higher levels of fiscal and monetary intervention by the bourgeois states, to the intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions and even wars, to the aggravation of social turmoil and to the rise of social revolutions, such as those that have occurred in the 20th century.

The urgency of the socialist cause

The imperialists themselves and local reactionaries in the dominated countries, including their ideologues and propagandists, admit that the current conditions

of global recession generate social unrest and political turmoil. The present crisis of the world capitalist system is the worst since the end of World War II and bears characteristics comparable to those that led to World War I and World War II. The severity of the crisis is such that the call for revolution and for socialism has become urgent.

The objective conditions of worsening socioeconomic and political crisis in the world capitalist system are favorable for the building or rebuilding of the Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary mass movements that aim for the realization of socialism.

All the basic contradictions in the world today are sharpening. These include those between the imperialist countries and the oppressed peoples and nations, among the imperialist countries and between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The sharpest among these contradictions is that between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations. The worst of oppression and exploitation by the imperialists and local reactionaries is unabated in Asia, Africa, Latin America and those former Soviet-bloc countries which have destroyed their industrial foundations and have retrograded into backward social and economic conditions.

In several countries, as in India, Nepal, Turkey, Peru and the Philippines, Marxist-Leninist parties are leading people's wars. These are the advance posts of the world proletarian-socialist revolution because they answer the central question of revolution. They are committed to pursuing the new-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution. There are also other armed revolutionary movements as in Colombia, Mexico, Kurdistan, Eelam, East Timor, Burma, Cambodia, Sudan and the Congo.

However, in most of the countries of the oppressed peoples and nations, the imperialists and reactionaries are one-sidedly unleashing high levels of violence against the people. In many countries, especially in Africa, Central Asia and the Balkans, reactionary forces are engaged in internecine warfare. The widespread conditions of social and political disorder are auspicious for the proletarian revolutionaries to build parties and mass movements.

Remember that the Bolsheviks on their way to the October Revolution were able to rouse popular resistance to the violent character of the czarist rule and take

advantage of its violent contradictions with the oppressed peoples in the Russian empire. So did the Chinese Communist Party avail of the united front against the northern warlords as well as the violent contradictions among the warlords.

The collapse of the “emerging markets” completely discredits not only the notion of the “free market” but also the entire world capitalist system in the same way that this system was previously discredited by the failure of the Keynesian notion of “development”. In the currently sinking markets, contradictions between reactionary forces can also be utilized to generate broad anti-imperialist movements under the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary party.

In the whole of Southeast Asia, the conditions are again fertile for people’s war. In the key country of Indonesia, nationwide mass protests have forced the 32-year long Suharto dictatorship to give way to successors pretending to be more democratic. But the Indonesian people are not satisfied with anything less than the revolutionary solution to undo the military fascist dictatorship. The Filipino people and the Communist Party of the Philippines have demonstrated in the last 30 years that it is possible and necessary to wage a protracted people’s war against US imperialism and the local exploiting classes.

In Northeast Asia, the proletariat in South Korea are taking the forefront in waging general strikes and other militant forms of mass protests. Workers’ strikes and peasant resistance continue to crop up in China. Conditions exist for the development of a genuine communist party to oppose bureaucrat monopoly capitalism and the comprador big bourgeoisie and seize the initiative from the revisionists as well as the blatant anti-communist exponents of bourgeois liberalization of Chinese politics.

In many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, militant workers’ strikes and other forms of mass protests have broken out. Legal mass struggles can prepare for or be coordinated with the effective method of seizing political power. In these days, throughout the world, the proletariat and people of the world are standing up to celebrate the October Revolution, condemn the oppressors and exploiters and cry out for social revolution.

In most countries, republics and regions of the former Soviet bloc countries, there is the resurgence of parties that call themselves Marxist-Leninist amidst the social deterioration and disorder and the game of musical chairs of the revisionists and blatant anti-communists, social-democrats and revisionists. On

October 7, in Russia, a gigantic wave of protest mass actions surged to shake the rule of the criminal new bourgeoisie. Again, the people are mobilizing to celebrate the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Genuine Marxist-Leninists, grasping the revolutionary essence of the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, are bound to arise against the criminal new bourgeoisie and also the looming threat of military fascism in Russia. It is in this vast country, as in China, where the proletarian revolutionaries can draw from the history of successful socialist revolutions and strive to re-establish socialism on a large scale.

Several states retain a high measure of anti-imperialist policy. Some of them, like Cuba and North Korea, resolutely and militantly fight for national independence and socialist aspirations. The imperialists describe them all as rogue states and subject them to aggression, intervention, blockades and threats. By resisting imperialism, they contribute to the advance of the broad anti-imperialist movement.

At this very moment, the imperialist alliance headed by the US is still holding. The imperialist countries combine to oppress and exploit the proletariat and people of the world. But as the crisis of the world capitalist system worsens, their inter-imperialist contradictions sharpen. The imperialist powers have increasing policy differences over economic, financial, political and security matters.

The US has been quite adept at maintaining its chieftainship over the imperialist alliance and at getting the most out of such “free trade” arrangements as the WTO, APEC and NAFTA, expanding the NATO towards the borders of Russia and beefing up the US-Japan security partnership in East Asia, while decreasing US financial obligations and increasing the obligations of its allies.

The stage for interimperialist war is being laid. The NATO is provocatively expanding to the borders of Russia, stirring up complicated violent situations in the former Yugoslavia, in the entire Balkans and in Central Asia. The US is always stirring up troubles in different parts of the world and presenting itself as the final arbiter of “peace”. In the process, it seizes all or most of the spoils of aggression and intervention as in the Middle East, East Asia, South Asia and elsewhere.

The class contradiction between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat is constant. It starts from the extraction of surplus value from labor power in the course of commodity production. As productivity rises, the relative rate of exploitation and mass unemployment also rises.

In the US, sustained workers' strikes in major industries have broken out against downsizing and union-busting. In Western Europe, general strikes of unprecedented scale have emerged against chronically high rates of unemployment, the deterioration of wage and living conditions and the manifestations of racism and neofascism. In Japan, strikes and other forms of mass protest have burst out against the roots and results of the long running stagnation and the impositions of the US and US-Japan security partnership.

In this current period of unbridled neoliberal exploitation and unprecedented bust, the workers in the imperialist countries have all the ground for building Marxist-Leninist parties and launching general strikes and other protest movements. To advance on the road of proletarian revolution, they must fight the monopoly bourgeoisie frontally and seize the initiative from the labor aristocracy, the reformists and revisionists and cast away from the working class the spell of petty-bourgeois mentality.

It ought to be most advantageous and suitable for socialism to be built on the economic and technological foundations previously produced by the proletariat in the imperialist countries. But it is also here where the monopoly bourgeoisie is strongest in reacting to the workers' movement and to the socialist cause.

Protracted legal struggle of the proletariat is necessary in the industrial capitalist countries. So far, the proletariat in such countries has seized power from the bourgeoisie in connection with inter-imperialist wars. But in the protracted class struggle of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, any of the basic contradictions can push the rapid development of the other basic contradictions.

The revolutionary movement of the proletariat and people in the imperialist countries is more than ever dialectically interconnected with that in the dominated countries. This interconnection has a potential of spiralling in basic correspondence to the accelerated intensity and expansion of the world capitalist crisis induced by the use of ever higher technology for profit and the most avaricious methods of monopoly capitalist exploitation.

The urgency of the socialist cause is clear because of the tremendously higher social productivity fettered by monopoly capitalism and because of the bitter consequences of imperialist globalization now ravaging the entire world. The current crisis of monopoly capitalism is bound to persist with the chronic overproduction, chronic mass unemployment and chronic abuse of finance capital.

As the great Lenin has taught us, we are in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. This is the era of moribund capitalism and social revolution. We are in this era, especially so because revisionist betrayal of socialism and the aggravation of imperialist exploitation and oppression drive the proletariat and the people of the world to fight for socialism and to further develop the ways of staying firmly on the road of socialism.

The struggle for socialism takes a whole historical epoch. There are advances and retreats, twists and turns, in this struggle. Wherever the Red flag falls, the proletariat picks it up in order to advance. The chronic crisis of imperialism always generates the conditions for the subjective forces of the revolution to regain strength and surge forward.

The undeniable bankruptcy of “free market” globalization engenders excellent conditions for proletarian revolutionaries to carry forward the revolutionary cause of socialism. The ground is well laid out for the resurgence and advance of the world proletarian revolution and the broad anti-imperialist movement.

Contradictions in the World Capitalist System

and the Necessity of Socialist Revolution

Brussels International Communist Seminar

May 3, 2001

My assignment is to analyze the new economic, political and social contradictions that have emerged in the world capitalist system in recent decades and to present the necessity of socialist revolution and the contradictions in the process of realizing socialism.

I propose to give a brief historical background on the stages of the general crisis of monopoly capitalism or imperialism in the 20th century. Then, I concentrate on the last two decades of that century and up to the present. Finally, I deal with the necessity of waging the socialist revolution. In brief, I shall discuss the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

This era continues and will continue for a long time to come. The epochal struggle between the proletariat and the monopoly bourgeoisie has by no means stopped, despite the revisionist betrayal of socialism and restoration of capitalism in former socialist countries. The general crisis of world capitalism has in fact entered a new stage.

I shall deal with the basic contradictions in the imperialist system: those between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat in imperialist countries, those among the imperialist powers and those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed nations and peoples.

The General Crisis of the World Capitalist System

As Lenin pointed out, imperialism is the highest and final stage of capitalism. It is an utterly parasitic and moribund kind of capitalism. The monopoly

bourgeoisie is a rentier class. Apart from owning capital, it contributes nothing to the process of social production but reaps profits from the extraction of surplus value and from the export of surplus goods and surplus capital.

In the few countries where monopoly capitalism became dominant after developing from free competition capitalism, industrial capital merged with bank capital to make the ruling bourgeoisie fundamentally a financial oligarchy. On top of the export of surplus manufactures, the export of surplus capital in the form of direct and indirect investments gains importance.

The monopoly firms of each imperialist country look after their own interests. But they combine and compete with those of other imperialist countries for control of the sources of raw materials, fields of investments, markets and positions of strength. The monopoly firms in various imperialist countries have always engaged in global expansion and in various combinations, such as cartels, trusts, syndicates, mergers and alliances. The phenomenon of the so-called multinational corporation is not new. What is new is the magnification and intensification of the phenomenon.

The imperialist states protect and promote the interest of their respective monopoly bourgeoisie and the various international combinations into which it goes. They maintain a power structure between imperialist and client-states in charge of an economic structure by which the monopoly bourgeoisie can exploit the proletariat and the oppressed nations and peoples.

Since the beginning of the 20th century, no part of the world has remained uncovered by one or several imperialist powers. The world has become too small for monopoly capitalism. It is pure nonsense to speak of globalization as if it were a new phenomenon. Monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism has always operated on an international scale, first appropriating the old colonial methods and then using the methods of neocolonialism. to nullify the formal independence of former colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries.

The imperialist powers struggle constantly among themselves for economic territory. The struggle for a redivision of the world intensifies when the crisis of overproduction intensifies and at worst breaks out into inter-imperialist wars.

The aggressive and rapacious character of imperialism made the 20th century the most exploitative and the most violent in the entire history of mankind. But the

economic crisis, repression and world wars generated by imperialism have also led to anti-imperialist and class struggles and to proletarian revolution. The general crisis of the world capitalist system has undergone three stages, culminating in social upheavals and revolutionary victories of the proletariat and the rest of the people.

On the way to the first inter-imperialist war, the monopoly bourgeoisie of the various imperialist countries accelerated the international flow of investments and trade, the concentration of capital and the use of state monopoly capitalism to aid private monopoly capital. It sought to override the domestic crisis of overproduction and the intensifying class struggle between itself and the proletariat by clamoring for a bigger share of the world market.

Imperialist powers that had more colonial possessions raised the anachronistic flag of "free trade" to camouflage their own protectionism while those that had less were blatantly protectionist and demanded to have a greater share of global economic territory. One group of imperialist powers was driven by economic competition and economic rivalry to make war preparations and to collide violently with another group as the struggle for a redivision of the world sharpened.

The first stage of the crisis of the world capitalist system was characterized by crisis leading to inter-imperialist war and by inter-imperialist war leading to revolutionary civil war and further on to the triumph of the proletarian revolution in Russia, the weakest link in the chain of imperialist powers. For the proletariat and the people, the happy ending of the first stage of the crisis of the world capitalist system was the establishment of the first socialist state in one-sixth of the globe.

As soon as the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 triumphed, the imperialist powers banded together against the Soviet state and launched a multinational war of intervention. The revolutionary alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry withstood the attacks of the imperialist powers and enabled the Bolsheviks to take advantage of inter-imperialist contradictions in order to preserve and consolidate the gains of the proletarian revolution.

The Soviet Union faced continuous encirclement, embargo and the threat of intervention. But it succeeded in solving the problems of socialist revolution and construction, going through the period of New Economic Policy and proceeding

to a series of five-year plans of socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization and mechanization.

After World War I, the world capitalist system entered the second stage of its general crisis. Eventually, the Great Depression started in 1929, preceded by the boom years of the "new era". It was an extended crisis of overproduction and financial collapse. It generated an unprecedentedly intense class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat in imperialist countries, fierce inter-imperialist contradictions and renewed war preparations, the rise of fascism and the invigoration of national liberation movements in colonies and semi-colonies.

The slogans of "free market" and "free trade" were discredited as all imperialist powers proclaimed the need for state intervention and protectionism in economic affairs. State monopoly capitalism had in fact grown far from its embryonic stage at the advent of the era of modern imperialism. The imperialist state increasingly used public finance to provide contracts and subsidies to the private monopolies and build armies for aggression.

To cope with the Great Depression, the imperialist powers turned to what would be conveniently called Keynesianism. This pertains to the use of state intervention and stress on fiscal policy in order to pump-prime, stabilize and stimulate the domestic economies of the imperialist countries. The state undertook public works to generate employment and raise consumption, provided contracts and subsidies to private monopoly firms or nationalized them for a while in order to justify the delivery of public resources to the monopoly bourgeoisie.

Independently of the British economist John Maynard Keynes, the New Deal economists of US president Franklin Delano Roosevelt devised state intervention through public works projects and so did Schacht of Hitlerite Germany. In Anglo-American economic history, Keynes took credit for providing the conscious theorizing and mathematical formulations for state intervention through a fiscal policy of pump-priming.

Until the 1970s, the US monopoly bourgeoisie cited Keynesianism as the policy for using the state to cope with the crisis of monopoly capitalism, to combat the rise of the working-class movement and socialism, to build a strong military machinery and to frustrate the demand of underdeveloped countries for industrial

development. But Keynesianism has never succeeded in solving the fundamental crisis of monopoly capitalism.

On the way to the second inter-imperialist war, as the entire world capitalist system was gripped by a grave economic crisis, the imperialist powers engaged in intense war preparations. Rather than Keynesian public works, war production would revive the depressed US economy during World War II just as war production had buttressed the more aggressive schemes of Germany and other Axis powers.

Hitlerite Germany stood out as the most brutal enemy of the world proletariat as it destroyed the German communist party, promoted fascist counterrevolution on an international scale and proceeded to launch the war of aggression aimed at destroying the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Union prevailed. It made heavy sacrifices but delivered the most fatal blows on the German invasionary forces and broke the backbone of the entire lot of Axis Powers.

World War II would be settled in favor of the Allied powers mainly because of the decisive role of the Soviet Union. For the proletariat and people, the happy ending of the second stage of the crisis of the world capitalist system was the emergence of several socialist countries and the great upsurge of national liberation movements.

As a late entrant in the war, whose exports had fed the war production of both Allied and Axis powers, the US emerged from World War II as the strongest economic and military power among the imperialists. US policymakers feared that a grave US economic crisis would follow should its war production end or slow down. The fear was compounded by fear of the unprecedented rise of several socialist countries and the national liberation movements. Thus, the US was in a hurry to declare the Cold War, confront the Soviet Union, intervene in China and launch a war of aggression on Korea.

In the aftermath of World War II, it was quite easy to recognize that the world capitalist system had gone through two stages of its general crisis, each breaking out in an inter-imperialist war and leading to proletarian revolution. It was also easy to discern that the world capitalist system was moving into the third stage of its general crisis as a consequence of the ravages of war and the continuing rise of revolutionary forces.

In the Moscow meetings of communist and working-class parties in 1957 and 1960, there was a general sense that the newly emergent socialist camp would defeat the capitalist camp. There was high optimism that the cause of socialism and national liberation would make further great advances in the rest of the 20th century. Indeed, great advances would be made. The people's democracies engaged in socialist revolution and construction among one-third of humanity. Many countries in Asia and Africa declared their national independence.

In waging the Cold War, the US maintained military bases and troops abroad and built military alliances like the NATO, the US-Japan security alliance, CENTO and SEATO. It stepped up military research and development, challenged the Soviet Union to an arms race and engaged in bullying, intervention and aggression. By breaking the nuclear monopoly of the US in 1949, the Soviet Union neutralized US nuclear blackmail.

Compelled by its strategy of containing the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp, the US promoted the reconstruction of Germany and Japan as soon as the Cold War started. Subsequently, the rapid revival of Japanese and German industrial production gave rise to another crisis of overproduction and finance capital. Recessions became more recurrent. The heavy costs of military production and overseas military forces and the market accommodations to its imperialist allies undermined the US economy.

The phenomenon of stagflation (simultaneous stagnation and inflation) afflicted the US economy throughout the decades of the 1970s. The proponents of monetarism and neoliberalism gained favor among US policymakers as they harped on the failure of Keynesianism and blamed the working class for so-called wage inflation and the government for supposedly big social spending. All along they obscured the cost-push effect of military deployment overseas, wars of aggression and the arms race.

The powerful trend of national independence against colonialism, imperialism and neocolonialism, combined with the world proletarian revolution to challenge US imperialism and the world capitalist system. With the US at the head, the imperialist powers were obliged to increasingly adopt neocolonialism, in order to co-opt the newly-independent countries. They negated the independence of these countries through control of their economy, finances, security forces and cultural institutions.

They waved the flag of "development" under the auspices of the UN, the IMF and World Bank and used the Eurodollar and then petrodollar surpluses to hook most of the newly-independent countries into heavy foreign borrowing for infrastructure-building and improvement of raw-material production for export. These served to draw the third world countries away from industrial development and frustrate their demands for a new international economic order.

Consequently, the mounting crisis of overproduction in raw materials and foreign debt debilitated these third world countries. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the imperialist powers also used brutal puppet regimes to suppress the people when neo-colonial methods of economic and financial manipulation did not suffice.

The world proletarian revolution and the broad anti-imperialist movement reached their peak in the simultaneous advance of the wars of national liberation in Indochina and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China from the 1960s to the 1970s. For the proletariat and people, the victories of these revolutions were the happy ending of the third stage of the crisis of the world capitalist system. However, they overlapped with the continuous deterioration of economic, social and political conditions in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe due to the betrayal of socialism by the ruling revisionists since 1956.

From the latter half of the 1970s, the adverse consequences of the betrayal of socialism became conspicuous. In the Soviet Union, the rise of the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie and the arms race led to an all-round deterioration of the Soviet economy, especially agricultural production and civil industrial production. Factors for the disintegration of the Soviet-bloc countries were stimulated by foreign loans and trade concessions from the West, especially West Germany.

In China, the Dengist ruling clique rose to power and reversed the socialist line of Mao soon after his death. Since then, China has openly restored capitalism faster and in a more deep going way than had the Soviet Union from the time of Khrushchov. The Dengist line of counterrevolution harped on the big comprador line of modernization through integration into the world capitalist system.

The betrayal of socialism by revisionist ruling cliques is definitely a strategic setback for the socialist cause. But it does not spell the end of the socialist cause. On the contrary, it means the aggravation and deepening of the general crisis of

the world capitalist system. This system cannot accommodate too many industrial capitalist countries without aggravating the crisis of overproduction.

The conversion of socialist countries to capitalism does not simply mean more ground for capitalist expansion. Under conditions of monopoly capitalism, the increase in the number of capitalist countries with some industrial base, means the increased recurrence of the crisis of overproduction. This leads to economic stagnation, destruction of productive forces and political turmoil not only in the less developed industrial capitalist countries, but also in the entire capitalist world.

In the latter half of the 1970s, the world capitalist system entered the fourth stage of its general crisis. The imperialist, the revisionist-ruled and the third world countries, were generally afflicted by economic, social and political crisis and proceeded on a course of continuous deterioration.

Our Current International Work

and Internationalist Tasks

**Contribution to the 14th International Communist Seminar,
Brussels, 2-4 May 2005**

The Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) is leading the Filipino proletariat and people in two stages of the Philippine revolution. The current stage is that of the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war. The next stage, which is the socialist revolution, can commence upon the basic completion of the new-democratic revolution through the nationwide seizure of political power.

At the core of the people's democratic state system, based on the worker-peasant alliance, is the dictatorship of the proletariat, which has for its main component the people's army under the direction and control of the working class. The transition from capitalism to socialism can be achieved only through the dictatorship of the proletariat for a whole historical epoch.

In carrying out the Philippine revolution, the CPP, the proletariat and entire people perform simultaneously tasks that are distinguishably national revolutionary and internationalist in character. The performance and fulfilment of both tasks advance the world people's struggle against imperialism and the world proletarian revolution for socialism and communism.

The revolutionary struggle of Filipino communists, the proletarians and semi-proletarians in the Philippines is part and parcel of the revolutionary struggle of

the world proletariat and people and contributes to the advance of the global anti-imperialist movement and the world proletarian-socialist revolution. Our victories are the victories of the world proletariat and people. So are their victories our victories.

Before and after the reestablishment of the CPP in 1968, the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries and the masses that they led have undertaken militant propaganda and mass actions in support of all and each one of the revolutionary struggles against imperialism and reaction. In certain instances, the CPP has provided some limited number of cadres and technical assistance to help other parties. But the most significant support that the CPP and the Filipino have so far extended to other people's revolutionary movements is the advance of the Philippine revolution.

The CPP has received significant moral and material support from parties that uphold the principles of proletarian class struggle and revolution, class dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian internationalism. The support includes cadre training and some material and technical assistance. But no amount of foreign assistance can ever be comparable to the sweat and blood of the Filipino revolutionaries and masses. Foreign assistance could even be harmful and counterproductive if it comes under wrong preconditions, if it is inappropriate or if it is indigestible.

In strategic terms, material support that we have received from abroad has hardly amounted to one per cent of the total resources that we have raised self-reliantly through fighting and mass work. In fact, our biggest foreign supplier of weapons unwittingly is the Pentagon. The US-supplied weapons are taken in the course of tactical offensives from the US puppet troops of the Armed Forces of the Philippines and the police and paramilitary forces of the enemy.

Sense of history

We Filipino communists have an acute sense of history. We are always conscious of the need to draw principles, lessons and inspiration from revolutionary theory and practice as developed by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao and other revolutionary thinkers and leaders and by the great revolutionary masses of the proletariat and semi-proletariat.

On the basis of the revolutionary experience of the Filipino people and the

Philippine trade union movement, Crisanto Evangelista and other comrades founded the CPP for the first time in 1930. They were inspired by the Great October Socialist Revolution and the Third International. But they had no explicit directive from the Third International for the founding even as American and Chinese cadres of the Third International had since the 1920s encouraged and facilitated the participation of worker and peasant delegates in conferences in Moscow, Canton and Shanghai.

Under the guidance of the antifascist Popular Front policy of the Third International, cadres of the Communist Party of the USA made representations to the US-Commonwealth government of Quezon in 1936-37 for the release of communist leaders from prison and exile. They also advised the merger of the Communist and Socialist parties in 1938 that combined their respective worker and peasant mass followings.

The Right opportunist influence of Earl Browder penetrated the CPP not because of the Third International but because of the influence of the CPUSA on the CSMP general secretary Dr. Vicente Lava, who was a former CPUSA member. The Browderite line of “peace and democracy” undermined the revolutionary resolve of the Communist-Socialist Merger Party (CSMP) after the dissolution of the Third International in 1943.

The CSMP had a limited knowledge of the struggle against Titoite revisionism in the Communist Information Bureau from 1948 onwards. Then, it was preoccupied with domestic issues, the growing attacks on the revolutionary forces and people and eventually the outbreak of civil war. The second Lava brother to become general secretary, Jose Lava, sought to carry the “Left” opportunist line of quick military victory in two years’ time, without painstaking mass work and solid mass organizing. Within the same two years, from 1950 to 1952, this line resulted in the destruction of the main units of the people’s army based in camps in the unpopulated Sierra Madre.

The third Lava brother to become the general secretary, Dr. Jesus Lava, adopted a Right opportunist line under the weight of defeat and pessimism. Subsequently, he increasingly came under the influence of Khrushovite revisionism. The CSMP continuously weakened as a result of the 1955 policy seeking to liquidate the people’s army and the 1957 single-file policy seeking to liquidate the CSMP. Before 1960, the CSMP was practically dead, with the general secretary merely hiding himself in Manila and with no party branch and revolutionary mass

movement left.

Dr. Jesus Lava took interest in forming an “executive committee” to revive the CSMP in 1962 only after becoming encouraged by a student demonstration of 5000 students that literally broke up the 1961 anti-communist congressional hearings against “subversive” writings in university publications in 1961. He invited Comrade Amado Guerrero to represent the youth in the committee in 1962, after he came from a few months of open language study and clandestine revolutionary studies in Indonesia.

The young proletarian revolutionary cadres led by Comrade Amado Guerrero had studied Marxism-Leninism independently of the CSMP. They studied Philippine history and current circumstances and the secretly available writings of Filipino communists since Crisanto Evangelista. They gained access to Marxist-Leninist literature and to the Soviet and Chinese literature through Indonesia. They studied the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and Moscow Statement of 1960 and the developing ideological debate and other contradictions between the CPSU and the Communist Party of China (CPC).

In 1967, the contradictions between the proletarian revolutionaries and the Lava revisionist clique came to a head principally over questions of Party history and strategy and tactics and secondarily over questions in the Sino-Soviet ideological debate. The proletarian revolutionaries had gained the majority of young and senior Party cadres and members.

They published their Marxist-Leninist position in Beijing Review on May 1, 1967. The Lava faction published their revisionist position in the Prague-based pro-Soviet Information Bulletin.

Comrade Amado Guerrero and other proletarian revolutionaries re-established the CPP under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in 1968. The congress of reestablishment was grounded on a thoroughgoing critique of the ideological, political and organizational errors of the Lava brothers from 1942 onwards and the phenomenon of modern revisionism centred in the CPSU. Our Party declared its adherence to the principle of proletarian internationalism and regarded its revolutionary struggle and victories as contribution to the world anti-imperialist struggle and the world proletarian revolution.

We criticized and repudiated the revisionist notion that the proletariat had already accomplished its historic mission in the Soviet Union. We denounced as bourgeois populism the Khrushchovite ideas of “party of the whole people” and “state of the whole people” and as bourgeois pacifism and reformism the slogans of “peaceful transition”, “peaceful economic competition” and “peaceful coexistence” (harped on as the general line as opposed to proletarian internationalism in international relations).

When Brezhnev was in power from 1964 to 1982, our Party exposed him for extending the work of Khrushchov in bourgeoisifying the politics, economy, culture, defense and international relations of the Soviet Union. From 1966 onwards, we upheld and supported Mao’s theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to combat revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism through the great proletarian cultural revolution.

Our Party holds the view that the revisionist line gained ascendance in the CPSU under Khrushchov and Brezhnev and paved the way for Gorbachov to destroy every semblance of socialism under his regime. Likewise in China, Right opportunism and revisionism gained ascendance as to allow the Right opportunists and revisionists to sabotage the cultural revolution and pave the way for the reversal of the proletarian revolutionary line of Mao and for the restoration of capitalism soon after his death.

More than any other factor, it is the ideological and political degeneration of the ruling party and state bureaucracy that has destroyed socialism. We must recognize this fact and study how for a number of decades socialism could be built against tremendous odds and how for another number of decades the gradual peaceful restoration of capitalism could occur through the ideological and political degeneration of the party and state bureaucracy. We need to use the Marxist-Leninist principles explicated by Lenin, Stalin and Mao to examine the growth of revisionism and the consequent destruction of socialism.

Anti-revisionist Struggle and Cultural Revolution: Consequence to the Communist Party of the Philippines

**Delivered at the International Forum on The Great
Proletarian Cultural Revolution and Lessons to the
Working Class Movement**

April 1, 2007

I wish to speak on the significance and relevance of the Marxist-Leninist struggle against modern revisionism since 1956 and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) since 1966. And I wish to deal with this large subject by examining the impact and consequences of the aforesaid historic events to the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP).

May I declare at the outset that the resoluteness, militancy, resilience and victories of the CPP have been immeasurably inspired by the anti-revisionist struggle and the GPCR led by Comrade Mao. These have contributed to the strong foundation of the CPP, its invincibility and victories in the course of struggle in the last 38 years and its unwavering confidence in the resurgence of socialism and the ultimate victory of communism.

The struggle against modern revisionism

in 1963 the Filipino revolutionaries began to sum up and analyze the historical experience of the communist party of the Philippine islands (1930 to 1938) and the old merger party of the communist and socialist parties (1938 to 1968). We sought to resume the armed revolution and to know why this had failed previously.

We were guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and revolution and we were certainly deeply influenced by the works of Comrade Mao on the new democratic revolution through people's war. Revolutionary storms were rapidly developing in Southeast Asia and elsewhere.

At that time, the struggle between the Marxist-Leninist line and the line of modern revisionism had already broken out, mainly between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and Communist Party of China (CPC). We the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries stood up for the Marxist-Leninist line, even as some of the key cadres in the old merger party insisted that the CPSU and the CPC were not in contradiction over fundamental revolutionary principles but were debating merely about methods of struggle.

Such cadres would later become well-defined as the Lava revisionist renegades in 1967. Having failed to rebuild the old merger party since it was crushed in the years of 1950 to 1952 and practically liquidated since 1957, they had no choice for a while but to have amicable relations with the proletarian revolutionaries who were leading the newly-formed branches of the old merger party, the major mass organizations and the resurgent anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and civil libertarian mass movement.

We the proletarian revolutionaries were determined to develop the mass movement in order to carry out the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war under the leadership of the working-class party. We were strongly opposed to the Khrushchovite revisionist line of bourgeois populism ("party of the whole people" and "state of the whole people") and bourgeois pacifism ("peaceful transition", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful co-existence").

We held the position that Khrushchov had vilified and totally negated Stalin under the pretext of rejecting the "cult of personality" in order to attack Marxism-Leninism and socialism. We became aware of Comrade Mao's criticism in April 1956 of Khrushchov's anti-Stalin speech in February 1956 and

the debate on the issues in the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings of communist and workers' parties. We eagerly studied the wide range of issues that emerged in the open debate between the Communist Party of China (CPC) and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the early 1960s.

We became aware of the decentralizing and confused reorganizations done in the Soviet party, state, economy and culture in order to subvert Marxism-Leninism and socialism. We saw as wrong Khrushchov's admiration for Titoite revisionism, which included rejection of land reform and central planning. We saw through the economism and opportunism in Khrushchov's promise of achieving communism in twenty years by changing the material and cultural foundation of Soviet society through bourgeois economic reforms.

We were indignant over Khrushchov's policies towards other countries. He cancelled all the agreements and blueprints of economic cooperation with China in retaliation for the anti-revisionist line of the CPC in the ideological debate. He refused to extend effective support to the preparations and efforts of the Vietnamese people to wage a war of national liberation against US imperialism and its puppets. He encouraged the revisionists in Eastern Europe to take power and change policies. He promoted the practice of neocolonialism. in relations with the countries in Eastern Europe, and Asia.

As a result of obvious bungs, Khrushchov was deposed and replaced by Brezhnev in 1964. Some of the old cadres who had believed that the debate between the CPSU and the CPC was only about methods of struggle thought that the ascendance of Brezhnev meant a consolidation of the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the practice of socialist revolution and construction because of the renewed Soviet revolutionary phrase-mongering and the recentralization of the ministries decentralized by Khrushchov.

We understood what Khrushchovism without Khrushchov meant. Brezhnev widened the revisionist breaches made by Khrushchov on the ideological, political and organizational line of the Soviet party and on the socialist state, economy and culture even as he recentralized the bureaucracy for the purpose of bureaucrat monopoly capitalism and strengthened the Soviet military for the purpose of big power politics and social imperialism.

What had started as the petty bourgeois social base (including degenerate sections of the bureaucracy and intelligentsia, the new kulaks and merchants)

generated the big bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie and its retinue of criminal big bourgeois in the private sector who manipulated and stole from state enterprises and warehouses and who increased their role in domestic and foreign trade.

The summing-up and analysis of the history of the old merger party matured among the proletarian revolutionaries towards the end of 1965. Earlier the Executive Committee of the old merger had assigned this speaker to draft the general report for a new congress of the old merger party. I included the evaluation of the old merger party in terms of the Marxist-Leninist ideological line, the general political line of people's democratic revolution and the organizational line of democratic centralism.

The draft general report sparked a debate and a division in the old merger party between the proletarian revolutionaries or the Marxist-Leninists and the Lava revisionists. The issues involved mainly how the series of Lavaite leaders in the old merger party had caused one disaster after another, how they had been afflicted by subjectivism and opportunism, how they failed to develop the Party, the people's army and the united front as weapons of the revolution and how they neglected land reform, armed struggle and mass base building as integral components of the armed revolution.

The Marxist-Leninists completely broke away from the Lava revisionist renegade in April 1967. They issued a declaration on May 1, 1967 and announced the plan to re-establish the Communist Party of the Philippine (CPP). The Lava revisionists also issued their own declaration. The Marxist-Leninists launched what is now called the First Great Rectification Movement based on the document, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party. They also formulated a new Party Constitution and the Program for a People's Democratic Revolution in order to establish the Communist Party of the Philippines on December 26, 1968, under the theoretical guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

The reestablishment of the CPP was benefited by the struggle of Marxist-Leninists against the Lava revisionist renegades and by the international struggle led by Comrade Mao against the modern revisionism centered in the Soviet Union. Furthermore, it was benefited by Comrade Mao's theory and practice of the continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship, through the Great

Proletarian Cultural Revolution begun in 1966, in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism.

Of course, there was a big difference between re-establishing the Communist Party of the Philippines for the immediate purpose of leading the people's democratic revolution and the phenomenon of the GPCR in socialist China. But we the Marxist-Leninists in the Philippines deeply appreciated the GPCR as the process of preventing the restoration of capitalism in socialist countries and we recognized the great benefit of acquiring foresight and confidence in the historical development of socialism, up to the threshold of communism.

We understood that Comrade Mao brought the theoretical and practical development of Marxism-Leninism to a new and higher level by putting forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship as the way to ensure the ultimate victory of communism. We had the advantage of sending delegations to China during the GPCR. We had the opportunity to observe the process and listen to the explanations.

Comrade Mao had learned from the earlier experience of the Soviet Union that one could err as Stalin did to declare prematurely the end of classes and class struggle, except the struggle between imperialism and the Soviet people, just because by legal and economic definition capitalists and landlords no longer existed in the Soviet Union. After Stalin, the Soviet revisionist party consistently proclaimed that the mission of the working class had been accomplished. The Chinese revisionists also declared that the class struggle was dying out.

Mao recognized the dangers and disastrous results of denying the existence of classes and class struggle in socialist society and presuming a short socialist transition from capitalism to communism. He stressed that class struggle is the key link and revolutionary politics must be in command. He pointed to the teachings of Lenin that socialism entails a whole historical epoch and that after its defeat in a country the bourgeoisie resists socialism more fiercely by ten-thousand-fold, regroups and tries to recover strength in any social sphere or institution to which it can withdraw and keeps availing of the assistance and influence of the international bourgeoisie.

The danger of capitalist restoration comes not only from the remnants of the old bourgeoisie and landlords but from the political degeneration of revolutionary veterans as well as from the children of the workers and peasants who become

well educated formally and rise up within the party, state, economy and culture but who become alienated from the working people and take on the petty bourgeois way of acting and behaving until they become full-fledged revisionists.

Having been the pioneer in socialist revolution and construction, the Soviet Union enjoyed great prestige and influence in China after the victory of the Chinese revolution. Quite a number of Chinese revolutionary leaders worshipped the Soviet model, even when this had become outdated, was inapplicable to Chinese conditions or was characterized by revisionism. Then after the 1949 victory of the Chinese revolution, many Chinese students and workers went to the Soviet Union for education and training, exactly when revisionism was gaining ground and upon their return acquired key positions in the bureaucracy and the Party.

The theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship was impelled by the need to counter the phenomenon of Chinese revisionism that arose not only from Chinese conditions but also took inspiration from Soviet revisionism. Mao had to contend with the Chinese revisionists who used the CPC Eighth Party Congress to undercut the socialist line and who opposed and tried to derail the Great Leap Forward and then the Socialist Education Movement.

Mao put forward the theory and practice of continuing the revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to revolutionize both the social base and the superstructure of Chinese socialism and ensure the leading position of the working class and its Party, to undertake the cultural revolution as the most extensive form of democracy ever experienced by humankind, to unite the entire Party, proletariat and people against the Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road, to provide the youth with revolutionary experience and train them as revolutionary successors, to continue resolving the contradictions between mental and physical work, between workers and peasants and between town and country, to unite the cadres, the masses and experts in factories, to build the rural industries and expand the scale of the communes, to develop intimate links with the masses and to build the revolutionary people's committees on a new basis.

Without the GPCR, the socialist line of Mao would have been reversed earlier by the Chinese revisionists. But in carrying out the GPCR, Comrade Mao, the Marxist-Leninists and the entire Chinese people won resounding victories

against the revisionists in the ten-year course of the GPCR from 1966 to 1976. The class struggle between the two sides continued to intensify and was not resolved completely. The revisionists were able to maneuver and fight, to make trouble and make a comeback. This explains why soon after the death of Mao the Marxist-Leninists lost power and the revisionists came to power through the combination of the Rightists and Centrists.

Certain errors and shortcomings in the course of the GPCR, enabled the revisionists to gain advantage and maneuver. Factional groupings and factional fighting arose and were at times confusing to the masses. In the course of the mass movement, due process was not rigorously respected and some people suffered persecution. At certain crucial junctures, the Left did not win over the Middle in order to isolate and defeat the Right. Thus, the Right could take advantage of ultra-Left attacks on the Middle. The centrists hardened and succeeded in intrigue at the expense of the Left and the Left split a number of times. With the help of the centrists, the Rightists gained ground and were restored to high offices as early as 1971.

In the Soviet experience, after the death of Stalin, the revisionists came to power after a series of splits among the successors loyal to Stalin from 1954 to 1956. For a long while, from 1956 to 1989, the revisionists pretended to improve on socialism by adopting capitalist reforms. It would only be in 1991 that they openly discarded the flag of the Communist Party, attack the name of Lenin and the entire legacy of Lenin and Stalin, legalize the accumulated capital in the hands of a few and accelerate the full-blown restoration of capitalism. Since then, Russia and other republics of the former Soviet have undergone unprecedented economic, social, political and cultural degradation. So have the former satellites of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe.

Up to the present, the Communist Party of China remains in power but since the 1976 coup it has completely departed from the revolutionary road under the leadership of Comrade Mao. It has flagrantly adopted and promoted capitalism since the unbridled re-commodification of Chinese labor power, the dismantling of the commune system and the opening to foreign direct investments. Chinese state-owned industries have been dismantled in a big way in favor of private enterprises. The ownership of land is still formally public but in fact the land is made available on a widescale for capitalist profit.

The Chinese economy is extremely lopsided. The foreign-owned sweatshops

proliferate in the eastern coast and private construction projects go on in the cities. But the underdevelopment and poverty of most parts of China have deepened and aggravated. Unemployment is rampant. Chinese in huge numbers have been laid off from the dissolved state-owned enterprises. Hundreds of millions of Chinese are migrant workers with extremely low wages and without rights. The peasant masses live under conditions similar to or worse than those before the victory of the revolution in 1949. China may be described as a neo-colonial adjunct of the economically far superior imperialist countries if one were to observe the increasing compradorization and refeudalization of its economy.

At the same time, there are those who describe China as an emerging imperialist country in certain respects and in certain degrees. Chinese monopoly capital, bureaucratic and private, even if increasingly foreign-controlled and big comprador in character, has a dominant position in the Chinese economy. Bank capital is merged with industrial capital to make finance capital to some extent, even as the banking system is overburdened with huge foreign loans as well as with bad industrial and commercial loans and is in the process of increasingly coming under the control of foreign banks through WTO-instituted "reforms".

China's export of surplus capital is still limited in comparison to the foreign investments of the US, Europe and Japan and is certainly too small in comparison to the huge export of goods (mostly with non-Chinese brands) from its sweatshops mainly by China-based foreign monopolies. China participates in alliances with other foreign monopolies through cartels, syndicates and the like but is a mere adjunct of the far more developed imperialist powers. It is not yet a major contender for economic territory (sources of raw materials, markets and fields of investment) and for political territory (colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries).

Perspective of Marxists-Leninists

The full restoration of capitalism in the former socialist countries and the rapid degradation of their economic, social, political and cultural conditions have vindicated the correctness of the anti-revisionist struggle since 1956 and the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through the GPCR. But in the aftermath of the social turmoil in China, the disintegration of revisionist regimes in Eastern Europe and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the imperialists headed by the United States have trumpeted that

socialism is completely and permanently finished and by implication that communists can never recover and learn from the revisionist betrayal of socialism.

The imperialists have unleashed all kinds of ideological, political, economic, social and cultural offensives against the proletariat and the people. They have asserted that private greed is the engine of progress and that social justice is a sure prescription for poverty. They have trumpeted that the cause of socialism is hopeless and futile and that humankind cannot go any farther than the end of history, which is supposed to be capitalism and liberal democracy. They have unleashed "neoliberal globalization" in utter rejection of any social pretense of the bourgeois state and even of state intervention as an anti-crisis device.

In so short a time, however, the US economy, which is most favored by "neoliberal globalization", has plunged into one round of unprecedented crisis after another. Bush has had to add military Keynesianism to neoliberal globalization. But the problem with stepping up military production is that it cannot really stimulate the economy because of its limited employment potential. Furthermore, the wars of aggression in Iraq and Afghanistan have not resulted in stable conditions of super-profit-taking on the coveted oil resources. The people of Iraq are fighting fiercely against US aggression and occupation.

The crisis of the world capitalist system is becoming worse and worse. The economic and financial crisis has led to political crisis and to widespread state terrorism and wars of aggression. These are conditions that compel and impel the proletariat and the people to wage all forms of revolutionary struggle. After all, we are still in the global era of the modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. As of now, anti-imperialist movements for national liberation, democracy and socialism are resurgent.

The proletarian revolutionary parties leading the mass movement are confident that they have the scientific guidance not only for realizing the immediate revolutionary objective but also for the long-term objective of building socialism until communism. Our source of confidence is Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship.

To win the national democratic revolution of a new type as in the Philippines, the Filipino Marxist-Leninists have more than adequate scientific guidance from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. They can also sum up, analyze and learn

lessons from their rich experience of nearly 40 years of continuous people's war. In moving forward to socialism in the future, they can build on their own achievements and can avail themselves of the positive lessons from decades of successful socialist revolution and construction, the anti-revisionist struggle and the GPCR as well as the negative lessons from decades of the betrayal of socialism by the revisionists. In the whole historical epoch of socialism, they can develop their subjective strength and use to their advantage the cumulatively favorable conditions for revolution.

Right now, and in the future, we can cite the worsening crisis of the world capitalist system as a source of our revolutionary optimism and confidence. This crisis is resulting in worse conditions of oppression and exploitation and in chauvinism, racism, religious bigotry, fascism and wars of aggression. These in turn generate the revolutionary resistance of the people. We can still cite the achievements of socialist revolution and construction in the past as an important source of knowledge for building socialism. We can cite further the GPCR as providing us with the basic principles and methods for developing socialism and defeating revisionism until the entire humankind can reach the goal of communism upon the worldwide defeat of imperialism.

Validity and Relevance of the October Revolution

in Response to the Challenges of the 21st Century

Contribution to the International Communist Seminar

Brussels, Belgium, May 4, 2007

I propose to discuss the objective conditions and subjective factors that brought about the October Revolution, the continuing validity of the October Revolution despite the disintegration of the Soviet Union and other revisionist-ruled societies and the validity and relevance of the October Revolution in dealing with the conditions of the 21st century.

1. Objective conditions and subjective factors that brought about the October Revolution

Since the beginning of the 20th century, the world had entered the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. Monopoly capitalism became dominant in the advanced capitalist countries. Finance capital was born out of the merger of bank and industrial capital. The export of surplus capital was gaining importance over the export of surplus goods.

Monopoly firms of the imperialist countries combined and competed with each other through cartels, syndicates and alliances. The colonial and imperialist powers had divided the rest of the world as colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries in political terms and as sources of raw materials, markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence in economic terms. And yet they continued to struggle for a redivision of the world in accordance with the changing balance of forces among them.

Like the bourgeoisie in the era of free competition capitalism, the monopoly bourgeoisie used the slogan of "free trade" to penetrate foreign markets and expand their direct and indirect investments abroad. But in their competition, the

imperialist powers in fact became increasingly protectionist economically and aggressive politically. They were driven by their national self-interest towards the first inter-imperialist war, World War I.

Kautsky and his followers who became dominant in the Second International interpreted the global expansion of imperialist capital as a continuous unilinear process for dissolving pre-capitalist formations and effecting industrial capitalist development in the backward countries. But Lenin correctly pointed to the uneven and spasmodic development of capitalism, the recurrent and worsening crises of overproduction and the decadent, aggressive and destructive character of imperialism.

He opposed the opportunist and revisionist line of Kautsky, which promoted social chauvinism, social pacifism and social imperialism. Having grasped well the lessons of the Paris Commune and the necessity of bringing about the dictatorship of the proletariat through the class struggle, he was well prepared to lead the Bolsheviks, the proletariat and the people in realizing the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia,

This huge country with a few islands of industrial development amidst an ocean of feudalism and medievalism was the weakest among the imperialist powers and was itself an object of penetration and manipulation by the stronger competing imperialist powers. At the same time, it was a real giant oppressor of nations and peoples within the Russian empire. The proletariat and the people had to contend with Czarism, representing feudalism and medievalism, and also with the bourgeoisie dominating the modern industrial sector and trying to head off the revolution.

Lenin saw the impoverished and desperate conditions of Russia as favourable for the advance of the Bolshevik party as the revolutionary party of the proletariat, leading the broad masses of the people to overthrow Czarism and install the democratic republic, rallying the peasant masses as the massive reliable ally of the proletariat through the nationalization of land and land reform and militating the proletariat with the demand for an 8-hour workday.

Lenin was ever conscious of the need to carry out a two-stage revolution, where democracy must first be won against feudalism and repression and where socialism must be subsequently established and developed. For the working class to lead such two-stage revolution, it must be able to build the Red Army

and mobilize the people to smash the military and bureaucratic machinery of the counterrevolutionary state. It must rely on the worker-peasant alliance, including the soldiers of worker and peasant origin. Thus, the Bolsheviks succeeded in defeating Czarism and then the bourgeoisie and in building the first sustainable socialist country on one-sixth of the face of the earth.

2. Validity of the October Revolution despite the disintegration of the Soviet Union and other socialist societies

The October 17 Revolution has come to signify all the great revolutionary achievements of the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin in establishing the proletarian dictatorship as a requisite of socialist revolution, overcoming civil war and foreign military intervention, reviving the economy through transition measures, building socialist industry, collectivizing and mechanizing agriculture, developing the educational and cultural system of the working class, supporting the international communist movement, fighting and defeating fascism and further pursuing socialist revolution and construction in the face of the threats of US imperialism after World War II.

These achievements can never be belittled. Socialist revolutions in Eastern Europe, Asia and elsewhere have been inspired by the October Revolution, the achievements of the Soviet Union and the work of the Third International. The Soviet Union was unquestionably a socialist country for decades from 1917 to 1956. Its great achievements could not be completely undone overnight. It would take decades for the modern revisionists to subvert and dismantle socialism, from the anti-Stalin coup of Khrushchov in 1956 to the undisguised full-scale restoration of capitalism and disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991.

There are principles and lessons to be learned from the positive experiences of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Union as well as from the negative experiences involving the "Left" and Right opportunists (represented by Trotsky and Bukharin, respectively) and modern revisionists from Khrushchov to Gorbachov. From the outside, the imperialists unleashed a series of attacks on the Soviet Union, including the war of foreign intervention, economic and military blockade, the fascist invasion and the Cold War. These did not defeat the Soviet Union. But modern revisionism proved to be the enemy most lethal to the Soviet Union, the main cause of its ultimate destruction.

Insofar as fighting imperialism, classical revisionism and reaction and

undertaking socialist revolution and construction are concerned, the October Revolution and the teachings of Lenin remain valid and relevant to this day. But in fighting modern revisionism, we need to study and learn from the history of the Soviet Union and other former socialist countries the lessons on how the bureaucrats and intellectuals became divorced from the working people and how they abandoned the class struggle and the class stand of the revolutionary proletariat. In this regard, we need to understand the struggle of Mao against modern revisionism since 1956 and his theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat since 1966.

Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution aimed at combatting modern revisionism, preventing the restoration of capitalism and consolidating socialism in China. It won victories in ten years of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, from 1966 to 1976. Although it was eventually defeated, it succeeded in posing the problem of modern revisionism and in presenting certain principles and methods for solving the problem. It offers a great deal for proletarian revolutionaries to learn and further develop in order to explain the disintegration of the former socialist systems and to avert the restoration of capitalism when in the future they shall build and develop socialist societies in various countries until they can defeat imperialism on a global scale and bring about communism.

In this period of the temporary defeat of socialism on a global scale, proletarian revolutionaries must be able to answer the questions of the proletariat and people about the past, present and future of the revolutionary cause of socialism. They must contend with the mocking claims of the imperialists and reactionaries that socialism is dead. Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union and other revisionist-ruled systems, the enemies of socialism have spread notions that are calculated to demoralize the proletariat and the people.

Such notions include the following: that there is no such thing as scientific socialism but only utopian and impracticable socialism, that personal greed rather than social concern can cause social equilibrium and progress, that history can go no further than capitalism and liberal democracy, that the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution is gone, that "neoliberal globalization" is the way to global capitalist development and that the people's struggles for national liberation, democracy and socialism are futile.

In fact, the world has not gone beyond the era of modern imperialism and

proletarian revolution precisely because of the large but temporary defeat of socialism caused by modern revisionism. Global conditions have basically retrogressed to those before the October Revolution when there was yet no socialist country as bulwark of the world proletarian revolution and the imperialist powers seemed to be able to do anything they pleased against the toiling masses.

Upon the rise of modern revisionism and ultimately upon the complete restoration of capitalism in the great socialist states, the conditions of oppression and exploitation of the working people by imperialism and reaction have become far worse than ever before. But the resistance of the people is steadily increasing on a global scale.

In so short a time, the concentration and centralization of capital in the imperialist countries and the chronicity and intensity of economic and financial crisis have become worse than ever before under the auspices of "neoliberal globalization". This has led to the stepping up of military production, state terrorism and wars of aggression. We are practically back to conditions of great disorder in which there was yet no socialist country before World War I but which were the prelude to the emergence of the first socialist country.

So long as there is oppression and exploitation by the monopoly bourgeoisie, there is resistance by the proletariat and people of the world. The epochal struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat continues. So do all the concrete forms of national and class struggles in various countries. The people do not wish the greed of the few to victimize them without end. They fight for national and social liberation from imperialism and reaction. And they strive for greater freedom and social justice to prevail and continue under the principles of scientific socialism.

The need for the revolutionary party of the proletariat continues. It is for leading the proletariat and the people to carry out the revolution in stages on the basis of concrete conditions. It upholds the Marxist-Leninist ideological line against modern revisionism and all forms of subjectivism. It makes sure that the general political line can bring about the victory of democracy and socialism and defeat imperialism and all forms of reaction and is not diverted by either "Left" or Right opportunism. It concentrates the collective will and material strength of the proletarian revolutionaries by following the organizational principle of democratic centralism.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat must arouse, organize and mobilize the broad masses of the people through various forms of struggle. The most important form of struggle is ultimately the smashing of the military and bureaucratic machinery of the counterrevolutionary state and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship or the people's democratic dictatorship under working class leadership, depending on the concrete conditions.

3. Dealing with the conditions and challenges of the 21st century

On the basis of the current conditions and trends that we see clearly, we can be optimistic that in the next decade or so the people will intensify in a dramatic way and on an unprecedented scale their revolutionary struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism against imperialism and reaction. Let us line up the major conditions that proletarian revolutionaries must deal with in the 21st century, particularly in the early decades where we are now. The century will either be too long for great leaps in the cumulative advance of the revolutionary forces or too short for the entire historical epoch needed for socialism to overpower capitalism.

First, let us observe immediately that the disintegration of the revisionist-ruled systems has led to the acute crisis of the world capitalist system and the unbridled oppression and exploitation of the working people by imperialism and reaction. Conspicuously, the US has been in the forefront of generating economic crisis, political turmoil and wars of aggression. It has enjoyed the unprecedented role of being the sole superpower in command of an obviously expanded world capitalist system through the complete integration of nearly all the former revisionist-ruled countries.

But the expansion of the world capitalist system has actually led to an increase in the number of imperialist powers and to the intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions. The world cannot accommodate too many imperialist powers. The US-led imperialist alliance became crisis-stricken, especially with the phenomenon of stagflation, as soon as the World War II losers were reconstructed and strengthened economically in the late 1960s. The addition of Russia, China and India as big players in the playing field of imperialism spells further crisis and troubles for the original Group of 7 and the original OECD countries.

Second, the policy of "neoliberal globalization" has been a big failure in

overcoming the problem of stagflation under Keynesianism and in shoring up the imperialist powers from worse economic and financial crisis. The problem of stagflation is persistent and has been merely covered up by ever rising levels of indebtedness in both imperialist and underdeveloped countries. The imperialist powers headed by the US have applied the policy of "neoliberal globalization" (denationalization, liberalization, privatization and deregulation of economies) at the expense of the world proletariat and the oppressed nations and peoples. And it has aggravated and deepened the crisis of overproduction and of finance capital and pushed the imperialist powers to compete with each other and adopt protectionist measures as in the decades before World War I and likewise before World War II.

The policy of "neoliberal globalization" has caused such worse crisis that the US has resorted to military Keynesianism. The Bush administration has sought to stimulate the US economy by stepping up military production. In this regard, it has also unleashed war hysteria, wars of aggression and state terrorism on a global scale under the pretext of combating terrorism and so-called rogue states. But the problem with high military production is that it has little employment potential. The US has also maintained a high level of consumerism by outsourcing goods, widening current account deficits and incurring an overly large foreign debt.

Third, despite the glaring failure of "neoliberal globalization" which is actually unbridled monopoly greed camouflaged by the petty bourgeois term "free market", the monopoly bourgeoisie continues to misrepresent its ideas and policies in petty bourgeois terms and give full play to petty bourgeois ideology as an instrument to befuddle not only the petty bourgeoisie but also the working people concerning the social, economic, political and cultural realities. Thus, the imperialists are funding and touting the petty bourgeois-run reformist nongovernmental organizations as the "civil society" and as the people's part in the triadic "social accord" of states, big business and a docile population.

The monopoly bourgeoisie is using a wide range of instruments (the cultural and educational system, the mass media, the electoral process, think tanks, policy institutes, charity foundations, religious institutions and so on) for promoting big bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideas in order to counter the resurgence of the proletarian revolutionary ideology and the revolutionary mass movements against imperialism and for socialism. Of course, various petty bourgeois currents masquerading as proletarian, such as classical revisionism (social

democracy), Trotskyism and modern revisionism are still around to assist the monopoly bourgeoisie and trying to outflank the theory and practice of genuine Marxism-Leninism.

But no matter how clever are the ideological and political trappings of the monopoly bourgeoisie, these become futile as the crisis of the world capitalist system worsens and the proletarian revolutionaries and the revolutionary mass movement arise, persevere and further develop the revolutionary struggle. As in the prelude to the October Revolution from the defeat of the 1905 revolution to the February revolution in 1917 when the Bolsheviks appeared to be small and weak, their proletarian revolutionary descendants of today appear likewise, especially in the aftermath of the disintegration of the revisionist-ruled systems from 1989 to 1991. But once more the objective conditions are favourable for the resurgence of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat and the people.

Fourth, the use of higher technology in production and consumption under the auspices of "neoliberal globalization" has accelerated the concentration and centralization of capital in a few imperialist countries. This has aggravated the crisis of overproduction in all types of goods and services. In the aftermath of every crisis of overproduction are the increase of chronic unemployment and the lowering of incomes. The destruction of productive forces is not being segued by any new round of expanding production and re-employment.

The adoption of higher technology by the monopoly bourgeoisie for the purpose of maximizing profits, accumulating capital and reducing the variable capital for labor can only result in aggravating the crisis of overproduction and the narrowing of the market. The higher technology that can be used for determining needs and market demand, expanding production and accelerating distribution is suitable to socialism and not to monopoly capitalism.

The higher technology for collecting, storing, processing and communicating information and knowledge is mainly under the control of the monopoly bourgeoisie. This kind of technology is used to promote monopoly bourgeois ideology and politics with embellishment by petty bourgeois phraseology, to propagate the petty bourgeois ideology of self-interest and to preoccupy the public with the message of consumerism, sports and entertainment. Most of the personal computers and other gadgets for disseminating information are in the hands of the petty bourgeoisie, particularly the professionals and the youth with a high level of formal education. However, as the crisis of the world capitalist

system worsens, the petty bourgeoisie becomes more discontented and more inclined to join up with the working people in progressive alliances against imperialism and reaction.

It is a sign of desperation and weakness that the monopoly bourgeoisie has been driven by crisis and competition to raise profits on new products by commercializing the information technology and other forms of technology that used to be exclusively for the military. Even now these openly available technologies can be used by the revolutionary forces for undertaking information and educational campaigns and for launching tactical offensives. The multi-media based on personal computers have been used to spread revolutionary theory and political messages and to mobilize people for mass actions. The cell phone has been used for precise tactical offensives by revolutionary armies.

Fifth, the contradictions between the working people of the world and the imperialist powers and reactionaries are intensifying. So are those between the countries asserting national independence and the imperialist powers. The imperialist powers are increasingly finding themselves at loggerheads with each other in the political and economic institutions that they have created to harmonize their relations against the working people of the world.

The continuing aggravation of the crisis of the world capitalist system under the policy of "neoliberal globalization" can push the imperialist powers to resort to Keynesianism, to further state monopoly capitalism, intensified monopoly competition and protectionism and to wars of aggression for the redivision of the world. The intensification of the inter-imperialist contradictions generates more favourable conditions for the resistance of the proletariat and people of the world.

Revolutionary parties of the proletariat must lead the resistance of the people in all types of countries, in the imperialist countries and in the dominated countries. The increase of competing imperialist powers deepens the crisis in every imperialist country. The proletariat in every country is driven by worse conditions to intensify resistance through strikes, protest rallies and other concerted actions. The working people and the oppressed nations and peoples suffering the most from imperialist plunder and war are the hardest pressed to rise up in armed revolution.

The crisis conditions of the moment generate the immediate issues of the

struggle against monopoly capitalism and local reaction. But in recruiting and developing party members, the revolutionary parties of the proletariat must inculcate in them the historic mission of building socialism up to the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship. There is the need to counter the propaganda of the enemy that socialism is successful only up to a certain point and then fails. There is the need to assure the proletariat and the people that modern revisionism and the restoration of capitalism can be prevented and that socialism can be consolidated repeatedly until it gains the upper hand over imperialism on a global scale and reaches the threshold of communism.

Validity and Relevance of the October Revolution

in Response to the Challenges of the 21st Century

Address to the Forum to Celebrate the 90th Anniversary of the October Revolution in The Hague, The Netherlands, December 2, 2007

I propose to discuss the objective conditions and subjective factors that brought about the October Revolution, the continuing validity of the October Revolution despite the disintegration of the Soviet Union and other revisionist-ruled societies and the validity and relevance of the October Revolution in dealing with the conditions of the 21st century.

1. Objective conditions and subjective factors that brought about the October Revolution

Since the beginning of the 20th century, the world had entered the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. Monopoly capitalism became dominant in the advanced capitalist countries. Finance capital was born out of the merger of bank and industrial capital. The export of surplus capital was gaining importance over the export of surplus goods.

Monopoly firms of the imperialist countries combined and competed with each other through cartels, syndicates and alliances. The colonial and imperialist powers had divided the rest of the world as colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries in political terms and as sources of raw materials, markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence in economic terms. And yet they continued to struggle for a redivision of the world in accordance with the

changing balance of forces among them.

Like the bourgeoisie in the era of free competition capitalism, the monopoly bourgeoisie used the slogan of "free trade" to penetrate foreign markets and expand their direct and indirect investments abroad. But in their competition, the imperialist powers in fact became increasingly protectionist economically and aggressive politically. They were driven by their national self-interest towards the first inter-imperialist war, World War I.

Kautsky and his followers who became dominant in the Second International interpreted the global expansion of imperialist capital as a continuous unilinear process for dissolving pre-capitalist formations and effecting industrial capitalist development in the backward countries. But Lenin correctly pointed to the uneven and spasmodic development of capitalism, the recurrent and worsening crises of overproduction and the decadent, aggressive and destructive character of imperialism.

He opposed the opportunist and revisionist line of Kautsky, which promoted social chauvinism, social pacifism and social imperialism. Having grasped well the lessons of the Paris Commune and the necessity of bringing about the dictatorship of the proletariat through the class struggle, he was well prepared to lead the Bolsheviks, the proletariat and the people in realizing the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

This huge country with a few islands of industrial development amidst an ocean of feudalism and medievalism was the weakest among the imperialist powers and was itself an object of penetration and manipulation by the stronger competing imperialist powers. At the same time, it was a real giant oppressor of nations and peoples within the Russian empire. The proletariat and the people had to contend with Czarism, representing feudalism and medievalism, and also with the bourgeoisie dominating the modern industrial sector and trying to head off the revolution.

Lenin saw the impoverished and desperate conditions of Russia as favourable for the advance of the Bolshevik party as the revolutionary party of the proletariat, leading the broad masses of the people to overthrow Czarism and install the democratic republic, rallying the peasant masses as the massive reliable ally of the proletariat through the nationalization of land and land reform and militating the proletariat with the demand for an 8-hour workday.

Lenin was ever conscious of the need to carry out a two-stage revolution, where democracy must first be won against feudalism and repression and where socialism must be subsequently established and developed. For the working class to lead such two-stage revolution, it must be able to build the Red Army and mobilize the people to smash the military and bureaucratic machinery of the counterrevolutionary state. It must rely on the worker-peasant alliance, including the soldiers of worker and peasant origin. Thus, the Bolsheviks succeeded in defeating Czarism and then the bourgeoisie and in building the first sustainable socialist country on one-sixth of the face of the earth.

2. Validity of the October Revolution despite the disintegration of the Soviet Union and other socialist societies

The October 17 Revolution has come to signify all the great revolutionary achievements of the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin in establishing the proletarian dictatorship as a requisite of socialist revolution, overcoming civil war and foreign military intervention, reviving the economy through transition measures, building socialist industry, collectivizing and mechanizing agriculture, developing the educational and cultural system of the working class, supporting the international communist movement, fighting and defeating fascism and further pursuing socialist revolution and construction in the face of the threats of US imperialism after World War II.

These achievements can never be belittled. Socialist revolutions in Eastern Europe, Asia and elsewhere have been inspired by the October Revolution, the achievements of the Soviet Union and the work of the Third International. The Soviet Union was unquestionably a socialist country for decades from 1917 to 1956. Its great achievements could not be completely undone overnight. It would take decades for the modern revisionists to subvert and dismantle socialism, from the anti-Stalin coup of Khrushchov in 1956 to the undisguised full-scale restoration of capitalism and disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991.

There are principles and lessons to be learned from the positive experiences of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Union as well as from the negative experiences involving the "Left" and Right opportunists (represented by Trotsky and Bukharin, respectively) and modern revisionists from Khrushchov to Gorbachov. From the outside, the imperialists unleashed a series of attacks on the Soviet Union, including the war of foreign intervention, economic and military blockade, the fascist invasion and the Cold War. These did not defeat the

Soviet Union. But modern revisionism proved to be the enemy most lethal to the Soviet Union, the main cause of its ultimate destruction.

Insofar as fighting imperialism, classical revisionism and reaction and undertaking socialist revolution and construction are concerned, the October Revolution and the teachings of Lenin remain valid and relevant to this day. But in fighting modern revisionism, we need to study and learn from the history of the Soviet Union and other former socialist countries the lessons on how the bureaucrats and intellectuals became divorced from the working people and how they abandoned the class struggle and the class stand of the revolutionary proletariat. In this regard, we need to understand the struggle of Mao against modern revisionism since 1956 and his theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat since 1966.

Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution aimed at combatting modern revisionism, preventing the restoration of capitalism and consolidating socialism in China. It won victories in ten years of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, from 1966 to 1976. Although it was eventually defeated, it succeeded in posing the problem of modern revisionism and in presenting certain principles and methods for solving the problem. It offers a great deal for proletarian revolutionaries to learn and further develop in order to explain the disintegration of the former socialist systems and to avert the restoration of capitalism when in the future they shall build and develop socialist societies in various countries until they can defeat imperialism on a global scale and bring about communism.

In this period of the temporary defeat of socialism on a global scale, proletarian revolutionaries must be able to answer the questions of the proletariat and people about the past, present and future of the revolutionary cause of socialism. They must contend with the mocking claims of the imperialists and reactionaries that socialism is dead. Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union and other revisionist-ruled systems, the enemies of socialism have spread notions that are calculated to demoralize the proletariat and the people.

Such notions include the following: that there is no such thing as scientific socialism but only utopian and impracticable socialism, that personal greed rather than social concern can cause social equilibrium and progress, that history can go no further than capitalism and liberal democracy, that the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution is gone, that "neoliberal globalization" is

the way to global capitalist development and that the people's struggles for national liberation, democracy and socialism are futile.

In fact, the world has not gone beyond the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution precisely because of the large but temporary defeat of socialism caused by modern revisionism. Global conditions have basically retrogressed to those before the October Revolution when there was yet no socialist country as bulwark of the world proletarian revolution and the imperialist powers seemed to be able to do anything they pleased against the toiling masses.

Upon the rise of modern revisionism and ultimately upon the complete restoration of capitalism in the great socialist states, the conditions of oppression and exploitation of the working people by imperialism and reaction have become far worse than ever before. But the resistance of the people is steadily increasing on a global scale.

In so short a time, the concentration and centralization of capital in the imperialist countries and the chronicity and intensity of economic and financial crisis have become worse than ever before under the auspices of "neoliberal globalization". This has led to the stepping up of military production, state terrorism and wars of aggression. We are practically back to conditions of great disorder in which there was yet no socialist country before World War I but which were the prelude to the emergence of the first socialist country.

So long as there is oppression and exploitation by the monopoly bourgeoisie, there is resistance by the proletariat and people of the world. The epochal struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat continues. So do all the concrete forms of national and class struggles in various countries. The people do not wish the greed of the few to victimize them without end. They fight for national and social liberation from imperialism and reaction. And they strive for greater freedom and social justice to prevail and continue under the principles of scientific socialism.

The need for the revolutionary party of the proletariat continues. It is for leading the proletariat and the people to carry out the revolution in stages on the basis of concrete conditions. It upholds the Marxist-Leninist ideological line against modern revisionism and all forms of subjectivism. It makes sure that the general political line can bring about the victory of democracy and socialism and defeat

imperialism and all forms of reaction and is not diverted by either "Left" or Right opportunism. It concentrates the collective will and material strength of the proletarian revolutionaries by following the organizational principle of democratic centralism.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat must arouse, organize and mobilize the broad masses of the people through various forms of struggle. The most important form of struggle is ultimately the smashing of the military and bureaucratic machinery of the counterrevolutionary state and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship or the people's democratic dictatorship under working class leadership, depending on the concrete conditions.

3. Dealing with the conditions and challenges of the 21st century

On the basis of the current conditions and trends that we see clearly, we can be optimistic that in the next decade or so the people will intensify in a dramatic way and on an unprecedented scale their revolutionary struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism against imperialism and reaction. Let us line up the major conditions that proletarian revolutionaries must deal with in the 21st century, particularly in the early decades where we are now. The century will either be too long for great leaps in the cumulative advance of the revolutionary forces or too short for the entire historical epoch needed for socialism to overpower capitalism.

First, let us observe immediately that the disintegration of the revisionist-ruled systems has led to the acute crisis of the world capitalist system and the unbridled oppression and exploitation of the working people by imperialism and reaction. Conspicuously, the US has been in the forefront of generating economic crisis, political turmoil and wars of aggression. It has enjoyed the unprecedented role of being the sole superpower in command of an obviously expanded world capitalist system through the complete integration of nearly all the former revisionist-ruled countries.

But the expansion of the world capitalist system has actually led to an increase in the number of imperialist powers and to the intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions. The world cannot accommodate too many imperialist powers. The US-led imperialist alliance became crisis-stricken, especially with the phenomenon of stagflation, as soon as the World War II losers were reconstructed and strengthened economically in the late 1960s. The addition of

Russia, China and India as big players in the playing field of imperialism spells further crisis and troubles for the original Group of 7 and the original OECD countries.

Second, the policy of "neoliberal globalization" has been a big failure in overcoming the problem of stagflation under Keynesianism and in shoring up the imperialist powers from worse economic and financial crisis. The problem of stagflation is persistent and has been merely covered up by ever rising levels of indebtedness in both imperialist and underdeveloped countries. The imperialist powers headed by the US have applied the policy of "neoliberal globalization" (denationalization, liberalization, privatization and deregulation of economies) at the expense of the world proletariat and the oppressed nations and peoples. And it has aggravated and deepened the crisis of overproduction and of finance capital and pushed the imperialist powers to compete with each other and adopt protectionist measures as in the decades before World War I and likewise before World War II.

The policy of "neoliberal globalization" has caused such worse crisis that the US has resorted to military Keynesianism. The Bush administration has sought to stimulate the US economy by stepping up military production. In this regard, it has also unleashed war hysteria, wars of aggression and state terrorism on a global scale under the pretext of combating terrorism and so-called rogue states. But the problem with high military production is that it has little employment potential. The US has also maintained a high level of consumerism by outsourcing goods, widening current account deficits and incurring an overly large foreign debt.

Third, despite the glaring failure of "neoliberal globalization" which is actually unbridled monopoly greed camouflaged by the petty bourgeois term "free market", the monopoly bourgeoisie continues to misrepresent its ideas and policies in petty bourgeois terms and give full play to petty bourgeois ideology as an instrument to befuddle not only the petty bourgeoisie but also the working people concerning the social, economic, political and cultural realities. Thus, the imperialists are funding and touting the petty bourgeois-run reformist nongovernmental organizations as the "civil society" and as the people's part in the triadic "social accord" of states, big business and a docile population.

The monopoly bourgeoisie is using a wide range of instruments (the cultural and educational system, the mass media, the electoral process, think tanks, policy

institutes, charity foundations, religious institutions and so on) for promoting big bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideas in order to counter the resurgence of the proletarian revolutionary ideology and the revolutionary mass movements against imperialism and for socialism. Of course, various petty bourgeois currents masquerading as proletarian, such as classical revisionism (social democracy), Trotskyism and modern revisionism are still around to assist the monopoly bourgeoisie and trying to outflank the theory and practice of genuine Marxism-Leninism.

But no matter how clever are the ideological and political trappings of the monopoly bourgeoisie, these become futile as the crisis of the world capitalist system worsens and the proletarian revolutionaries and the revolutionary mass movement arise, persevere and further develop the revolutionary struggle. As in the prelude to the October Revolution from the defeat of the 1905 revolution to the February revolution in 1917 when the Bolsheviks appeared to be small and weak, their proletarian revolutionary descendants of today appear likewise, especially in the aftermath of the disintegration of the revisionist-ruled systems from 1989 to 1991. But once more the objective conditions are favourable for the resurgence of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat and the people.

Fourth, the use of higher technology in production and consumption under the auspices of "neoliberal globalization" has accelerated the concentration and centralization of capital in a few imperialist countries. This has aggravated the crisis of overproduction in all types of goods and services. In the aftermath of every crisis of overproduction are the increase of chronic unemployment and the lowering of incomes. The destruction of productive forces is not being segued by any new round of expanding production and re-employment.

The adoption of higher technology by the monopoly bourgeoisie for the purpose of maximizing profits, accumulating capital and reducing the variable capital for labor can only result in aggravating the crisis of overproduction and the narrowing of the market. The higher technology that can be used for determining needs and market demand, expanding production and accelerating distribution is suitable to socialism and not to monopoly capitalism.

The higher technology for collecting, storing, processing and communicating information and knowledge is mainly under the control of the monopoly bourgeoisie. This kind of technology is used to promote monopoly bourgeois ideology and politics with embellishment by petty bourgeois phraseology, to

propagate the petty bourgeois ideology of self-interest and to preoccupy the public with the message of consumerism, sports and entertainment. Most of the personal computers and other gadgets for disseminating information are in the hands of the petty bourgeoisie, particularly the professionals and the youth with a high level of formal education. However, as the crisis of the world capitalist system worsens, the petty bourgeoisie becomes more discontented and more inclined to join up with the working people in progressive alliances against imperialism and reaction.

It is a sign of desperation and weakness that the monopoly bourgeoisie has been driven by crisis and competition to raise profits on new products by commercializing the information technology and other forms of technology that used to be exclusively for the military. Even now these openly available technologies can be used by the revolutionary forces for undertaking information and educational campaigns and for launching tactical offensives. The multi-media based on personal computers have been used to spread revolutionary theory and political messages and to mobilize people for mass actions. The cell phone has been used for precise tactical offensives by revolutionary armies.

Fifth, the contradictions between the working people of the world and the imperialist powers and reactionaries are intensifying. So are those between the countries asserting national independence and the imperialist powers. The imperialist powers are increasingly finding themselves at loggerheads with each other in the political and economic institutions that they have created to harmonize their relations against the working people of the world.

The continuing aggravation of the crisis of the world capitalist system under the policy of "neoliberal globalization" can push the imperialist powers to resort to Keynesianism, to further state monopoly capitalism, intensified monopoly competition and protectionism and to wars of aggression for the redivision of the world. The intensification of the inter-imperialist contradictions generates more favourable conditions for the resistance of the proletariat and people of the world.

Revolutionary parties of the proletariat must lead the resistance of the people in all types of countries, in the imperialist countries and in the dominated countries. The increase of competing imperialist powers deepens the crisis in every imperialist country. The proletariat in every country is driven by worse conditions to intensify resistance through strikes, protest rallies and other

concerted actions. The working people and the oppressed nations and peoples suffering the most from imperialist plunder and war are the most hard pressed to rise up in armed revolution.

The crisis conditions of the moment generate the immediate issues of the struggle against monopoly capitalism and local reaction. But in recruiting and developing party members, the revolutionary parties of the proletariat must inculcate in them the historic mission of building socialism up to the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship. There is the need to counter the propaganda of the enemy that socialism is successful only up to a certain point and then fails. There is the need to assure the proletariat and the people that modern revisionism and the restoration of capitalism can be prevented and that socialism can be consolidated repeatedly until it gains the upper hand over imperialism on a global scale and reaches the threshold of communism.

On China Today

**Interview By Noel Sales Barcelona, Bulatlat.com and CBCP News Service,
October 25, 2008**

I am currently a correspondent of both Bulatlat.com and CBCP News service. I am currently writing about the "emerging" China, with some information gathered earlier through ABC News Desk Peking senior producer Chito Sta. Romana.

He told the media that China has two-faces, Leninist in politics but capitalist in economy. I know that this is quite an "unusual" combination. China, before the leader of Deng Xiaoping, was a strong enemy of the capitalist system, especially US imperialism.

But now, as Mr. Sta. Romana is telling his stories about China, he said that "China is looking for a new model for democracy and is thinking of adopting the Japanese model of democracy and has no intention to go back to Mao (Zedong Thought).

Knowing your capabilities, professor, to analyze world political and economic events and one of the pioneers of the Maoist form of revolution here in the Philippines, I want to know your opinion on the following issues:

1. Is there such a thing as capitalist-Leninist China?

JMS: The expression "capitalist-Leninist" is an oxymoron. Indeed, China's economy is capitalist. But it is not Leninist in politics because state power is not in the hands of the working class.

2. How do you see the current relationship between China and the US both in economy and polity? Sta. Romana said, they're "tied on the hips."

JMS: In a sense, the two countries are "tied on the hips". They can gyrate together in the current global economic and financial crisis. China has become dependent on exports to the US, which are now hard hit by the contraction of US

consumer demand. And the values of China's US dollar holdings, US treasury bills and bonds, US corporate bonds and securities are seriously undercut and damaged by the current crisis.

3. By 2010 or maybe, later, China will have almost or more than a US\$3 trillion economy (as I recall, quoting Sta. Romana's statements), what will be its effect on the global economy and the capitalist system?

JMS: The current GDP of China is reportedly already USD 3.251 trillion. But China is a huge country with a huge population of 1.33 billion. With a per capita income of only around US 2700, China is still a very poor country, a far cry from the US per capita income of USD 46,000 in 2007. China and the Philippines have per capita incomes of nearly USD 2500 and USD 1500, respectively in 2007. Both of them are still ranked below the more than 100 countries with higher per capita income and are among the poor countries of the world.

4. Do you believe that China will become a superpower, in terms of economic and political power, while it is said to be "refusing to deploy its army the world over" unlike what US imperialism has done? Or is China now a superpower?

JMS: China has a weak economic base for becoming a superpower. Its military strength is limited to a defensive position. In fact, it is the object of military containment as well as economic engagement by the US.

5. How do you foresee the intent of the Chinese government with the Spratlys? Quoting Sta. Romana again, he said the Chinese government is now willing to buy it for US\$2 billion or more.

JMS: The Chinese government seems to prefer the diplomatic approach within the ASEAN-China framework of constructive dialogue and cooperative relations regarding the Spratlys. However, the high bureaucrats and big compradors of China and the Philippines are constantly cooking up deals. The rulers of the Philippines are unprincipled and corrupt enough to sell Philippine interest in the Spratlys islands to foreign buyers.

6. About the melamine-tainted milk scandal now hounding the two State sponsored Yili and Meniu milks, what do you think about this?

JMS: The most unscrupulous and worst kinds of capitalist criminals are bred in countries in which capitalism has emerged from the dismantling of socialism by

corrupt bureaucrats and their partners in the so-called free market. The US food monopolies have seized the melamine incidents to discourage the purchase of Chinese products in the global market.

7. Please give your forecast on the global economic turmoil, the effect of the fast-growing Chinese economy to the Philippines and the Philippine revolution.

JMS: The global economic and financial crisis will worsen at least in the next two years and may extend to as long as 10 years. The Chinese economy will be adversely affected. But China has more capacity than the Philippines in coping with the crisis and will more than ever regard the Philippines as a profitable client in the vicinity. The worsening crisis generates conditions favorable to the advance of the Philippine revolution.

Capitalist Crisis Makes Socialism Necessary

Statement on the 20th Anniversary of the Fall of the Berlin Wall, November 9, 2009

Since the fall of the Berlin wall on November 9, 1989, the world capitalist system has sunk deeper into crisis. It is now undergoing its most severe crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s, with some commentators calling the present crisis “the Greater Depression” in terms of its effects on the jobs and livelihood of the workers and peoples of the world.

After emerging as the world’s sole superpower in the wake of the collapse of the former Soviet Union, the US itself is wracked by a severe crisis and is further plunging the world with it. The imperialists and their propagandists perorate on how value and value-creation in the economies of the socialist states and then the modern revisionist regimes were distorted by the state bureaucracy.

Now all the countries of the world in varying degrees are reeling from a crisis driven by unbridled private greed under the slogan of “free market globalization” involving the fantastic accumulation of immense wealth by the financial oligarchy and monopoly capitalists through unrelenting super-exploitation of the working people, financial manipulation and the berserk generation of fictitious capital.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the social conditions of the workers and peoples of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union have plummeted under the conditions of unbridled capitalist exploitation, oppression and violence. Poverty levels have risen due to massive unemployment and depressed incomes. Inflation has been cutting down the value of wages, pensions and savings.

State investment in production and job creation has been significantly reduced. Public allotment to education and other social services has plummeted. The

educated have difficulties finding work and illiteracy is spreading. The workers' and peoples' health have taken a beating, causing severe malnutrition, stunting growth among the youth and shortening the average life span of people.

The number of children living in the streets and left to fend for themselves in these very cold countries has multiplied. The suicide rate has grown among them by significant percentages. The situation of the street children and society at large is being further aggravated by the current financial and economic crisis.

The anger and discontent of the workers and peoples of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union are becoming manifest in different ways. Parties of the Left are becoming popular and are gaining strength in national elections. The workers and people are speaking out against the accelerated escalation of exploitation, oppression and violence of the big bourgeoisie.

Survey after survey shows that the people feel they are plunging deeper into poverty and that they are increasingly disillusioned and angry with capitalism and its unfulfilled promises. With the onslaught of the current economic and financial crisis, there is rising interest in and study of Marxist and progressive writings. The imperialists and the local ruling classes are responding to this by deflecting the workers and peoples from the class struggle and anti-imperialist solidarity by promoting divisions and hatred based on chauvinism, racism, ethnocentrism and religious bigotry.

The Comecon is gone. But all the former revisionist-ruled countries are now in the tight grip of the US-controlled world capitalist system and are caught up in the turmoil of the gravest economic crisis since the Great Depression. The crisis is whipping up fascism and aggressive wars. The room for inter-imperialist competition has become more cramped and more intense, with Russia and China joining in as big power players.

The Warsaw Pact is gone. But the NATO has been expanded as to include the former revisionist-ruled countries in Eastern Europe, reaching the borders of Russia. Most of the former revisionist-ruled countries are potential hotbeds of fascist repression and wars of aggression as already indicated by the violent disintegration of Yugoslavia by a series of wars instigated by the imperialists and by wars involving Chechnya and Georgia. Mercenary forces from the former revisionist-ruled countries have been deployed by the NATO to distant lands like Iraq and Afghanistan.

The crisis of monopoly capitalism has brought ever-greater suffering among the workers and peoples of the world. The imperialist-controlled multilateral agencies underestimate world hunger when they report that only 1 billion people go hungry out of the more than six billion human population. They say that this is the largest number of people going hungry in history, and the same number of people suffer from malnutrition.

This situation is bound to get worse, as world economic output is predicted to decrease this year, the first time since World War II. The contraction of employment is estimated to last for another eight years. The number of people living on less than \$2 per day will increase by hundreds of millions. Decreasing demand for consumer goods, semimanufactures and raw materials impacts heavily on millions of workers and peasants in neocolonial economies.

The workers and peoples of the world are waging various legal and illegal forms of organized action to protest the anti-people policies of imperialism. International gatherings of the monopoly capitalists, the finance oligarchy, and heads of imperialist states have become occasions for mass protests by indignant workers and peoples in the meeting areas and in various countries. Countries assertive of national independence are exposing and lambasting the dictates and impositions of imperialism.

Armed revolutions for national liberation and democracy are continuing and gaining strength in the Philippines, Colombia, India, Peru and Turkey. The peoples of Iraq and Afghanistan are waging armed resistance against the US occupation and colonization of their countries. The armed forms of struggle are bound to grow in strength and advance as a result of the intensification of the crisis of monopoly capitalism.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the workers and peoples of Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union and the world have undergone ever worsening economic and social conditions. They see monopoly capitalism as an evil and bankrupt system that is destroying the world's productive forces and is inflicting immense suffering on the people.

Monopoly capitalism is igniting the people's desire for socialism. So long as imperialist oppression and exploitation persist, the people fight for national and social liberation. It is farthest from the truth that monopoly capitalism is the end of history. The utter bankruptcy of monopoly capitalism and its descent to ever

more barbarous forms of plunder and aggression drive the people to fight for their rights and for a bright socialist future. The workers and peoples of the world are called upon to persevere in the struggle for genuine socialism and against monopoly capitalism that is now in the throes of its worst crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. The crisis of the world capitalist system makes socialism necessary for humankind.

Contrary to the claims of the imperialists and their propagandists that socialism fell in 1989, the fall of the Berlin Wall has actually meant the collapse of the modern revisionist regimes in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the completion of the restoration of capitalism. It is the end result of the revisionist betrayal of socialism started by Khrushchov in 1956 and completed by Gorbachov in the years of 1989-91.

The history of socialist countries from the Bolshevik victory of 1917 up to 1956, and from the founding of the People's Republic of China up to 1976 shows great leaps in the advancement of the social, economic, political, cultural and defense situations of the workers and peoples of those countries. The poverty, hunger, joblessness, and the cruelties of exploitation and oppression before the victory of the socialist revolution were overcome. The great victories in socialist construction and revolution were achieved despite imperialist wars of aggression and economic and military blockades and subversion.

The rise of modern revisionism in socialist countries and elsewhere reversed all the great achievements of socialism. Advances in the situation of the workers and peoples were slowly but surely eroded, and pre-revolutionary forms of exploitation, oppression and violence were restored. Together with criminal syndicates in the so-called free market, the modern revisionist big bourgeoisie grew fat on bureaucratic corruption and enjoyed the lifestyles of the rich and famous, while the workers and peoples suffered from the decrease in food, jobs, savings and social services.

As workers and peoples grew restive and began clamoring for reforms, the ruling revisionist regimes imposed severe political repression. In Eastern Europe, and in East Germany especially, this condition fueled the mass protests that brought about the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. The revisionist regimes in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union peacefully gave up power and gave way to the legalization of their bureaucratic loot, the barefaced restoration of capitalism and the blatant privatization of state assets.

Since Nikita Khrushchov's reign in the Soviet Union, genuine proletarian revolutionaries the world over have called the ruling regimes in the Soviet Union and its satellite states in Eastern Europe as modern revisionists, who mouth socialism but practice capitalism. They have predicted that it will not take long before capitalism reveals itself barefaced in these countries.

The fall of the Wall has shown how accurate are their predictions. The modern revisionists in these countries have since exposed themselves as pseudo-communists and anti-communists. It is modern revisionism, not socialism, which fell with the Berlin Wall and delivered the workers and peoples of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe into the even more predatory and violent rule of barefaced capitalism. The revisionists had earlier undermined, eroded and destroyed socialism.

Since 1989 up to the present, imperialism and its well-paid propagandists in the mass media and academe have tirelessly repeated their line on the fall of the Berlin Wall. They have misrepresented the revisionist regimes as socialist and boasted that their fall meant the futility of socialism and the end of history with capitalism and liberal democracy.

They have touted the jump from the frying pan of revisionist-ruled state monopoly capitalism to the flames of barefaced capitalism as the beginning of development and democracy. But the imperialist powers are incomparable in discrediting monopoly capitalism through their unbridled plunder and wars of aggression and the recurrent and increasingly severe crisis.

The workers and peoples of the world are subjected to ever increasing exploitation, oppression and violence and are impelled to wage resistance, seek national and social liberation and aim for the attainment of socialism. The present crisis, which has been generated by the US-directed policy of neoliberal "globalization" in the last three decades, incites the people to struggle for socialism.

The world capitalist system continues to sink deeper into crisis. It is devastating jobs and livelihood of the workers and peoples of the world. The profuse use of public funds to bail out the big banks and corporations in the military industrial complex is building bigger bubbles than ever before. These are bound to burst and cause a steeper fall in the crisis.

The US and its imperialist allies have generated the global financial and economic crisis, have plunged the world into a state of economic depression and have aggravated and deepened the conditions for state terrorism and aggressive wars.

The combination of state monopoly capitalism and monopoly capitalism in imperialist countries is responsible for the unprecedentedly greatest devastation of productive forces through the most rapacious forms of private profit-taking and private accumulation, including the wanton creation of fictitious capital.

We are in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. Further economic crisis, social disorder, state terrorism and imperialist wars of aggression are in prospect. These are the objective conditions for the rise of revolutionary movements for national and social liberation led by the working class.

The Relation between the Immediate Tasks of Communists and their Struggle for Socialism

Contribution to the 21th International Communist Seminar Brussels,

May 18-20, 2012

On behalf of its general membership, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippines hereby expresses warmest greetings of comradeship and revolutionary solidarity to our co-members in the Advisory Committee of the International Communist Seminar and to all delegations participating in this 21st seminar.

We are deeply pleased and highly honored to have this opportunity to share with you our views on The Immediate Tasks of Communists and Their Struggle for Socialism. Let us consider and discuss the urgent ideological, political and organizational tasks that communists need to carry out in order to advance towards socialism.

Immediate Ideological Tasks

The constant task of every revolutionary party of the proletariat is to propagate the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism and to apply this on the history and concrete circumstances of the people and the concrete practice of revolution in every country. Ideological work is the first requisite of building the Marxist-Leninist party.

Through ideological work the Party rank and file acquires a clear materialist and scientific outlook and materialist-dialectical method of thinking, analysis and action. Marxism-Leninism is the guide to action of the Party in leading the

revolution on the basis of the current situation towards the goal of socialism and communism.

The immediacy of ideological work is underscored by the fact that such basic components of Marxism as philosophy, political economy and social science, and all subsequent great developments in the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism have been obscured and vilified by the imperialist powers and their camp followers since the fall of revisionist regimes, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the full restoration of capitalism in former socialist countries in the years of 1989 to 1991 following decades of the dominance of modern revisionism.

For a long while, despite the recurrence and worsening of the crisis of capitalism, the imperialist powers headed by the US kept boasting that humankind could no longer go beyond capitalism and liberal democracy and that socialism was dead forever. With the most unrestrained air of triumphalism, they embarked on all kinds of offensive: ideological, political, economic, military and cultural. These coincided with the conspicuous use of high technology in production, commerce, finance, communications and war.

All forms of bourgeois subjectivism and idealism ran rampant in philosophy amidst mass consumerism induced by debt financing. By political insinuation, the bourgeoisie associated and even equated communism and revolutionary movements with terrorism to set them up for repression. The neoliberal economic policy gave free reign to bourgeois greed and the denial of the working people as the real creators of social wealth. The US and NATO promoted state terrorism worldwide, and launched wars of aggression at a rapid rate. Consumer products with the US brand spearheaded the imperialist cultural offensive.

The ranks of communists and the broad masses of the people are clamoring for the explanation of the root causes and consequences of the current grave crisis, and more importantly for what is to be done in order to confront the crisis and carry forward the antiimperialist and democratic struggle towards socialism. The most important ideological task of the communist and workers' parties at the moment is to explain the crisis, and clarify and set forth the tasks for advancing the revolutionary struggle.

Under the neoliberal economic policy, the expansion of global capitalism seemed

limitless as huge amounts of debt financing were poured on the recurrent and worsening crisis of overproduction to propel finance capitalism as the platform for conjuring the illusion of economic growth. Financial bubbles were launched only to burst one after another, dumping mountains of debt on the real economies of the imperialist countries in 2008. Since then, the financial and economic crisis has resulted in a global depression.

The imperialist powers have failed to solve the crisis because they cling to the neoliberal dogma that the state is only good for helping the monopoly bourgeoisie to accumulate capital and maximize profits. Thus, they have pushed down the wage level, cut back on social services, provided tax cuts, gold-plated contracts and subsidies to the corporations, and conceded everything else to the big bourgeoisie under the terms of investment and trade liberalization, privatization, deregulation and denationalization of the less developed capitalist countries and the big mass of underdeveloped countries.

Under conditions of economic and financial collapse, the state has provided the bailouts to the big banks and corporations. It incurs higher deficits because of the bailouts, the tax cutbacks for the corporations and lessened tax revenues due to the stagnant economy. Thus, it goes into a public debt crisis, which becomes the basis for austerity measures at the expense of the people. All the while the monopoly bourgeoisie prohibits the state from employing the unemployed and from engaging in any enterprise to expand production.

The imperialist powers keep on adopting measures that aggravate the crisis. They are finding it increasingly hard to abstain from Keynesian-type measures or all-out protectionism against each other in economic production. For the moment, they still find it easier to unite on shifting the burden of crisis to the proletariat and the people of the world. Nevertheless, the crisis is generating inter-imperialist contradictions in the contest to secure sources of strategic raw materials, especially oil, expand markets and sell weapons under the stimulus of the wars of aggressions, civil wars and other localized or regional wars.

At any rate, the crisis is worsening and is hitting hard both the imperialist countries and the dominated countries, with the latter countries continuing to suffer the crisis more than the former. It is already comparable to the Great Depression in terms of the massive destruction of productive forces, wide scale social degradation, the growth of ultra-reactionary currents, the increasing aggressiveness of the imperialist powers and the rise of both organized and

spontaneous popular resistance.

While the crisis of the world capitalist system is worsening, the science of Marxism-Leninism stands as a beacon for us to understand the problems brought about by the monopoly bourgeoisie and its financial oligarchy, and to provide the revolutionary solution that the working class and its advanced detachment can adopt and develop, together with the rest of the exploited and oppressed people.

With the aid of Marxism-Leninism, the proletarian revolutionaries of today are answering the questions regarding the course of advance for the socialist cause, how to overthrow the bourgeois state and how to establish and develop the socialist state. The questions and answers cover the historical experience and new circumstances of the proletariat and people and extend to how to build socialism, strengthen it and consolidate it, combat opportunism and revisionism, and move steadfastly towards the ultimate goal of communism.

Immediate Political Tasks

The immediate political tasks of all communist and workers' parties involve arousing, organizing and mobilizing the masses on current issues generated by the global and domestic crisis of capitalism. Issues that immediately have a political character involve the demands for anti-imperialist and class struggle, the violations of human rights, brutal acts of repression, and wars of aggression.

Issues such as unemployment, wage freeze, homelessness, soaring prices of basic goods and services, deteriorating social services, and so on, arise at first as economic issues. But they can easily become political issues when the revolutionary party of the proletariat and the people raise them as issues in the anti-imperialist and class struggle.

The imperialists, the ruling class, and the state are held responsible for the people's economic suffering and become the targets of the people's outrage. The exploiters themselves unwittingly incite the people to rise up when they oppress them by vilifying and suppressing the mass protests. In the course of the political struggle, both tactical demands for basic reforms and the strategic call for revolutionary change are made.

Whatever is the state of economic and political development in a country, and whatever is the corresponding character of the revolutionary movement, the revolutionary party of the proletariat and the people must win the battle for

democracy by taking the mass line. This involves arousing, organizing and mobilizing the people in their millions according to their interests, trusting and relying on them, asserting and exercising their democratic rights, and opposing political repression by the state and exploitation by the ruling classes.

In the course of fighting for immediate demands and aiming for socialism in the industrial capitalist countries, the revolutionary forces and the people must be vigilant and militant against the attempts to suppress the mass movement. The monopoly bourgeoisie does not hesitate to employ fascism against those who aim for socialism. In a clever way, it also imposes violence on the people by accelerating the recruitment of military troops, police and intelligence agents from the ranks of the people, especially the unemployed, for the purpose of so-called homeland security, civil war, or wars of aggression.

In an underdeveloped country like the Philippines, the exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords are ever active in using both persuasive and violent means of the reactionary state to suppress the people's movement for a new democratic revolution with a socialist perspective. The battle for democracy here entails not only the political mobilization of the people by asserting and exercising democratic rights but also emphatically by struggling for the liberation of the millions of peasants from feudal and semi-feudal conditions.

The crisis of the world capitalist system and the crisis of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in the Philippines are distinct from each other and are at the same time closely interrelated. The Philippine ruling system has its own frailties due to its underdevelopment but is so dependent on the world capitalist system - especially the US - that the current crisis of global capitalism impacts violently on the Philippines from the outside and at the same time aggravates the chronic crisis that is due to the underdevelopment of the Philippines.

The Philippine economy is so dependent on the production of raw materials (agricultural and mineral) and the semi-manufacture of certain consumer products for export, as well as the export of cheap labor in the form of overseas contract workers. It goes awry and goes into deeper crisis as a result of lesser demand and lower prices for such exports upon the worsening of the crisis of global capitalism. The worsening of the Philippine crisis results in great suffering for the Filipino people and at the same in the intensification of contradictions among the reactionaries themselves and between the people and the ruling system.

The Communist Party of the Philippines has set the general line of new democratic revolution at the current stage of the Philippine revolution in order to take into account and oppose the semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of Philippine society. The current stage of democratic revolution under the leadership of the working class is preparation for the subsequent stage of socialist revolution, which begins upon the basic completion of the new democratic revolution through the nationwide seizure of political power as a result of the protracted people's war.

The general line of new democratic revolution with a socialist perspective sets the direction of the Philippine revolution and guides the Party and the masses in sorting out the welter of economic, social, political, cultural, environmental and moral issues that arise from oppression and exploitation and their aggravation as a result of crisis. The working class is the leading class in the revolution for being the most advanced productive and political force. It relies mainly on its basic alliance with the peasantry, wins over the urban petty bourgeoisie as a major ally, further wins over the middle bourgeoisie, and takes advantage of the contradictions among the reactionaries in order to isolate and destroy one enemy after another.

At every given time, the enemy is the worst of the reactionaries, acting as chief puppet of the imperialists and as chief representative of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. It wages a vicious counterrevolutionary war against the people and the revolutionary forces. In the light of international law, it can be said that a civil war is going on in the Philippines. But the US is increasing its military intervention because it is driven by the aggressive character and grave crisis of imperialism and its current scheme to refocus its attention on East Asia. The possibility looms for the civil war to become a national war of liberation against foreign aggression.

In times of grave crisis, the issues abound for the Filipino people to take up in accordance with national and class interests along the general line of new democratic revolution. There are several types of mass organizations that must be developed in order to solidify the mass of patriotic and progressive activists. The larger the membership of the mass organizations, the easier it becomes to reach and mobilize the people in their millions.

The patriotic and progressive legal mass organizations can arise and grow by asserting and exercising their democratic rights against the exploitation and

oppression of the people, and against both the blatant and subtle acts of suppression by regimes that hypocritically claim to be democratic and different from the fallen Marcos fascist dictatorship. The working class has trade unions, with the Kilusang Mayo Uno as the strongest labor center. The peasants and farm workers have the Pambansang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas; the fisher folk, the Pamalakaya; and the government employees, COURAGE, to cite only the major mass formations of the toiling masses.

There are various types of sectoral mass organizations, like those of students, teachers, health workers, lawyers, scientists and technologists, writers and artists, progressive religious, patriotic businessmen, and so on. There are also mass organizations based on such concerns and causes as national independence, democracy, human rights, land reform and national industrialization, indigenous people, labor rights, youth rights, women's rights, children's rights, patriotic and progressive culture, environment, just and lasting peace, international solidarity against imperialist plunder and war, and so on.

By way of employing the policy of the united front, the patriotic and progressive mass organizations have developed sectoral alliances (within classes and occupational categories) and the multi-sectoral alliances like the BAYAN (New Patriotic Alliance), which is the largest of its kind. These alliances have served to augment, amplify and expand the strength and influence of the national democratic movement in campaigns and various kinds of activities on major longstanding issues as well as on burning issues of the day.

The legal mass organizations and alliances make it a point to assert their independence from the Communist Party of the Philippines and the illegal revolutionary mass organizations. They do so obviously to counter the anti-communist witch hunts that have become more vicious than ever under the so-called antiterrorism law. They are closely related to progressive party list groups that participate in electoral struggles within the ruling system.

Of course, the Communist Party of the Philippines has developed various types of illegal mass organizations. The most important of these in terms of waging the protracted people's war is the New People's Army. It is led by the Party and the working class, and most of the Red commanders and fighters come from the peasantry. At the moment, the NPA is engaged in the five-year strategic plan to advance the people's war from the strategic defensive to the strategic stalemate.

There is a comprehensive array of underground mass organizations for workers, peasants, youth, women, cultural workers, lawyers, scientists and technologies. And there are underground alliances of the peoples of Cordillera, Moros and the Lumads, and the progressive religious, especially the Christian for National Liberation. All the aforesaid underground revolutionary forces are dedicated to the people's war. Together with the CPP and NPA, they belong to the National Democratic Front of the Philippines.

The NDFP is a revolutionary united front organization, with its own program of people's democratic revolution and constitution harmonious with those of the CPP. The NDFP consists of the mass formations of the toiling masses and the urban petty bourgeoisie. But it is ever ready to broaden the united front so as to include the middle bourgeoisie and even the temporary and unreliable allies from among the ranks of the reactionaries who oppose the worst of the reactionaries as the enemy.

The NDFP has gone so far as to engage in peace negotiations with a series of reactionary regimes in order to assert its status of belligerency under international law and to demand that the roots of the armed conflict be addressed to lay the basis for a just and lasting peace. To avert confusion among the revolutionaries and people, the CPP and NDFP have always made it clear that the line for a just and lasting peace is no different from the line of the new democratic revolution. The reactionary regimes have failed to come to an agreement on a just and lasting peace because of their extreme subservience to US imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

The patriotic and progressive mass organizations and alliances have been responsible for well-sustained campaigns on highly significant issues and for large scale mobilizations that have resulted in the overthrow of the Marcos fascist dictatorship and the corrupt Estrada regime. They generate the campaigns and activities that carry the general line of new democratic revolution and express the protests and demands of the people. In turn, they are strengthened by these acts of mass mobilization which bring forward mass activists on a large scale.

The strategic line of protracted people's war in the Philippines is now greatly favored by the terrible conditions of oppression and exploitation generated by the crisis of the world capitalist system. All forms of people's resistance, including general strikes and mass protest rallies and armed revolutionary

movements, are spreading and growing in strength.

The Philippine revolutionary movement is contributing what it can in order to expand and intensify the revolutionary movements of the people of the world against imperialism and for national liberation, democracy and socialism. At the same time, it is benefited by the expansion and intensification of revolutionary movements abroad.

The imperialist powers can be dizzied and weakened by the great number of what they consider as trouble spots. In all continents and in so many countries, including the imperialist countries, the grave all-round crisis has resulted in an upsurge of mass movements. The entire world is in ferment. We are on the eve of great social upheavals and revolutionary advances.

Thanks to the use of higher technology, the monopoly bourgeoisie has accelerated not only the accumulation of capital and profit-making but also the recurrence and worsening of the crisis of overproduction and the abuse of monopoly finance capital. It has produced the rapid means of communications that the revolutionary forces can also avail of.

Revolutionary propaganda and agitation, the organization of people in various types of mass formations and mass mobilizations have been facilitated and accelerated by the use of the internet, cellphone, audio-visuals and social networks. But of course, we presume that the revolutionary forces use these means very intelligently and effectively, mindful that the enemy uses the same means against the revolutionary movement.

Immediate Organizational Tasks

The Communist Party of the Philippines is guided by democratic centralism as its basic organizational principle. This means centralized leadership based on democracy, and democracy guided by centralized leadership. It is an effective way of giving full play to democratic debates, taking decisions at every level and from the lowest level to the highest, and concentrating promptly the will of the entire Party in the Central Committee.

At the base of the Party are the Party branches and groups or fractions within mass organizations and institutions. On the basis of facts and discussions, they give reports and recommendations to the section committee. Section committees make reports and recommendations to the district committee; the district

committees to the provincial committee; the provincial committees to the regional committee; and the regional committees to the Central Committee. Decisions of the Central Committee go down from level to level.

The individual Party members are subordinate to the entire Party and the Central Committee. At any level, decisions are taken by majority vote or consensus after full discussion of an issue. The lower organ is subordinate to the higher organ. The essence of centralized leadership is upholding Marxism-Leninism as guide to action and applying it on concrete issues and circumstances. In the first place, the Party is constituted as a Marxist-Leninist party and its members are educated, trained and act as Marxist-Leninists.

The Party recruits its members from the ranks of the advanced mass activists. These are considered advanced because they have a relatively high level of political consciousness, are militant, and conscientiously perform their tasks. Most important of all, they are willing to join the Party. They enter the Party first as candidate members. The period of candidature for workers and peasants is six months, and for the urban petty bourgeoisie, one year.

The mass movement is growing fast because of the severity and protraction of the economic, social and political crisis, and because the Party and the mass organizations are intensifying propaganda and agitation, mass organizing of various types, and mass mobilizations on the burning issues. On the basis of the fast-growing mass movement, the Party can recruit fast and carry out the policy of expanding the Party boldly without letting in a single undesirable element. The honesty of every applicant for Party membership is of crucial importance and is verified.

The rapid expansion of the Party is required by the worsening crisis and by the need of the Party to strengthen itself for its current strategic plan of advancing from the strategic defensive to the strategic stalemate in the people's war. The Party is resolved to make an accelerated advance on the basis of more than 43 years of building the Party, the mass organizations in both urban and rural areas, and the organs of political power in the countryside.

The cadres of the Party are in leading organs of the Party itself as well as in those of the New People's Army, the mass organizations and the people's government. They have developed into cadres by virtue of their ability to lead ideological, political and organizational work, and to accomplish the expansion

and consolidation of the Party organizations to which they are assigned. The rapid expansion of the Party that is now being carried out is expected to result in the rapid development of cadres.

All Party cadres and members are acutely conscious of the need to fulfil the central task of the revolution, which is to seize political power, and of the decisive role of the Party in leading the revolutionary process. The Party serves as the coordinator of the forces of the New People's Army and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines, and the various forms of struggle in both the urban and rural areas.

Party cadres and members in the urban areas are conscious of developing the legal mass movement in order to support and complement the revolutionary armed struggle in the countryside, and they encourage the workers and educated youth to join the people's army. Those in the rural areas, especially in the people's army, are conscious of advancing the people's war in order to bring about ultimately the nationwide seizure of political power.

The broad masses of the Filipino people and the revolutionary led by the Communist Party of the Philippines are confident of completing the stage of the new democratic revolution and proceeding to the stage of socialist revolution. Their confidence is based on adherence to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, awareness of the chronic crisis and losing course of the domestic ruling system and the world capitalist system, learning lessons from the experiences of the revolutionary movement in the Philippines and abroad, and undertaking all the necessary hard work and struggle to advance the revolution from one stage to another.

Requisites For Building the Socialist Future

**Paper for the Inception Workshop of the People's Resource for
International Solidarity and Mass Mobilization (PRISM)**

Utrecht, The Netherlands, November 14, 2014

Introduction

There are five general requisites for building the socialist future. First, learn from the historical experience of the revolutionary proletariat in building socialism in the 20th century.

Second, grasp the potential for socialist revolution in various countries in the current circumstances. Third, build the subjective forces of the revolution, such as the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the mass organizations, effective alliances, the people's army or self-defense units, and the organs of political power. Fourth, carry out the various forms of revolutionary struggle to overthrow the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Fifth, build the socialist state of the proletariat on the basis of a broad people's alliance, and engage in continuous socialist revolution in the political, socio-economic and cultural fields.

Learn from the historical experience of building socialism!

In the emergence and development of industrial capitalism, it has been unavoidable for the capitalist class to create and expand the working class from which it extracts surplus value and enables it to accumulate capital. It is a given fact that the modern industrial proletariat is the most advanced productive force. And in the course of class struggle against exploitation and oppression, it has become the most advanced political force capable of liberating itself and other exploited classes, and of building socialism as a result of being developed ideologically, politically and organizationally to fight and overthrow the exploitative and crisis-ridden capitalist system.

As a revolutionary class for itself and for other exploited people, the working

class has been involved in and benefited from the three stages of development of its revolutionary theory and practice. In the first stage, in the era of free competition capitalism, Marx and Engels laid the fundamental principles of Marxism in philosophy, political economy and social science, and engaged in initial efforts to build the communist and workers' movement. In the second stage, in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the Bolsheviks led by Lenin and Stalin prevailed over the revisionism and opportunism of the Second International and the Mensheviks in order to lead the October Revolution that overthrew the Czarist rule and establish a socialist state, victoriously engaged in the socialist revolution and construction in the Soviet Union.

After Lenin died in 1924, Stalin brought the New Economic Policy to a successful conclusion. He adopted the series of five-year economic plans to bring about socialist industrialization, the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture, the education training and deployment of the biggest corps of scientists and engineers, the promotion of socialist culture and art and the mass mobilization of the Soviet people of various nationalities. After the arrest and trial of the traitors in the 1930s, the German Nazi intelligence could not find a fifth column for the Nazi invasion. Stalin victoriously led the Great Patriotic War against the fascists who killed 27 million Soviet people and destroyed 85 per cent of Soviet industry. He proceeded to industrialize the Soviet Union for the second time and encouraged the oppressed nations and peoples of the world to fight for national liberation and socialism.

In the same stage of the Leninist development of Marxism, the Communist Party of China led by Mao made a still far greater breach on the imperialist front in the East by winning the people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war and proceeding to carry out the socialist revolution. Mao can be credited with the consolidation of the revolutionary victory amidst the devastation brought about by the Japanese invasion and the civil war unleashed by Guomindang, the basic socialization of the Chinese economy, the Great Leap Forward to socialist industry and to establish communes, the socialist education movement, the critique of and improvement on the Soviet model of economic development and the vital support extended by China to the Korean people and the Indochinese people in their struggles for national liberation and socialism against US imperialist aggression and to all the peoples of Asia, African and Latin America.

It became the responsibility of Mao to confront the full-blown phenomenon of

modern revisionism of Khrushchov and then Brezhnev. This paved the way for the third stage, that of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, when Mao put forward the theory and practice of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. The GPCR prevailed from 1966 to 1976. But a coup d'etat headed by Deng Zhao Ping, behind a combination of Rightists and Centrists, overthrew the socialist state and began a series of capitalist reforms. This was a repeat of the coup d'etat headed by the revisionist chieftain Khrushchov in the Soviet Union in 1956.

It is of crucial importance for the scientific socialists or communists of today to learn the historical experience of the revolutionary proletariat in building socialism. We must appreciate the great socialist achievements of the proletariat, entire people and their leadership in the philosophical, political, social, economic and cultural fields, against imperialism, revisionism and opportunism. And we must criticize and repudiate the “Left” and Right opportunist errors of certain leaders at certain times and the biggest of all errors of modern revisionism, which destroyed socialism under the pretext of creatively improving it through capitalist reforms. The positive and negative lessons from the past are a legacy to learn from.

The imperialists and their petty bourgeois camp followers are systematically using the total negation of the socialist revolution and socialist construction, especially from 1917 to 1956 in the Soviet Union and from 1949 to 1976 in China, in order to attack entirely the revolutionary cause of socialism. They use cheap reductionist psychological trick of the total negation of Stalin and Mao as the short cut to the total negation of socialism, and the proletariat, people and party that built socialism. In times of either the most strident or most subtle anti-communist propaganda anywhere, the communists and revolutionary people must resolutely uphold their principles and militantly do their work.

In what is already an extended period of strategic retreat for the international communist movement, as a result of the revisionist betrayal of socialism, the scope and impact of the revolutionary ideological and political work of the persevering communists may appear limited and ineffectual on a global scale or in certain countries, The imperialists may even appear invincible as they unleash the most brutal forms of class struggle and aggressive wars as the petty bourgeois reformists and neorevisionists seem to steal the struggle from the

communist revolutionaries. But the resolute and steady ideological and political work of the communist revolutionaries will eventually resound, amplified by the ever-worsening crisis of the bourgeois ruling system, and will certainly lead to the upsurge and expansion of the revolutionary movement.

Grasp the potential for socialist revolution in the current circumstances!

At present, all major contradictions in the world capitalist system are intensifying. These are the contradictions between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the working class in the imperialist countries; those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations; those between the imperialist powers and some countries assertive of national independence; and those among the imperialists themselves. The objective conditions are favorable for waging revolution. The broad masses of the people are in extreme suffering and are desirous of revolutionary change. There is a high potential for the rise of revolutionary forces for people's democracy and socialism against imperialism.

In the imperialist countries, the contradiction between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the working class has been exacerbated by the rapidly accelerating adoption of higher technology in production, distribution, finance and communication, and the intensification of profit-taking by the monopoly bourgeoisie under the neoliberal economic policy. The crises of overproduction have recurred more frequently and more gravely. The attempts of the monopoly bourgeoisie to counter the crisis of overproduction and the tendency of the profit rate to fall by resorting to the tricks of finance capitalism, mainly the expansion of the money supply and credit to stimulate production and consumption, have led from one financial crisis to another until the financial meltdown of 2008, which has caused what is in fact a protracted global depression.

The contradiction between the social character of production and the private mode of appropriation has become utterly conspicuous, and the destructiveness and irrationality of capitalism are well manifested by high rates of unemployment, lower incomes among the working people, the thinning out of the middle social strata, and the growing poverty and misery even in imperialist countries. But the incipient people's resistance is not yet being turned into a resounding demand for system change and for socialism because the revolutionary parties of the proletariat have not yet arisen or are still too few, small and weak to overcome the long running and current strategy and tactics of repression and deception employed by the state and private instruments of the

monopoly bourgeoisie.

The contradiction between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations has become far worse than ever before. The fact of neocolonialism in most underdeveloped countries has been aggravated by the rampage of neoliberalism. The broad masses of the people are suffering from rising levels of exploitation, oppression and aggression. They suffer the main brunt of imperialist plunder and war. Even in the so-called emergent markets favored by the imperialist outsourcing of manufactures and special flows of hedge funds, the people suffer from unemployment, reduced real incomes, and other dire consequences of the global depression.

As a result of extreme oppression and exploitation, there are revolutionary parties of the proletariat persevering in armed revolution for national liberation, people's democracy and socialism in a number of underdeveloped countries. There are also similar parties preparing for armed revolution. Where the imperialist powers have unleashed wars of aggression, as in Iraq and Afghanistan, political and social turmoil among Islamic sects and ethno-linguistic communities has continued, and conflicting armies have arisen. But no communist party has yet taken advantage of this kind of situation.

Communist parties still exist in former revisionist-ruled countries but have not gone beyond parliamentary struggle. Certain states like Cuba, Venezuela, Bolivia and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea stand out today for upholding their national independence and socialist aspirations against the blockades and provocations by US imperialism. They are holding their ground, even while the US has succeeded in destroying the Qaddafi government in Libya and is trying to overthrow the Assad government in Syria for the benefit of the US-Israeli combine in the Middle East.

The contradictions among the imperialist powers in economic, financial, security and other policy matters are fast coming to the fore. The US is now worried to death about the growing tendency of Russia and China to act independently and pose a challenge to its status as No. 1 imperialist power and sole superpower, in contrast to the previous period when the US gloated over the full restoration of capitalism in the two countries and proclaimed it as the final doom of the socialist cause. The ruling parties of both Russia and China have indeed betrayed the cause of socialism but they have brought to the top rung of capitalist powers the high sense of sovereign power and social capital that they had acquired under

socialism.

The struggle for a redivision of the world has become more intense. It is a struggle for sources of cheap labor and cheap raw materials as well as for markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence. The US resents the Shanghai Cooperation Organization as a counter to NATO, and the formation of the BRICS economic bloc. Thus, it is carrying out the strategic pivot to East Asia to contain China, and is making provocations on the borders of Russia to destabilize Russia. Inter-imperialist contradictions in general, and inter-imperialist wars in particular, offer opportunities for developing revolutionary civil wars for national liberation and socialism. Remember how the first socialist state arose in connection with World War I and several socialist countries in connection with World War II.

Build the subjective forces of the revolution!

In relation to such objective conditions as the system of exploitation, the crisis, and the moods of the spontaneous masses, the subjective forces of the revolution are highly conscious solid organizations of people who are determined to wage various forms of revolutionary struggle in order to discredit, isolate and ultimately destroy the bourgeois ruling system. The objectives of the scientific socialists are to smash and destroy the bourgeois state and establish the proletarian or socialist state. Definite types of organizations are needed to realize these objectives.

Just as the bourgeoisie was the class agent to establish and develop capitalism, the modern industrial proletariat is the class agent to establish and develop socialism. Whatever is their level of consciousness about socialism at a given time, or whatever is the degree of influence of petty bourgeois and anti-socialist ideas on them, the blue collars and white collars in the labor force have their class interest which is increasingly under vicious assault by the monopoly bourgeoisie and which can, in due time, rouse them to rise up when the boiling point is reached. They are objectively the overwhelming majority in the well-developed capitalist economy, in contrast to the minority consisting of the capitalist owners and their highest paid subalterns. They have the potential of becoming conscious that they can get rid of the bourgeois rule and can run and expand the national industrial economy without the bourgeois proprietors and managers.

No matter how large is the peasantry in a country, it cannot lead the socialist revolution because its perspective is, at best, to own the land through democratic revolution or reform, and the possibility for socialist cooperation and mechanization is made possible by the proletariat in power. At any rate, the proletariat cannot seize and hold power without a strong alliance with the peasantry in any agrarian country. The class tendency of the petty bourgeoisie is to serve the bourgeois system and even to climb to the level of the big bourgeois. Marx himself had to change his petty bourgeois outlook and remould himself into a proletarian revolutionary to become a scientific socialist.

The most important subjective force to build for socialist revolution is the party of the revolutionary proletariat – the Communist Party or the workers' party. It is the advanced detachment of the entire working class and the trade union movement. It builds and strengthens itself ideologically, politically and organizationally for winning the battle for democracy by mobilizing the workers and other working and exploited people; for smashing the state power of the bourgeoisie; and for building socialism in transition to communism. It propagates the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat. It proclaims and carries out the general political line, and the strategy and tactics in the revolutionary struggle. It recruits as Party members the most advanced elements in the revolutionary mass movement.

The proletarian revolutionaries must rely on the masses and do mass work. They must engage in social investigation in order to learn from the masses their basic problems and urgent needs, and how to arouse, organize and mobilize them in order to unite and strengthen themselves against their powerful adversaries. In industrial capitalist countries, they must focus mass work among the workers in their work places and communities. They must build revolutionary unions where no unions yet exist or even if they must at first form and multiply communist cells within the reactionary unions. They must trust the workers in embracing the revolutionary theory and practice of their own class. In agrarian or underdeveloped countries, they must build the revolutionary trade unions and peasant associations at the same time, and strengthen the basic alliance of these two classes. The revolutionary worker's party must field cadres and organizers to the countryside to arouse, organize and mobilize the peasants and develop proletarian revolutionaries from among their ranks.

It is not enough to build the basic class organizations of the toiling masses of workers and peasants. The proletarian revolutionaries and mass activists must

build certain types of organizations like people's cooperatives and organizations of the youth, women, teachers, health workers, cultural workers and other low-income people. They must encourage the petty bourgeoisie to form its own progressive organizations in rejection of the exploiting classes and in support of workers and other working people. Revolutionary alliances of the working people with the progressive organizations of the petty bourgeoisie are of great importance. The progressive petty bourgeoisie carries with it to the socialist cause their various professional and technical skills and can serve as articulators and moulders of public opinion. The progressive bourgeois can become allies of decisive importance and can remould themselves into proletarian revolutionaries.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat answers the central question of revolution when it builds a people's army for seizing political power. But the situation may not yet be ripe for establishing the people's army in certain countries. In preparing for the eventuality of creating a people's army and waging an armed revolution, the Party and the pertinent mass organizations can form discreet self-defense units and engage in mass training for self-defense, but always avoiding provocations that lead to unnecessary or untimely armed clashes that give the enemy to unleash white terror against the revolutionary forces and people. In the US and certain countries, it is a matter of constitutional right for ordinary citizens to bear arms to restrain or prevent the state from misusing its armed power against the people. Practical legitimate reasons for the private possession of firearms include self-defense against common criminals, fondness for hunting, and membership in a sports club.

In the application of the strategy of protracted people's war by encircling the cities from the countryside in underdeveloped countries, people's committees of self-government are formed as organs of political power in local communities. Even in the absence of a revolutionary civil war, such organs of political power can be established with the support of the mass organizations and can perform certain non-violent functions of local government in communities of the working people. Even at the national level, an alliance of progressive political parties and mass organizations can appear and act like a government by forming a people's shadow cabinet, with major departments that monitor and criticize the policies and actions of the reactionary government and voice out the demands of the people and the mass movement.

Carry out various forms of struggle to overthrow the capitalist system!

Ideological building is the first requisite and continuing fundamental task in building the revolutionary party of the proletariat. It avails of the treasury of Marxist-Leninist works written by the great communist thinkers and revolutionary leaders in the course of victorious revolutionary struggles against the capitalist system, reaction and revisionism of the classical and modern type. These works provide the principles and methods to guide the analysis of the history and circumstances of the people in a country, the formulation of the revolutionary program of action, and the concrete practice of revolution by the proletarian revolutionaries and the people.

The theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism is ever developing in relation to the world and to the particular country where it is applied. It is comprehensive and profound as it musters the proletarian revolutionary outlook and scientific knowledge in criticizing and repudiating class exploitation and oppression; in drawing up the general political line, strategy and tactics; in striving to end the capitalist system; and in proposing socialism as the preparation of communism. It requires the concrete analysis of concrete conditions, and the testing of ideas in social practice. It demands within the proletarian party a struggle against petty bourgeois subjectivism, be it in the form of dogmatism or empiricism. The consequence is that the party is well equipped to wage ideological struggle against the theorists and ideologues of the bourgeoisie and in constantly combating non-proletarian ideas and tendencies inside the party.

Ideological building serves to firm up the political building of the proletarian revolutionary party and reinforces the line of political struggle against the big bourgeoisie in different conditions. In the developed capitalist countries, the proletariat can regard the forces of social production as the basis for socialism, but it also has to win the battle for democracy by winning over the petty bourgeoisie and all disgruntled sections of capitalist society, in order to have the overwhelming majority of the people for the uprisings to overthrow the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The capitalist class never gives up its power and wealth voluntarily but uses violence and deception to hold on to these, and it does not hesitate to use fascism to suppress the forces of socialism and the people. It is therefore necessary for the proletarian party to develop a revolutionary mass movement and prepare the means for frustrating or defeating state terrorism, and for establishing the state power of the proletariat. The proletariat cannot fulfil the historic mission of building socialism without state power. This is proletarian class dictatorship

against bourgeois class dictatorship, and is at the same time proletarian democracy for the proletariat and the rest of the people.

In the underdeveloped or agrarian countries, where the peasantry still comprises the majority of the population, the proletarian revolutionary party adopts the line of people's democratic revolution led by the proletariat but is based mainly on the worker-peasant alliance. It can adopt the strategic line of protracted people's war, encircling the cities from the countryside in order to accumulate the political and armed strength to eventually seize power in the cities and on a national scale. In addition to the basic worker-peasant alliance, the party can build further alliances with the urban petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie, and take advantage of splits among the reactionaries.

In all kinds of countries, legal and illegal forms of struggle need to be carried out by the proletarian revolutionaries who lead a broad range of revolutionary forces. Even where there is yet no armed revolution by the proletariat and the people, the bourgeois can be repressive and outlaw activities that are legal in other times or other countries. When armed revolution is already surging, certain legal forms of struggle are still possible and necessary to isolate and weaken the enemy. In the general run of third world countries, the people suffer the main brunt of imperialist exploitation, oppression and aggression, thus the conditions for waging revolutionary wars are far more favorable than in the imperialist countries. The best possible situation for the world proletarian revolution is the interaction of revolutions in countries with different levels of development.

The revolutionary mass movement can pursue certain kinds of economic struggle, like strikes and blockades by the workers and peasants, boycotts or interdiction of goods and enterprises of the imperialist enemy, undertaking industrial cooperatives of workers, handicraft cooperatives of artisans, land reform and improvement of agricultural production. But it cannot rely mainly on these to take over the national economy. It is the politico-military struggle that makes the bourgeoisie lose its economic power and bureaucratic offices.

The proletarian revolutionaries, the cultural activists and the people can also engage in cultural struggle. They can create and promote cultural works to inspire more people to join and support the revolutionary movement. But only the politico-military struggle can make the reactionaries lose their control over the secular cultural institutions. Even then, unlike the power and wealth of the big bourgeoisie which can be confiscated, the ideas, sentiments and habits of the

reactionaries will persist and can only be overcome or re-channelled persuasively by persevering in the revolutionary education of the current and future generations.

Build the socialist state and engage in socialist revolution in all fields!

Consequent to the smashing and dismantling of the military and bureaucratic machinery of the bourgeois state, the proletarian revolutionary party, the proletariat and the broad masses of the people can establish the socialist state and carry the socialist revolution forward, uphold and defend the national independence and socialist revolution, promote socialist democracy, socialize the commanding heights of the economy, carry out land reform and other bourgeois democratic reforms when necessary as transition measures, foster a patriotic, scientific and socialist system of education and culture, establish diplomatic and trade relations with all countries, and uphold proletarian internationalism and anti-imperialist solidarity.

The democratic state power must protect and defend the proletariat and the people against imperialism and the exploiting classes. It must ensure and encourage the exercise and enjoyment of rights among the broad masses of the people individually and collectively. The revolutionary party of the proletariat must take the lead in the correct handling of contradictions of the people and must give full play to democracy. It must take care that the contradictions among the people are not confused with those between the people and the enemy.

The state must have a republican socialist constitution and must be under the leadership of the revolutionary party of the proletariat, on the basis of the participation and support of the broad masses of the people, and in cooperation with other democratic parties and mass organizations. The main component of state power is the people's army under the absolute leadership of the Party, and must be capable of defending national sovereignty and the socialist revolution against internal and external threats.

The constitution must prohibit imperialist intervention and domination, and the rule of any exploiting class. It must have a bill of rights which gives full play to democracy among the citizenry and all the patriotic and progressive forces within the framework of socialism. It must provide for the distinct executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, their powers and their obligations, and the methods for constituting them.

The national people's congress or parliament must have an Upper House of Labor which upholds the socialist constitution and ensures that legislation by the Lower House of Commons conforms to the constitution and to the socialist principles, policies and plans for developing the political, socio-economic and cultural system. The members of the House of Labor must be elected representatives of the Party and the workers of all major industries. The House of Commons must be a bigger body which includes representatives of the patriotic and progressive classes, forces and sectors and national minorities who are elected by the people at the appropriate levels of political subdivision. The national people's congress or parliament may be replicated at lower levels. And people's consultative assemblies may be formed at any level to prepare and support the work of their respective congress or parliament.

As soon as the socialist republic is established, such commanding heights of the economy as strategic industries, sources of raw materials, and the major means of transport and communication will come under public ownership. Transitory measures may be adopted to allow land reform and other bourgeois democratic reforms, overcome the consequences of war and enemy blockades, and revive the economy in the quickest way possible. But all these measures are subject to the steady process of cooperativization and socialization. As soon as possible, a series of 5-year economic plans must be adopted and implemented to develop socialist industry, agricultural cooperation and mechanization, and such social services as public education, cultural work, health care, housing, sports and recreation.

The centralized economic planning must provide for a well-balanced allocation of resources and development. The strategic industries must be in the lead of development and agriculture must be the base of the economy, ensuring food self-reliance and some major raw materials. But light industries, which will provide basic consumer and producer goods as well as the social services, must be developed as quickly as possible in order to serve the immediate basic needs of the people.

There must also be a well-balanced distribution of economic development tasks between the central and lower levels of economic and social ministries or departments. The objective is to spread economic development nationwide, even as various levels of processing can be located close to the source of raw materials, and certain light industries and social services can be assigned to lower levels of the government.

In socialism, the general principle of compensating people for their work is to each according to his or her deeds. There will still be wage differentials on the basis of the quantity and quality of the work done. But certainly, the needs of those who have retired and those who are unable to work permanently or temporarily (children, women on maternity leave, the elderly, the sick, those with physical or mental impairments, and so on) will be provided for. As productivity rises and production expands, it becomes possible to decrease the number of working hours and raise the real income, unlike in the capitalist system in which the capitalists press down wages in order to maximise private profit. In the socialist system, aside from the assurance of full employment and rising real wages, the surplus value that used to be privately accumulated by the exploiters becomes social capital for expanding and improving production, infrastructure, social services, efficient administration, scientific and technological research and development, artistic cultural work and public performances, defense capabilities and environmental improvement.

It is realistic and reasonable to expect that, in so many vital respects, socialism advances towards communism. The rise in the quantity and quality of production and the efficiency in its organization, the decrease of working hours and increase of real income, and the expansion of social services move towards a classless society in which the needs for subsistence, good health, recreation and cultural upliftment of the individual and the entire community are fulfilled. But to proclaim prematurely the end of classes and the class struggle, and the withering away of the worker state is to encourage the abandonment of the proletarian revolutionary stand, viewpoint and method of thinking. This translates to becoming blind to the persisting reactionary die-hards and potentially new shoots of the bourgeoisie in socialist society and to the continuing threats from imperialism and the international bourgeoisie.

Lenin pointed out that socialism will take a whole historical epoch because of the persistence of imperialism and the increased resistance of the defeated domestic bourgeoisie by tenfold. By virtue of the proletarian revolutionaries' respect for the freedom of thought and belief, the bourgeoisie can still persist and grow by using the bureaucracy, religious institutions and modern cultural institutions as refuge and cover, and ride on old customs and habits that favor reactionary thinking and acting. Mao observed the emergence and growth of the phenomenon of modern revisionism with a growing petty bourgeoisie as its social base in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and also the persistence of the bourgeoisie in Chinese socialist society. Thus, he fought against modern

revisionism since the 1950s and eventually put forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship.

It is easy to understand that it is foolish to suggest the withering away of the worker state in the face of imperialism still riding roughshod over the people of the world. After the full restoration of capitalism in former revisionist-ruled countries, it should also be easy to understand that modern revisionism has been the most lethal poison to socialism. It is proven by history that it is possible to build socialism in one country and then several countries for several decades. But communism cannot be achieved without defeating imperialism, modern revisionism and reaction on a global scale. Thus, proletarian revolutionaries consider it of the highest importance to uphold proletarian internationalism against these anti-socialist and anti-communist adversaries.

The proletarian revolutionary parties and revolutionary mass organizations of the world must unite. They must strive to develop mutual understanding, fraternal relations, and mutual support and cooperation. Giving life to the slogan, “Workers of all countries, unite!”, the socialist state must give uppermost importance to the internationalist unity of the working class through the establishment and development of fraternal relations of working-class parties and socialist states. It must strive to strengthen solidarity of all peoples, revolutionary parties and mass movements around the world in order to fight and defeat imperialism on a worldwide scale. Upon the global defeat of imperialism, communism is realizable.

Revisionist Betrayal of Socialism in the Soviet Union

February 21, 2016

Introduction

It is to the immeasurably great honor and everlasting glory of Lenin, Stalin and their Bolshevik comrades that the socialist revolution and construction which they carried out from 1917 to 1953 or a total of 36 years could not be totally destroyed by the modern revisionists for more than three decades, from 1956 to the final years of the Soviet Union in 1990 and 1991.

Irina Malenko testifies in her book *Sovietica* from her birth in Tula, USSR in 1967 to her immigration to The Netherlands in 1990 at the age of 22 that she could still enjoy some of the most significant fruits of the revolution, like free education, access to cultural and sports facilities, a high sense of patriotism and mutual care and clear job prospect after graduation from the Institute of History and Archives in Moscow.

But in 1991 the Gorbachov regime completed the work of the modern revisionists in destroying the Soviet Union. It is my task to trace how the modern revisionists subverted in stages and ultimately destroyed socialism in the Soviet Union. First, I must briefly describe socialism as the legacy of Lenin and Stalin.

Socialism as the legacy of Lenin and Stalin

After Lenin died in 1924, Stalin took the responsibility of carrying forward the socialist revolution and construction. He followed the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin on: proletarian dictatorship and mass mobilization, public ownership of the means of production, economic planning, industrialization,

collectivization and mechanization of agriculture, full employment and social guarantees, free education at all levels, expanding social services and rising standard of living.

He pursued the line that socialism was possible in one country. He launched the first five-year economic plan in 1929 after the New Economic Policy was terminated. The plan won resounding victory. The Soviet people were jubilant over the establishment of heavy and basic industries. The peasant masses were pleased with the considerable mechanization of agriculture, especially in the form of machine and tractor stations. The standard of living improved significantly.

The jubilation was so high that the 1936 Soviet Constitution proclaimed that there were no more classes and class struggle, except that between the Soviet people and the external enemy. The confiscation of bourgeois and landlord property was interpreted as the disappearance of classes and class struggle, of course by mere economic and legal definition.

Stalin was a proletarian internationalist. He encouraged and supported the communist parties and anti-imperialist movements in capitalist countries and the colonies and semi-colonies through the Third International. From 1935 onward, he promoted internationally the antifascist Popular Front policy.

Stalin prepared well against the expected Nazi German invasion of the Soviet Union, which occurred in 1941. He strengthened the Soviet Union economically and militarily as well as politically through patriotic calls to the entire Soviet people. The Soviet people united. Even as they suffered a tremendous death casualty of more than 20 million and devastation of their country, including the destruction of 85 percent of industrial capacity, they played the pivotal role in defeating Nazi Germany and world fascism and paved the way for the rise of several socialist countries in Eastern Europe and Asia and the national liberation movements on an unprecedented scale.

In the aftermath of World War II, Stalin led the economic reconstruction of the Soviet Union. Just as he succeeded in massive industrialization from 1929 to 1941 (only 12 years) before the war, so he did again from 1945 to 1953 (only eight years) but this time with apparently no significant resistance from counterrevolutionaries. In all these years of socialist construction, socialism proved superior to capitalism in all respects.

When Stalin died in 1953, he left a Soviet Union that was a politically, economically, militarily and culturally powerful socialist country. He had successfully united the Soviet people of the various republics and nationalities and had defended the Soviet Union against Nazi Germany. He had rebuilt an industrial economy, with high annual growth rates, with enough homegrown food for the people and the world's largest production of oil, coal, steel, gold, grain, cotton and so on.

Under his leadership, the Soviet Union had created the biggest number of research scientists, engineers, doctors, artists, writers and so on. In the literary and artistic field, social realism flourished while at the same time the entire cultural heritage of the Soviet Union was cherished.

In foreign policy, Stalin held the US forces of aggression at bay in Europe and Asia, supported the peoples fighting for national liberation and socialism, neutralized what was otherwise the nuclear monopoly of the United States and ceaselessly called for world peace even as the US-led Western alliance waged the Cold War and engaged in provocations.

First stage of revisionist betrayal: the Khrushchov regime, 1953-64

To become the first secretary of the CPSU and accumulate power in his hands, Khrushchov played off Stalin's followers against each other. He depended on the new bourgeoisie that had arisen from the bureaucracy and the new intelligentsia. In 1954, he succeeded in reorganizing the CPSU to serve his revisionist ideological and political position. In 1955, he upheld Tito against the memory of Stalin, especially on the issue of revisionism.

In 1956, he delivered before the 20th Party Congress his "secret" speech against Stalin, completely negating him as no better than a bloodthirsty monster and denouncing the "personality cult". The congress marked the overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship. In 1957, he used the armed forces to defeat the vote for his ouster by the Politburo and thereby made the coup to further consolidate his position.

In 1956, the anti-Stalin diatribe inspired the anti-communist forces in Poland and Hungary to carry out uprisings. The Hungarian uprising was stronger and more violent. Khrushchov ordered the Soviet army to suppress it, chiefly because the Hungarian party leadership sought to rescind its political and military ties with

the Soviet Union.

But subsequently, the Khrushchovite ruling clique allowed the satellite regimes in Eastern Europe to adopt capitalist-oriented reforms (private enterprise in agriculture, handicraft and services, dissolution of collective farms even where land reform had been carried out on a narrow scale and, of course, the free market). The revisionist regimes were, however, under strict orders to remain within the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the Warsaw Pact.

The unremolded social-democratic and petty-bourgeois sections of the revisionist ruling parties in Eastern Europe started to kick out genuine communists from positions of leadership in the state and the party under the direction of Khrushchov and under the pressure of anti-communist forces in society. The so-called proletarian ruling parties had actually been mergers of communists and social-democrats.

The total negation of Stalin by Khrushchov was presented as the prerequisite for promoting democracy and civility, rapid economic progress to build the material and technological foundation of communism in twenty years, peaceful social revolution from an exploitative system to a nonexploitative one, detente with the United States, nuclear disarmament step by step and world peace, a world without wars and arms.

Khrushchov used bourgeois populism, declaring the CPSU was a party of the whole people and the Soviet state as a state of the whole people on the anti-Marxist premise that the tasks of proletarian dictatorship had been fulfilled. He used bourgeois pacifism, declaring that it was possible and preferable for mankind to opt for peaceful transition to socialism and peaceful economic competition with the capitalist powers in order to avert the nuclear annihilation of humanity; raising peaceful coexistence from being diplomatic policy to being the general line governing all kinds of external relations of the Soviet Union and the CPSU; and denying the violent nature of imperialism.

In the economic field, he autonomized state enterprises and promoted private agriculture and the free market. The autonomized state enterprises became responsible for their own cost and profit accounting and for raising the wages and bonuses on the basis of the profits of each individual enterprise. The private plots were enlarged and large areas of land (ranging from 50 to 100 hectares)

were leased to groups, usually households. Machine and tractor stations were sold to collective farms and agricultural machines were sold even to private entrepreneurs. The free market in agricultural and industrial products and services was promoted.

Khrushchov's revisionist rhetoric was presented as the “creative application” of Marxism-Leninism. The socialist system of production and distribution was being breached but could not be dismantled totally. Thus, the Soviet economy under Khrushchov could still register high rates of growth. But the regime boasted of a higher rate of growth in the private sector which benefited from cheap energy, transport, tools, supplies and even stolen products from the public sector.

In the autonomization of state enterprises, managers acquired the power to hire and fire workers, transact business within the Soviet Union and abroad; increase their own salaries, bonuses and other perks at the expense of the workers; lessen the funds available for the development of other parts of the economy; and engage in bureaucratic corruption in dealing with the free market.

Private agriculture was touted as more productive than the state and collective farms. The reemergent rich peasants were praised. But in fact, the corrupt bureaucrats and private farmers and merchants were colluding in under-pricing and stealing products (through pilferage and wholesale misdeclaration of goods as defective) from the collective and state farms in order to re-channel these to the free market. In the end, the Soviet Union would suffer sharp reductions in agricultural production and would be importing huge amounts of grain.

The Khrushchov regime drew prestige from the high educational and cultural level of the Soviet Union, the advances of Soviet science and technology, the achievements in space technology and the continuing economic construction. All of these were not possible without the prior work and the accumulated social capital under the leadership of Stalin. Khrushchov went into rapid housing and office construction which pleased the bureaucracy and the people.

The eventual deterioration of Soviet industry and the breakdown of agriculture and bungling in foreign relations led to the removal of Khrushchov in a coup by the Brezhnev clique. Brezhnev became the general secretary of the CPSU and Kosygin became the premier. The former would eventually assume the position of president.

Second stage of revisionist betrayal: the Brezhnev regime, 1964-82

While Khrushchov was blatantly anti-Stalin, Brezhnev made a limited and partial “rehabilitation” of Stalin. He recentralized the productive ministries and state enterprises previously decentralized by Khrushchev and thus assured the central bureaucracy of revenues and the means to engage in the arms race.

At the same time, the Brezhnev-Kosygin tandem pushed hard Khrushchovite capitalist-oriented reforms. Socialism was converted fully into state monopoly capitalism, with the prevalent corrupt bureaucrats not only increasing their official incomes and perks but taking their loot by colluding with private entrepreneurs and even criminal syndicates in milking the state enterprises. On an ever-widening scale, tradeable goods produced by the state enterprises were either under-priced, pilfered or declared defective only to be channelled to the private entrepreneurs for the free market.

Sales and purchase contracts with capitalist firms abroad became a big source of kickbacks for state officials who deposited these in secret bank accounts abroad. There was also a thriving black market in foreign exchange and goods smuggled from the West through Eastern Europe, the Baltic and southern republics.

The corruption of the bureaucrat and private capitalists discredited the revisionist ruling party and regime at various levels. At the end of the Brezhnev regime, an estimated 30 million people were engaged in private enterprise. Among them were family members of state and party officials. Brezhnev family members were closely collaborating with private firms and criminal syndicates in scandalous shady deals.

The state enterprises necessary for assuring funds for the ever-expanding central Soviet bureaucracy and for the arms race were recentralized. A military-industrial complex grew rapidly and ate up yearly far more than the conservatively estimated 20 percent of the Soviet budget. The Brezhnev regime was obsessed with attaining military parity with its superpower rival, the United States.

The huge Soviet state that could have generated the surplus income for reinvestment in more efficient and expanded civil production of basic and non-basic consumer goods, wasted the funds on the importation of the high grade consumer goods for the upper five per cent of the population (the new

bourgeoisie), on increasing amounts of imported grain, on the military-industrial complex and the arms race, on the maintenance and equipment of half a million troops in Eastern Europe and on other foreign commitments in the third world.

Brezhnev did better than Khrushchov in showing solidarity and giving effective weapons assistance to the Vietnamese people in their war of national liberation against US imperialism as well as to the peoples of Cuba, Angola and Nicaragua. But the Soviet Union was drawn to a disadvantageous prolonged war in Afghanistan to which it deployed a huge number of Soviet troops and equipment to Afghanistan at the time that the Soviet Union was already clearly in dire economic and financial straits.

Brezhnev introduced to the world the so-called doctrine of “limited sovereignty” and “international proletarian dictatorship” on the occasion of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. It was on this occasion that the Soviet Union came to be criticized as social-imperialist, socialism in words and imperialism in deed. Brezhnev also deployed hundreds of thousands of Soviet troops along the Sino-Soviet border. In the 1970s, however, the Soviet Union gave powerful assistance the African national liberation movements and enabled them to defeat colonialism in Africa and weaken the apartheid regime in South Africa in the 1970s.

In trying to keep a tight rein on its satellites in Eastern Europe within the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union expended a lot of its own resources and those of its East European partners in maintaining and equipping half a million Soviet troops in Eastern Europe. Before the 1970s, the Soviet Union encouraged capitalist-oriented reforms in its East European satellites but definitely discouraged any attempt by these satellites to leave the Warsaw Pact.

In the early 1970s, the Soviet Union itself wanted to have a detente with the United States, clinch the “most favored nation” (MFN) treatment, gain access to new technology and foreign loans from the United States and the other capitalist countries. However, in 1972, the Brezhnev regime was rebuffed by the Jackson-Vannik amendment, which withheld MFN status from the Soviet Union for “preventing Jewish emigration”. The regime then further encouraged its East European satellites to enter into economic, financial and trade agreements with the capitalist countries.

During most of the 1970s, the revisionist-ruled countries got hooked to Western

investments, loans and consumer goods. In the early 1980s, most of them fell into serious economic troubles as a result of the aggravation of domestic economic problems and the difficulties in handling their debt burden. Being responsible for the economic policies and for their bureaucratic corruption, the revisionist ruling parties and regimes became discredited in the eyes of the broad masses of the people.

The third and final stage: the Gorbachov regime, 1985-91

The Gorbachov regime from 1985 to 1991 marked the third and final stage in the anti-Marxist and antisocialist revisionist counterrevolution to restore capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship. The destruction of the CPSU and the Soviet Union accelerated as the climax of the previous work of Khrushchov and Brezhnev.

Gorbachov engaged in a systematic campaign of deception. He described his regime as being engaged in socialist renewal and at the same time encouraged the forces of capitalist restoration to do their work under the slogans of glasnost and perestroika.

From time to time, Gorbachov paid lip service to Marxism-Leninism and socialism and made frequent protestations that he was a convinced communist. But in his final message as President of the Soviet Union on December 25, 1991, he used the language of the imperialists in the Cold War to describe his principal achievement, as “giving freedom” to the people from “totalitarianism” and “civilizing” what he decried as the “uncivilized” Soviet state and people.

Gorbachov and his clique systematically adopted barefaced anti-communist “advisers” and placed the anti-communists in various key branches of government, the Congress of People’s Deputies, the institutes and mass media in order to churn out a constant stream of anti-communist propaganda.

Gorbachov took the lead in ridiculing the proletarian revolutionary stand as outdated and Marxism-Leninism as having no monopoly of the truth and won the adulation of the officials, ideologues and publicists of the United States and other capitalist countries.

The key idea in the welter of anti-communist propaganda under glasnost was the advocacy of capitalism and bourgeois liberalism. Gorbachov attacked Stalin to be able by implication to attack Lenin, Marxist-Leninist theory and the entire course of Soviet history. But his subalterns explicitly attacked all these in the

entire course of the Gorbachov period.

In 1989, he had a new Soviet Congress of People's Deputies dominated by an anti-communist intelligentsia most of whom were at first formally communists but would eventually declare themselves as ex-communists and even anti-communists. The congress included from the very start prominent anti-communists of longstanding.

In early 1990, Gorbachov used the All-Union Congress of Soviets to disempower the CPSU and to give him autocratic presidential powers. He used these powers to put the sovereignty of the Soviet Union under question and called for a referendum in early 1991. The popular vote in the referendum was for the retention of the Soviet Union.

But to counter this, he agreed with the nationalist forces in the various republics to make a new "union treaty" whose terms (like having separate armies and currencies, etc.) meant the breakup of the Soviet Union. In this period before the alleged coup to save the Soviet Union, Gorbachov announced that it was wrong to stress the role of the proletariat and that he was going to dissolve the CPSU and establish a social-democratic party.

Gorbachov was arrested and detained by his own appointees in an alleged coup against him from August 19 to 22, 1991. Gorbachov and Yeltsin collaborated in using the charade as a pretext for dissolving the entire CPSU and the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies. The Soviet Constitution and the Soviet Union were still existing and Gorbachov himself had a presidential term extending to 1995 but he decreed the dissolution of the Soviet Union and resigned in favor of a commonwealth of independent states (CIS) still on the planning board.

Perestroika was in fact capitalist restructuring and the disorganization and breakdown of production, despite the avowals of renewing socialism and raising production through better management, a campaign against alcoholism and absenteeism, higher wages and availability of domestic and imported consumer goods, higher profits for the private entrepreneurs, the expansion and retooling of the means of production and the conversion of military enterprises to civilian uses.

The main objective of perestroika was the privatization and marketization of the economy by domestic and foreign investors. One plan after another was adopted

and made dependent on foreign direct investments and loans as domestic savings disappeared and the real income of the people was cut down by inflation due to the wanton printing of money by Moscow and the price gouging in the free market.

The most favored among the private businesses were the joint ventures (joint stock companies) with foreign investors and the private cooperatives. Going into joint ventures with foreign investors mainly in the importation of consumer goods and in the repackaging or assembly of these, the high bureaucrats of the ruling party and the state and their family members appropriated for themselves state assets and drew from foreign loans.

The most widespread form of business organization was the private cooperatives of varying scales in industry, agriculture and services. Their operations included the rechanneling of goods and services from the state to the private sector, small and medium private manufacturing and the private export of whatever Soviet goods, including oil and weapons, and the importation of high-grade consumer goods like cars, computers, video recorders, etc.

From 1988 to 1990, Gorbachov deliberately caused inflation. He increased the money supply by more than 50 percent even as annual production had fallen by only 10 to 20 percent. In 1991, he increased the money supply by more than 100 percent amidst a production fall of more than 20 percent. He also increased the Soviet foreign debt from USD 30 billion at the start of his regime to USD 100 billion at the end in order to finance the importation of consumer goods and the sheer bureaucratic thievery under the cover of the joint ventures.

At this point, I end my presentation. I just wish to say enough to show how the modern revisionists were responsible for destroying the Soviet Union, restoring capitalism completely and causing the economic shambles and social degradation that immediately followed.

Historic Significance, Global Impact and Continuing Validity of the Great October Socialist Revolution Led by Lenin

May 5, 2017

It is an honor and privilege for all of us to participate in this conference to launch the Campaign to Celebrate the Great October Socialist Revolution. We thank the International League of Peoples' Struggle (ILPS) and the People's Resource for International Solidarity and Mass Movement (PRISM) for choosing the Philippines as the starting point of the campaign. We thank ILPS-Philippines, Bayan, Kilusang Mayo Uno, Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas, Gabriela and many other organizations for co-organizing this signal event and for inviting this speaker.

ILPS and PRISM are undertaking the global campaign to celebrate the centennial of the Great October Socialist Revolution in cooperation with Marxist-Leninist, socialist and anti-imperialist organizations. The campaign will culminate in the holding of global mass actions on November 7. The steady core of the campaign is a series of conferences, forums and seminar-workshops in various continents and countries to generate papers and discussions for book publication on the history and continuing legacy of the October Revolution.

The campaign also encourages all participating forces to produce and disseminate papers, study guides, essays, news and feature articles, short videos and dramatic works, songs, poems, commemorative items (posters, banners, postcards, buttons, pins, etc.) relevant to the centenary, and to commission progressive writers, researchers, artists, multimedia workers, and grassroots activists to help out in producing, compiling, publishing, and disseminating such

work.

All of us welcome the call of the ILPS and PRISM: “Let us celebrate the historic gains and continuing validity of the Great October Socialist Revolution for the proletariat and people. Let us draw and share lessons from its revisionist reversal, continue its legacy, persevere in leading the masses, and advance the struggle for democracy and socialism against imperialism and all reaction!” Let us discuss today in this conference the historic significance of the October Revolution, its global impact and its continuing validity for current and future revolutionary movements of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations against monopoly capitalism and all reaction. Despite or because of the betrayal of socialism by the modern revisionists, we are still in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. We confront today the ever-worsening general crisis and wars of aggression of monopoly capitalism and we are engaged in contributing the best we can to the resurgence and advance of the world proletarian revolution.

I. Historic significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution

Marx and Engels formulated the fundamental principles of the theory and practice of Marxism in the era of free competition capitalism. They availed of the highest development of philosophy, political economy and social science in their time in order to arrive at the proletariat’s vantage point of dialectical and historical materialism, the laws of motion of capitalism that led to socialism and the general political line, strategy and tactics for defeating the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and winning the socialist revolution.

In their time, the most that Marx and Engels could observe was the Paris Commune of 1871 as the sprout of the proletarian revolution that the bourgeoisie soon crushed. They were not dismayed by the massacre and defeat of the communards. They studied the strong and weak points of the Paris Commune for the guidance of succeeding revolutions. The most crucial lesson learned was that the proletarian revolution must wield the class dictatorship of the proletariat to smash the military and bureaucratic machinery of the bourgeois state.

Lenin assumed the task of inheriting, upholding, defending and further developing the fundamental principles of the Marxist theory and practice in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. In philosophy, he fought against the subjectivist idealist philosophy of the bourgeoisie and grasped the

unity of opposites as the most fundamental law of contradiction and explicated the law of uneven development. In political economy, he critiqued monopoly capitalism or imperialism and laid the foundation of the socialist economy in correspondence to the extent of proletarian power and took into account the transitory measures necessary to realize democratic reforms and cope with the exigencies of war and foreign intervention.

Lenin was the grand master of social science who established the first socialist state in accordance with the principles of scientific socialism. He learned comprehensively, profoundly and meticulously, with all the necessary hindsight, insight and foresight to solve problems and set the program of action and line of advance and subsequently bring about the seizure of political power by the proletariat in concert with the broad masses of the people, especially the peasants who constituted a large part of the population. He understood that on a global scale, by the law of uneven development, imperialism can engage only in the inadequate and spasmodic development of capitalism for the purpose of grabbing super profits and that the proletariat and the people could be mobilized to rise up and establish socialism at the weakest link in the chain of imperialist countries.

Even as he focused on the practical tasks of the Bolsheviks in the accelerated revolutionary upsurge in Russia amidst the complex contradictions of World War I, he attended to theoretical work during those years. A large number of items in Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks relate to 1914-16 and involved a thorough review of dialectics. In the first half of 1916, he wrote *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* and defined imperialism's decadent and moribund character and five features of dominance in industrial capitalist countries: merger of industrial and bank capital to constitute finance capital, the great importance given to the export of capital than to that of commodities and the growth of cartels, syndicates and other monopoly combines on a global scale. He described imperialism as the eve of the socialist revolution and urged the proletariat and people to turn the imperialist war to revolutionary civil war. In the summer of 1917, he wrote *State and Revolution* to stress the necessity of the proletarian class dictatorship in overthrowing the bourgeoisie and building socialism.

After the overthrow of Tsarism in the February revolution of 1917 and the installation of the Kerensky-led provisional government predominantly of Liberals and Social Revolutionaries, he anticipated the sharpening and complexity of the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and

exerted all efforts to be in Russia as soon as possible in order to participate directly in the revolutionary process. He was certain that the Kerensky government and the bourgeoisie were on the way down because they wished to stay in the inter-imperialist war, motivated as they were by social patriotism (chauvinism in “socialist” garb) and revolutionary “defensism”; they did not nationalize the land for the land-hungry peasants and they could not fix the economy, which was in shambles.

On April 16, 1917, upon his arrival at the Finland Station in Petrograd, Lenin called for all power to the soviets (revolutionary councils) of workers, peasants and soldiers away from the bourgeois Kerensky government. He observed the passing of the first stage of the revolution, which placed power in the hands of the bourgeoisie to the second stage, which must place power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants. He stated all the major points that needed to be done. He clarified that circumstances and events were moving in transition to socialism even as socialism was not yet the immediate task.

He called for a party congress of the Bolsheviks to change the outdated program and name of their party (from Russian Social Democratic Labor Party to All-Russia Communist Party) and differentiate themselves from the social chauvinists of the Second International and social democratic parties of Europe that supported their respective countries in World War I. He also called for a new International of communist parties. The Communist International (Third International) would be formed in 1919.

Events moved in the direction anticipated by Lenin. The Provisional Government sent a diplomatic note on May to the Central Powers, signifying its desire to continue the war to a victorious conclusion. Tens of thousands of workers and soldiers of Petrograd and subsequently those of other cities under the leadership of the Bolsheviks raised the slogans, “Down with the war!” and “All power to the Soviets!” On July 1, hundreds of thousands of workers and soldiers assembled in Petrograd with the same slogans. They expressed the people’s opposition to the war and their hunger for bread and freedom.

In the entire month of July, the Provisional Government became stricken by a severe crisis upon the collapse of its offensive against the Central Powers. It sought to repress the Bolsheviks and the masses. It raided the offices of Pravda (the official Bolshevik daily newspaper) and the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks and ordered the arrest and trial of Lenin who had to go underground.

It fired on the demonstrations of workers and soldiers demanding the end of the war and all power to the soviets. It became even more isolated politically. When commander-in-chief General Kornilov tried to make a coup, Kerensky sought the help of the Petrograd Soviet led by the Bolsheviks to thwart the coup. After the defeat of Kornilov, the revolutionary prestige of the Bolsheviks rose ever higher.

In September and October 1917, workers' strikes spread on a wide scale beyond Petrograd and Moscow, with more than a million workers rising up and taking control over production and distribution in many factories and plants. More than 4,000 peasant uprisings occurred against landowners. The peasant masses became more enraged when they were attacked by government troops, police and thugs of the landlords. The soldiers and sailors refused to recognize the authority and to carry out the commands of the Provisional Government.

On October 23, the Bolsheviks' Central Committee voted 10–2 in favor of the resolution declaring an armed uprising inevitable, and the time for it fully ripe. On October 25, 1917 (or November 7 in the Gregorian calendar) the Bolsheviks led their forces in the uprising, according to plan, to seize the buildings of the bourgeois state and to storm the Winter Palace. The Red Guards seized the buildings and facilities as the Petrograd soldiers joined the uprising. Lenin issued the proclamation "To the Citizens of Russia," ending the Provisional Government and installing Soviet power as the sole state after the surrender of the Kerensky Cabinet.

The Bolsheviks and the soviets under the leadership of Lenin were able to consolidate power. They prevailed over the White Armies in the Civil War and foreign intervention by 1920. The war was waged mainly in the countryside. After the war, he promulgated by decree the New Economic Policy (NEP), which the Bolshevik government had earlier adopted in the course of the 10th Congress of the All-Russia Communist Party in 1921. The NEP replaced the ration system of "war communism" based on scarce production due to the war and revived the economy by adopting methods of state capitalism and giving concessions to middle and small entrepreneurs and rich peasants.

In the period of wartime ruin, the Austro-Hungarian coalition and the Anglo-French coalition, both enemies of Soviet power, were distracted from attacking it because of their mutual warfare. But in the struggle against the White Armies led by Kolchak and Denikin, the Soviet power created the Red Army to defeat them.

In the succeeding period of struggle against economic ruin, it successfully coped with famine and oversaw the considerable advance of agriculture and light industry. Lenin pointed to the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) as a new framework of state existence. The Congress of Soviets ratified the Declaration and Treaty of Union of the Republics in 1922.

After the death of Lenin in 1924, Stalin assumed the leadership of the Bolshevik party and the USSR. He was loyal to Lenin and Leninism. He ended the NEP in 1928 and proceeded with the implementation of a series of five-year plans to build socialist industry and the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture. These brought about resounding success in transforming the USSR into a powerful industrial federal state in the face of the worsening global economic crisis, the rise of fascism in several capitalist countries and the looming outbreak of World War II.

The Great October Socialist Revolution has come to signify all the great revolutionary achievements of the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin in socialist revolution and construction. It verified the revolutionary principle that proletarian class dictatorship is a requisite for defeating the bourgeoisie and guaranteeing the socialist revolution, overcoming civil war and foreign military intervention, reviving the economy through transition measures, building socialist economy, developing the educational and cultural system of the working class, promoting the international communist movement, fighting and defeating fascism and further pursuing socialist revolution and construction in the face of the threats of US imperialism after World War II.

II. Global impact and continuing validity of the October Revolution

The salvoes of the October Revolution reverberated throughout the world. The establishment and development of socialism from 1917 to 1956 on one-sixth of the surface of the earth cannot be ignored by the people of the world, especially the working class and the oppressed peoples and nations. The great achievements in socialist revolution and construction have the force of example in inspiring the oppressed and exploited masses to fight for a bright and better world in socialism. And the Communist Party led by Lenin made sure through the Third International that communist parties and revolutionary mass movements would arise and grow on a global scale, upholding the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism and applying it on the concrete conditions of various countries.

The global impact of the October Revolution can also be measured in terms of the negative reaction of the imperialist powers and the international bourgeoisie. These have always been terrified by the “spectre of communism” and wanted to strangle socialism in the cradle. Right after the October revolution, from 1918 to 1920, the imperialist powers sent to Russia military forces of intervention, with Japanese forces staying on up to 1925 in northern Russia and Siberia, to aid the counterrevolutionaries. But when the Great Depression occurred and resulted in fascist rule in several capitalist countries and the outbreak of World War II, the Allied Powers could obtain victory against the Axis Powers only because of the decisive roles of the Soviet Union in defeating the forces of Nazi Germany and China under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party in likewise defeating the invasionary forces of fascist Japan.

During and after World War II, the toiling masses under the leadership of communist parties excelled in fighting against fascism and gained political power in the process. The Soviet counter-offensive against the Nazi German forces led to the establishment of states under communist leadership in Eastern Europe up to East Germany. The victory of the Chinese people led by the Communist Party against Japan in 1945 and then against the Kuomintang in 1949 meant that one more large part of the world was lost by imperialism. National liberation movements spread and flourished, highlighted by the national wars of liberation against US aggression in Korea and Vietnam. Newly-independent countries promoted decolonization and national independence in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

By the 1950s it could be said that one-third of humankind was under the socialist governance of the revolutionary parties of the proletariat and that the world was divided into the capitalist and socialist camps. However, soon after World War II, the US together with its imperialist allies girded for the Cold War against the Soviet Union and tried to use wars of aggression and nuclear blackmail. But the emergence and growth of modern revisionism, from Khrushchov to Gorbachov, became far worse and more lethal than the blatant threats and actions of US imperialism in terms of subverting and destroying socialism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Comrade Mao led the Chinese Communist Party in the struggle to uphold Marxism-Leninism against modern revisionism since 1956. Eventually, he put forward his theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR)

from 1966 to 1976 in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism in China. The GPCR obtained great victories but was eventually defeated by a coup, with Deng Xiaoping at the head of the revisionists and capitalist restorationists, soon after the death of Mao.

At any rate, the GPCR succeeded in posing the problem of modern revisionism, in presenting certain principles and methods for solving this problem and in generating the rich experience from which positive and negative lessons can be learned. The proletarian revolutionaries can learn from all these in order to explain the disintegration of the former socialist systems and to avert the restoration of capitalism when in the future they shall build and develop socialist societies in various countries until they can defeat imperialism on a global scale and bring about communism. The Paris Commune of 1871 won for a while and was soon defeated but became a source of principles, methods and lessons for advancing the world proletarian revolution.

In the period of the temporary strategic defeat of socialism on a global scale, communists and revolutionary mass activists must be able to answer the questions of the proletariat and people about the past, present and future of the revolutionary cause of socialism. They must answer effectively the taunts of the imperialists and their petty bourgeois adjutants that socialism is dead and that capitalism is the end of history. They must be able to do so in terms of philosophy, political economy and social science. In this regard, the Communist Party of the Philippines is one of the parties upholding the banner of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the torch of socialism in the transition from strategic retreat to the counter-offensive of the revolutionary proletariat.

In terms of dialectical and historical materialist philosophy, nothing is permanent but change. Social systems have come and gone, like slavery and feudalism, which existed for thousands of years. Capitalist society, which first appeared autonomously in the Italian city state in the 13th century, has probably a shorter life span than the earlier social formations if we take into account the rapid development of free competition capitalism to monopoly capitalism in the cumulative advance of history. The bourgeoisie adopts higher technology and minimizes wage payments in order to increase private profit. But the proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations can be aroused, organized and mobilized to resist and change the oppressive and exploitative relations with imperialism and the ruling bourgeoisie in every country. They have seen how national

liberation, people's democracy and socialism can be achieved.

In terms of the critique of capitalism and modern imperialism in political economy, Marx has long pointed out the laws of motion of capitalism both in his microscopic study of the commodity and his macro study of mass production and finance. The capitalist extracts the surplus value from the total value created by the workers, pushes down the wage level, over-accumulates capital and causes the crisis of overproduction, stagnation, unemployment, social turmoil and the intensification of the class struggle. Lenin laid bare how free competition capitalism leads to monopoly capitalism and how the latter brings out the worst of capitalism, goading the proletariat and people of both developed and underdeveloped countries to rebel and seek a revolutionary solution. He has described modern imperialism as the highest and final stage of capitalism. Indeed, it is at this stage when socialist states arose and developed first in Russia and then in several other countries.

In terms of fighting for and achieving scientific socialism in social science, the revolutionary party of the proletariat as the advanced detachment must grasp Marxism-Leninism-Maoism at this time and make a concrete analysis of the concrete conditions in whichever country such party operates. It must win the battle for democracy where the bourgeoisie uses fascist terror to suppress the revolutionary movement for socialism in developed capitalist countries. It must carry out the two stages of the people's democratic revolution and socialist revolution in semicolonial and semifeudal countries. In any case, the proletarian revolutionary party must arouse, organize and mobilize the broad masses of the people to overthrow the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and install that of the proletariat as the key to socialism.

The disintegration of the revisionist-ruled systems and the collapse of the Soviet Union in the years from 1989 to 1991 made the US appear as the big winner in the Cold War and as the sole superpower. Indeed, it served to expand the world capitalist system. But it has not served to strengthen it. It has served to weaken it. It has increased the number of capitalist powers as economic competitors and political rivals, and it has intensified the contradictions within and among the imperialist powers. There is little room for the imperialist powers to maneuver as these are driven by one crisis after another to redivide the world. The addition of China and Russia as big players in the capitalist world has aggravated the crisis and further complicated the problems for the original Group of 7 and the OECD countries.

The US took full advantage of its position as sole superpower since 1991 by taking the offensive in all fields, especially the economic and military ones. It pushed the neoliberal economic policy of imperialist globalization and the neoconservative policy of aggression and intervention more than ever before. It outsourced consumer manufacturing to China to keep it integrated in the world capitalist system. It then became dependent on consumer manufactures and credit from China and concentrated on producing big items for the military-industrial complex and on financializing the US economy. It carried out the neoconservative policy of aggression and intervention with the use of high-tech weaponry. It has unleashed wars of aggression with impunity against the former Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria and other countries, killing and maiming people by the millions, destroying homes and the social infrastructure and forcing more millions of people to become refugees.

But the aforesaid policies of the US have been self-defeating if we consider the high financial costs and the rapid increase of its public debt. This is far bigger than the acknowledged debt of USD 19 trillion. The neoliberal economic policy is dependent on heavy doses of debt for both imperialist and non-imperialist countries, for corporations and households as if there were no limits to the credit orgy. The limits have become conspicuous with the recurrence and worsening of the crises of overproduction and of finance capital. The strategic decline of the US has accelerated from being the sole superpower in the 1990s to one scrambling for hegemony in a multipolar world. The irony of it all is that the main instigator of neoliberal economic policy is purportedly turning to protectionism under Donald Trump.

Those who have suffered most from the neoliberal economic policy are the workers of all countries and the oppressed peoples and nations. Thus, they abhor to hear the mantra that the key to increasing production and employment is to let the monopoly bourgeois have more capital to reinvest by being given tax cuts and by pressing down wages, cutting back on social services and carrying out liberalization of trade and investments, privatization of profitable public assets, deregulation of measures to protect labor, women, children and the environment and the denationalization of the economies of client states. The concentration and centralization of capital in the imperialist countries and in the hands of a handful of monopoly bourgeois have resulted in widespread unemployment, poverty and social unrest. But the reaction of the US and other imperialist powers is to whip up national chauvinism, military production, state terrorism and wars of aggression.

IV. Conclusion

The escalation of exploitation and oppression by the imperialists and their reactionary puppets in various countries is inflaming the resistance of the proletariat and people of the world. The epochal struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat continues. So do all the concrete forms of national and class struggles in various countries. The people do not wish the greed and violence of the few to victimize them without end. They fight for national and social liberation from imperialism and reaction. And they strive for greater freedom and social justice to prevail under the principles of scientific socialism.

There is an urgent need for the revolutionary party of the proletariat in many countries. Such a party must uphold the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideological line against modern revisionism and all forms of subjectivism and must be politically capable of leading the proletariat and people through the anti-imperialist and democratic mass movement. It must ensure that the general political line can bring about the victory of democracy and socialism and defeat imperialism and all forms of reaction and must not be led astray by either “Left” or Right opportunism. It must concentrate the collective will and material strength of the proletarian revolutionaries by following the organizational principle of democratic centralism.

The crisis conditions of the moment generate the immediate issues of the struggle against monopoly capitalism and local reaction. But in recruiting, training and developing their members, the revolutionary parties of the proletariat must inculcate in them the historic mission of building socialism up to the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship. We must counter the propaganda of the enemy that socialism is successful only up to a certain point and then fails because of the inherent selfish and asocial nature of people and their leaders. And we must assure the proletariat and the people that there is no alternative to capitalism but socialism, that modern revisionism and the restoration of capitalism can be prevented and that socialism can be consolidated repeatedly until it gains the upper hand over imperialism on a global scale and reaches the threshold of communism.

Carry Forward the Legacy of the Great October Revolution

Message to Participants of the Study Conference in New York to celebrate the Centenary of the October Revolution

July 1, 2017

As chairperson of the International League of Peoples' Struggle (ILPS), I wish to congratulate the People's Resource for International Solidarity and Mass Mobilization (PRISMM) and the member-organizations of the ILPS National Chapter in the US for cooperating and successfully preparing this study conference today and the cultural festival tomorrow to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in advance of November 7, 2017.

I am thankful, delighted and honored to be afforded the opportunity to express warmest greetings of solidarity and some remarks to the speakers and all other participants in this study conference. I am thankful to the organizers for making available tomorrow during the cultural festival advance copies of my latest book, *Combat Neoliberal Globalization*, which is pertinent to your subject today.

The theme of your study conference is highly significant and urgent: "Advance the Global People's Resistance! Carry Forward the Vision and Tasks of the Great October Socialist Revolution!" The US and world capitalist system are in the throes of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression of the thirties. All the smart guys of monopoly capitalism have turned stupid with their unbridled greed. They can neither solve nor salve the crisis but have only succeeded in aggravating it, particularly since the financial meltdown of 2008.

The call to action is fittingly direct to the point. The proletariat and the rest of the people cannot tolerate the gross violations of their rights and the deprivations and suffering inflicted by the oppressors and exploiters. They must resist monopoly capitalism resolutely and militantly. They must fight for their democratic rights and aim for the realization of socialism. They must be guided and inspired by the vision of the Great October Socialist Revolution and perform the tasks required by the struggle for socialism.

Since the years from 1989 to 1991, when the revisionist betrayers of socialism rapidly, openly and fully restored capitalism in the countries that they ruled and the Soviet Union no less collapsed, US imperialism had appeared with overweening arrogance as the winner in the bipolar world of the Cold War and as the unchallenged sole superpower that had the liberty to launch any kind of offensive in a supposedly unipolar world against the proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations. The moguls and touts of US imperialism dared to prate that history could not go beyond capitalism and liberal democracy. The US proceeded to pursue even harder its neoliberal economic offensive. It foisted on the whole world the notion that the capitalists are the creators of social wealth and that they could create more jobs and more wealth if they could maximize their profits and accumulate more capital by paying less taxes, pressing down wages, cutting back on social spending by government, liberalizing investments and trade, privatizing profitable public assets, deregulating restrictions on the abuse of labor, women, children and the environment and denationalizing the economies of the semi-colonies and dependent countries.

The US seemed oblivious of the fact that the crisis of overproduction in a capitalist country arises when the workers have insufficient income to buy what they produce. It seemed not to notice that the boom-and-bust cycles had become more frequent and worse since the mid-1970s when the industrial countries that had been devastated in World War II recovered and made capitalist countries more vulnerable to the crisis of overproduction. The use of finance capital, the arms race and wars of aggression to override the crisis of overproduction was precisely the cause of stagflation, the ever-worsening economic and financial crisis and the strategic decline of the US.

In the 1980s the US pushed hard the neoliberal economic policy. It expanded the outsourcing of consumer manufactures to China in order to accelerate its integration in the world capitalist system. It concentrated on the production of high-tech weaponry and other big items produced by the military-industrial

complex. It was overconfident that it could maintain global hegemony by being ahead in high-tech weaponry, exporting big items for foreign consumption and taking debt service and super profits from the third world. In less than a decade, the biggest creditor of the world became the biggest debtor by decreasing employment and consumer manufacturing in the US and increasing consumer imports.

The neoliberal dogma is to shun state intervention in the economy and give free rein to the unregulated market, with the big exception of delivering to the monopoly bourgeoisie, especially the military-industrial complex, all kinds of favors to corporate welfare like wage freezes, tax cuts, social cutbacks, financial bailouts and, of course, overpriced military contracts. Under the stimulus of the so-called neoconservative policy in foreign relations, the economic neoliberals welcome and give way to pump priming the US economy with public funds for war production, overseas deployment of US military forces and wars of aggression. Thus, trillions of dollars have been spent on wars in Afghanistan, the former Yugoslavia, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Ukraine and elsewhere.

For a while in the 1990s, the US appeared to profit most from the information technology and the financialization of the economy until the economic and financial crisis came at the end of the 20th century. The attempt to buoy up the US economy since the beginning of the 21st century with the use of unrepayable mortgages, war production and wars of aggression inevitably led to the financial meltdown of 2008. This has plagued the entire capitalist world, plunging it to a depression longer and deeper than the Great Depression, accelerating the strategic decline of the US and unfolding more clearly than ever before a multipolar world of intensifying contradictions among capitalist powers, between labor and capital, between the imperialist and the anti-imperialist governments and between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations.

Because of the betrayal of socialism by the modern revisionists, we the revolutionary forces and people of the whole world are still in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution and we have to advance from a temporary strategic retreat. But because of the ever-worsening crisis of the world capitalist system, we are now in transition to a greatly favorable situation in which the forces of anti-imperialism, democracy and socialism are resurging and advancing and socialist societies can once more arise in several countries. To make this transition successful, we must build and develop the various subjective

forces of the revolution through relentless struggle.

We must adhere to the ideological, political and organizational lines that made victorious the Great October Socialist Revolution by the great Lenin and further revolutions led by the proletariat. We must build the revolutionary party of the proletariat that can lead the broad masses of the people to victory against imperialism and all reaction. We must build the mass organizations of the workers, peasants, women, youth, children, the professionals and intelligentsia. We must build alliances to reach the people in their millions. We must wage various forms of struggle and ultimately overthrow the state power of the bourgeoisie. Wherever possible, we must build the organs of political power to establish people's democracy and socialism.

May the study conference and further studies shed light on what is to be done in order to advance the anti-imperialist movement and proletarian revolution and bring about the victory of socialism!

Turn the Grave Crisis to the Revolution's Advantage

Message to participants of the ORCC-CL, July 6, 2017

On behalf of the entire International League of Peoples' Struggle, I extend my most ardent revolutionary greetings and solidarity to all those participating in the celebration of the centenary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Central Luzon on July 7, 2017.

It is fine that BAYAN-Central Luzon, Central Luzon Alliance for a Sovereign Philippines (CLASP), Anakbayan-Central Luzon and others have responded to the call of the ILPS, People's Resource for International Solidarity and Mass Mobilization (PRISM) and BAYAN-National to conduct studies on the October Revolution led by the great Lenin.

Your objective of intensifying the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-fascist struggle is correct, especially against neoliberal economic policy and against the unbridled use of state terrorism. As the exploitation of the toiling masses is being intensified, so is the repression against them.

It is but fitting that your speakers will be including in their talks the national context of the anti-imperialist struggle, Central Luzon's brilliant history of struggle and the current struggle of Workers Alliance of Region III or WAR III. It is right to underscore the role of the working class as the vanguard class, being the most progressive productive and political force.

Thanks to the great Lenin, the five characteristics of imperialism have been explained to us. And he said that humanity entered the international era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution when capitalism reached the stage of monopoly capitalism as its last and highest stage. Imperialism is very

exploitative and oppressive and gives rise to crisis and wars of aggression.

Thus, the working class and the oppressed peoples and nations are waging resistance in various parts of the globe. Lenin explained and demonstrated in the February and October Revolutions of 1917 that the revolution led by the proletariat has two stages if a large part of a country's economy is agrarian, feudal or semifeudal. The first stage involves the waging of bourgeois-democratic revolution and the second stage involves the waging of socialist revolution.

At the onset of imperialism, towards the end of the 19th century, US imperialism had already manifested the violent and aggressive character of monopoly capitalism. US imperialism waged war against Spanish colonialism to seize Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines and begin fulfilling its ambition of becoming the No. 1 imperialist power of the 20th century. The old bourgeois-democratic revolution waged by the Filipino people was not sufficient to defeat US imperialism.

Nonetheless, the outbreak of the inter-imperialist First World War provided the Bolsheviks and the Russian people with the opportunity to shift it into a revolutionary war within and with the Russian empire and lay the foundations of the socialist revolution with the proletariat's seizure of power from the bourgeoisie. The toiling masses all over the world, including the Philippines, drew inspiration from the October revolution.

The outbreak of the inter-imperialist Second World War provided an even bigger opportunity to the working class and the oppressed peoples and nations to wage revolution, including the Philippines. The Hukbalahap was formed in Central Luzon with the movement of the toiling masses as its base. In resisting and defeating fascism, national liberation movements became victorious and socialism emerged in Eastern Europe and China, Korea and Indochina. It can be said that in the 1950s, one-third of humanity was under the governance of socialism and the working class.

But modern revisionist rule emerged in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956. It destroyed the socialism built by Lenin and Stalin and fought the Marxist-Leninist standpoint of the international communist movement.

The Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong

struggled against revisionism and succeeded on the whole during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Even if the revisionist clique led by Deng Xiaoping was able to launch a coup de etat upon the death of Comrade Mao, the latter's legacy remains on how to struggle against revisionism, stop capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

Due to the rapid, brazen and full restoration of capitalism in the countries led by the revisionist cliques, especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989 to 1991, US imperialism boasted that socialism was dead and hopeless; and that history would no longer progress beyond capitalism and liberal democracy. Believing that it owned the entire world as the sole superpower, the US further accelerated its imposition of neoliberal economic policy and waged wars of aggression under the so-called neoconservative policy.

Since 2008 up to the present, the US and its fellow capitalist powers have not been able to solve the frequent and worsening economic crisis, the chronic and deepening global depression and the outbreak of wars of aggression. US imperialism has been on a rapid strategic decline. And contradictions among the world's capitalist powers have been intensifying, with these being linked to and affecting the crisis of the ruling system in the Philippines.

Let us emulate Lenin and the Bolsheviks on how they were able to turn the grave crisis and the inter-imperialist wars to the revolution's advantage. We must face the challenges and prepare for intense difficulties in the struggle. We must further strengthen the revolutionary party of the working class, the mass organizations, the Red vanguard, the organs of democratic power and the alliances to be able to reach out to, draw in, organize and mobilize the broad masses in their millions until we attain complete victory for the Philippine revolution.

Long live the legacy of the October Revolution!

Long live the proletarian revolutionaries!

Advance the Philippine revolution up to socialism!

Long live the Filipino people!

The Future of Imperialism and Socialism

Message to participants in the launch and forum on

Lenin's 'Imperialism' in the 21st century

July 21, 2017

Introduction

It is difficult or even impossible to discuss and elaborate on the future of imperialism (monopoly capitalism) and socialism without understanding the laws of motion involved in social transformation and the trajectory of developments from the past to the present, especially at this time when imperialism is still dominant and socialism has still to resurge by taking advantage of the persistent economic and financial crises and aggressive wars that manifest the parasitic, violent, decadent and moribund character of imperialism.

At any rate, we are well past the time when a factotum of US imperialism could arrogantly claim that humankind cannot go beyond capitalism and liberal democracy and that the socialist cause is dead because of the restoration of capitalism in China, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and East Germany before the 20th century was over.

Since then, after boasting of itself as winner in the Cold War and sole superpower in a unipolar world, the US has hastened its own strategic decline by undermining itself with the high costs of the crisis-stricken neoliberal economic policy and the neoconservative policy of aggressive wars. In the early decades of the last century, a multipolar world has emerged, characterized by intensified

inter-imperialist contradictions and sharpening struggle for a redivision of the world.

At the International Seminar on Mao Zedong Thought to mark the 100th birth anniversary of Comrade Mao Zedong in 1993, the Communist Party of the Philippines declared that we are still in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, even as the former seems to reign without serious challenge and the latter has taken a strategic retreat as a result of the betrayal of socialism by the modern revisionists that started in earnest in the Soviet Union during the time of Khrushchov.

Since the last decade of the 20th century, we have witnessed the overweening arrogance and yet self-defeating direction of the ideological, political, economic and military offensives undertaken by US imperialism and its NATO allies to attack the proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations. Such offensives and their extremely harsh consequences have served to stress the point that there is no alternative to imperialism but socialism.

Part I. Marx and Engels in the era of free competition capitalism

Marx and Engels laid down the fundamental principles of Marxism in the fields of philosophy, political economy and social science. They surpassed the preceding level of knowledge in these fields by studying the reality of rapid changes due to the use of machines in large-scale commodity production in the era of free competition capitalism and by taking into account the vantage point and revolutionary potential of the industrial proletariat.

The philosophy of dialectical materialism teaches us that there is nothing immutable in the universe and that there is nothing permanent but change. The material world that exists objectively, independent of human consciousness, is governed by the laws of contradiction from the level of particles and sub particles to the most conspicuous formations and phenomena in nature and society.

Historical materialism is the application of dialectical materialism in the study of societies and the process of social transformation. It has shown the general sequence of the many millennia of classless but stone-age primitive communal societies and the slave, feudal, capitalist and socialist forms of societies characterized by literacy, existence of classes and metallurgy. The contradiction

between the forces of production (people in production and the means of production) and the relations of production gives rise to a new and higher form of society.

In general, when evolution precedes revolution, the forces of production predetermine the relations of production. But in the process of revolution, the new relations of production can promote and accelerate the growth of productive forces and revolutionize both the mode of production and the social superstructure. Social transformations are cumulative but not unilinear. They tend to follow a zigzag course.

There are also examples of societies retrogressing to an earlier form of society due to internal and external factors. In the Marxist critique of the capitalist economy, the workers get wages that are only a small part of the new material values that they create and the rest, which is called the surplus value is divided among the capitalist proprietor, the banks and landowner as profit, interest and rent, respectively. To maximize profit and to survive or prevail in intercapitalist competition, the capitalist seeks to minimize and press down wages and to make up for fewer workers with labor-saving machines.

In effect, he limits and narrows the market because of the lessened employment and incomes or purchasing power of the workers. Thus, the crisis of overproduction occurs relative to the market. When the capitalists try to overcome the economic slump, they run to the bank for credit to tide them over the dire situation and eventually they cause a financial crisis when bankruptcies and production cutbacks occur due to the persistent stagnation or depression of demand.

The economic and financial crisis that arises from pressing down wages and investing more on the means of production allows the winning capitalist to beat his competitors. Thus, competition leads to concentration of capital and ultimately to monopolies. In the middle of the 19th century, there were already British monopolies benefiting from the so-called free trade in the expanding British colonial empire. In the last three quarters of the 19th century, monopolies emerged in several industrial capitalist countries.

In social science, Marx and Engels advanced the study of class struggle, which was started by the revolutionary democrats in the French revolution. They extended the study to that of the class struggle leading to the proletarian class

dictatorship and supplanting the bourgeois class dictatorship. The proletarian class dictatorship or the working-class state is the key to the entire theory and practice of scientific socialism. In contrast, utopian socialism is mere wishful thinking and relying on a few good hearts to establish communal enclaves

In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels called for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the proletarian class dictatorship. They also called for winning the struggle for democracy. The working class can assure itself of victory not only by strengthening itself but also by winning over the broad masses of the people in the struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie. Marx and Engels did their best to participate in the working-class movement by founding the Communist League in 1847 and taking leading roles in the formation and work of the International Workingmen's Association or the First International in 1864.

Marx studied the Paris Commune of 1871 as a great source of both positive and negative lessons by which to advance proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. He lauded the working class of Paris for seizing state power and establishing the proletarian dictatorship and adopting revolutionary policies and actions. But he also criticized the failure to take the offensive against Versailles and to smash the bureaucratic and military machinery of the bourgeois state. The communards prematurely called for elections. They unwittingly allowed the bourgeoisie to exercise their influence in Paris and to even plot the massacre of the communards. At any rate, the Paris Commune has served as the prototype of the proletarian class dictatorship.

Part II. Lenin in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution

The great Lenin summed up Marxism, with its three basic components and its revolutionary essence. He upheld, defended and further developed what he inherited from Marx and Engels. He made his own outstanding contributions to Marxist philosophy, political economy and social science. He was inspired by the fact that Marxism had become the main trend in the working-class movement in Europe by the last decade of the 19th century. He sharpened his theoretical knowledge by applying it in the revolutionary struggle against Tsarism and the bourgeoisie and criticizing the currents of opportunism, reformism and revisionism among the avowed revolutionaries in Russia and in the Second International.

In philosophy, Lenin combated petty bourgeois subjectivist idealism, which poses as third-party philosophy between materialism and idealism or insists on the dualism of the natural and the supernatural, garbs idealism and metaphysics with empiricism or mechanical materialism and denies dialectical materialism. He maintained the scientific materialist position and pointed to the unity of opposites as the most fundamental law of material dialectics among the three laws of contradiction (unity of opposites, negation of the negation and quantitative change to qualitative change).

He elaborated on the law of uneven development to indicate that socialism can arise from the weakest link among the imperialist powers, such as Russia with a growing bourgeoisie in industrial islands surrounded by an ocean of medievalism and feudalism and using a military-feudal empire to exploit and oppress various nationalities. Where capitalism is more industrially developed and offers the economic and social conditions for socialism, the bourgeoisie is in a stronger position to resist and repress the working-class movement and the socialist cause. The proletariat is likely to face state terrorism and has to win the battle for democracy by overthrowing the bourgeois state. In a less advanced country like Russia, the bourgeois democratic stage of the revolution becomes more defined.

In political economy, Lenin studied the development of free competition capitalism to monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism and defined the latter as the highest and final stage of capitalism. This is decadent and moribund because it is prone to crises and wars. He described the five features of imperialism: the dominance of monopoly capital in the capitalist economy, the merger of bank capital with industrial capital becomes the basis of finance capital, the higher importance of the export of surplus capital than that of surplus commodities, the rise of international combines of monopoly capitalist corporations to share the world among them and the territorial division of the world among the strongest imperialist powers has been completed.

A substantial change in the balance of forces among the imperialists leads to an intensified struggle for the redivision of the world and the outbreak of a world war. He described the inter-imperialist war as the eve of socialist revolution and called on the proletariat and people to turn the imperialist war into revolutionary civil war. He opposed the European social democratic parties in the Second International for supporting the war effort and war budget of their respective countries and called them social chauvinists.

He successfully led the Bolshevik party and the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers in overthrowing the Provisional Government headed by Kerensky in Petrograd on October 25, 1917 (November 7 in the Gregorian calendar). Thus, he established for the first time in history the first socialist state in one country covering one sixth of the face of the earth. He proclaimed all power to the soviets and the end of the inter-imperialist war. He consolidated immediately the power of the soviets by pursuing peace, nationalization of the land and revival of the economy.

After the Red Army won the Civil War against the White armies and the foreign military intervention, he decreed the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1922 in order to revive the economy as soon as possible from the dire conditions of war, scarcity of goods and the “war communism” of rationing by adopting methods of state capitalism and giving concessions to small and medium producers and traders. The Bolshevik-led government had earlier adopted the NEP in the course of the 10th Congress of the All-Russia Communist Party in 1921.

Lenin directed the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) as a new framework of state existence. The Congress of Soviets ratified the Declaration and Treaty of Union of the Republics in 1922. After the death of Lenin in 1924, Stalin assumed the leadership of the Bolshevik party and the USSR and carried forward socialist revolution and construction. He ended the NEP in 1928 and proceeded with the implementation of a series of five-year plans to build socialist industry and the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture. He defeated opposition from the “Left” opportunists who pontificated that socialism was impossible in one country as well as the Right opportunists who demanded the prolongation of the NEP.

Under the leadership of Stalin and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the USSR became a powerful industrial state by 1936. Through the Soviet Constitution, Stalin proclaimed the end of classes and the class struggle, except the one between the Soviet people and the imperialists. This formulation was erroneous because classes and class struggle continued to exist and needed to be handled correctly. In contrast to the Soviet Union, the industrial capitalist countries were beset by the Great Depression, social turmoil, the rise of fascism and the growing danger of an inter-imperialist war.

Stalin was ever loyal to Lenin and Leninism and adhered to Marxism-Leninism. His merits outweighed his demerits in building socialism. Comrade Mao would

later rate him 70 percent good in contrast to Khrushchov's total negation of him in 1956. In philosophy, he was sometimes overly focused on the interrelation of conflicting forces that were external to each other. In political economy, he prescribed the full correspondence of the mode of production and the superstructure. In social science, he prematurely declared the end of classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union.

In overstating that the Soviet society had become classless, he unwittingly obfuscated the need to enhance the proletarian revolutionary stand, viewpoint and method and the need to handle correctly the relations of classes among the people. He tended to deal with his critics and opponents with a heavy iron hand because they were easily cast as enemies of the people. But when World War II loomed and broke out, with Russia as the main target of Nazi Germany, he loosened up politically and returned the properties of the Orthodox Church for the sake of expanding and strengthening the Great Patriotic War against the fascist invasion.

By and large, Stalin was an outstanding communist leader and fighter. He excelled at fighting imperialism and fascism to uphold, defend and advance socialism in the Soviet Union, he succeeded in building the Soviet socialist economy from 1928 to 1940 and rebuilding it from 1945 to 1953, in developing the educational and cultural system of the working class, in inspiring the Soviet people to fight and defeat Nazi Germany and fascism, in promoting the international communist movement and in supporting communist-led forces to establish people's democracies and socialist states (in Eastern Europe, East Germany, China and Korea) as well as movements for national liberation and in facing up to the US and its imperialist allies in the aftermath of World War II.

Part III. Modern revisionism and the restoration of capitalism

Exactly when it could be said that one third of humanity were in socialist countries led by revolutionary parties of the proletariat and that the world was divided between the capitalist and socialist camps, Khrushchov delivered his "secret" speech against Stalin at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, accusing him of promoting the personality cult, of using this to disregard collective leadership and resulting in the purges of communist cadres and entire masses. He enumerated 61 allegations of crimes, which were demonstrably false. The speech signalled the rise of modern revisionism in the CPSU and most of the ruling communist parties in Eastern

Europe.

Modern revisionism may be described as an all-round ideological, political, economic and social line and practice by an avowedly communist ruling party claiming to be engaged in the creative application of Marxism-Leninism by undertaking so-called reforms that subvert a socialist society and restore capitalism. In contrast, the classical revisionists (the social democrats) behave as the tail of bourgeoisie in the bourgeois parliament. The modern revisionists are those at the center of executive power already in a position to junk socialism and restore capitalism. It is nurtured by a resurgent domestic bourgeoisie and encouraged by the international bourgeoisie.

Khrushchov totally negated Stalin and his achievements and denigrated the CPSU and the Soviet proletariat and people for being subservient to his personality cult. He claimed that the proletariat had fulfilled its historic mission of building socialism, that the CPSU and socialist state were no longer of the proletariat but of the entire people, that the transition to socialism ought to be peaceful, that the superiority of socialism over capitalism would be proven through peaceful economic competition and that peaceful coexistence was the general line of the international communist movement.

He adopted and carried out “reform” policies and measures to dismantle the socialist economy. He decentralized the economic ministries and sabotaged central economic planning. He promoted factory egoism, made individual enterprises responsible for their cost and profit accounting and gave the managers the power to hire and fire workers. In agriculture, he undermined the state and collective farms by enlarging the private plots and the free market and caused the re-emergence of kulaks in large numbers; he put the machine and tractor stations under the ownership of individual collective farms and made these responsible for their own cost and profit accounting. He also caused the planting of the wrong crop on the wrong kind of soil.

Khrushchov was held responsible for economic failure and was replaced by Brezhnev as the CPSU General Secretary in 1964 until 1982. The latter posed as someone engaged in re-Stalinization of the economy by recentralizing certain ministries and enterprises needed to assure the federal state with funds and to ensure the production of weapons in accordance with Brezhnev’s policy of engaging in the arms race with the US and gaining parity in military strength. Many of the reforms undertaken by Khrushchov persisted to favor the bureaucrat

bourgeoisie in collusion with the private bourgeoisie as criminal partner in corrupt practices. Thus, Brezhnevism was called Khrushchovism without Khrushchov.

In external relations, Khrushchov prated much about the general line of peaceful coexistence, seeking detente with the US and ending the Cold War. But he was quite vicious in withdrawing assistance from China as a result of the ideological debate between the CPC and the CPSU, with the former taking the Marxist-Leninist stand against the latter's modern revisionism. He deployed missiles in Cuba in 1961 only to withdraw these quickly upon warning by the US. He avoided giving concrete support to the Vietnamese people's struggle for national liberation. In comparison, Brezhnev adopted an aggressive policy, earning criticism as a social imperialist (socialist in word and imperialist in deed) by invading Czechoslovakia in 1968, attacking Zhenbao island in the Wusuli River and deploying a million troops along the Sino-Soviet border.

The series of short-time general secretaries of the CPSU that followed Brezhnev did not change the revisionist Khrushchov-Brezhnev continuum. Gorbachov and his teammates, including Yeltsin as collaborator and seeming rival, found this as a convenient ground for ideas, policies and measures for the rapid and full restoration of capitalism and the collapse of the Soviet Union. Gorbachov engineered the scarcity of consumer goods and encouraged the creation of 500,000 phoney cooperatives to enable backdoor sales to consumers who had grown tired of queuing at state-owned stores, while the Russian Mafia (the criminal bourgeoisie) waited for the big prize of privatizing state monopoly assets.

No self-respecting leader or ruling party of a state would put into question the life of that state by calling for a referendum on it. But Gorbachov did so. On a seemingly different track, Yeltsin separated Russia from the Soviet Union only to form a Confederation of Independent States (CIS) and lay aside the results of the referendum called by Gorbachov to decide the life of the Soviet Union, even as the majority of the Soviet people voted for continued existence of the Soviet Union. Thus, the Soviet Union was dissolved on December 25, 1991.

Mao knew much about the CPSU and the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin and the scourge of modern revisionism from the long-running relationship between the CPSU and the Chinese Communist Party, the Moscow meetings of communist and workers' parties in 1957 and 1960, the study and training of

thousands upon thousands of Chinese students and workers in the Soviet Union in the 1950s and the Soviet withdrawal of assistance to China in 1959. As a matter of principle, the CPC took exception to the complete negation of Stalin by Krushchov and stood for Marxism-Leninism against modern revisionism.

Part IV. Maoist theory and practice against imperialism and revisionism

The great Mao further developed the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism and made greatly significant contributions in philosophy, political economy and social science. It can be said that Maoism is the third stage in the development of the theory and practice of proletarian revolution after the earlier stages of Marxism and Leninism. At the time of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR), Mao Zedong Thought was described as the guide to revolutionary action in the context of imperialism heading for total collapse and socialism winning total victory in the world.

But consequent to the successful Dengist coup and defeat of the proletarian revolutionaries in 1976 after the death of Mao and the restoration of capitalism in China itself and the full restoration of capitalism of revisionist-ruled societies in the years from 1989 to 1991, the socialist cause has taken a strategic retreat. To be circumspect and to reflect the current strategic situation we can say that we are still in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. Indeed, imperialism is still dominant and socialism still needs to resurge. The stage of Maoism can extend to the period of new victories of socialism over imperialism and all reaction in various countries.

In philosophy, Mao elaborated on the unity of opposites as the fundamental law of the universe. Contradictions exist everywhere, but they differ in accordance with the different nature of different things and processes. There is at once unity and struggle, and it is the struggle that impels things to move and change. In a simple kind of contradiction, the principal aspect determines the character of the temporary unity or balance of the opposites. But the secondary aspect has the potential to become the principal aspect by overpowering it. In a complex set of contradictions, the principal contradiction must be determined because its resolution facilitates that of the other contradictions.

Mao declares that social practice is the source of knowledge and includes production, class struggle and scientific experiment. He describes as rising in a series of waves the advance of perceptual and rational knowledge and theory and

practice. Mao's penetrating analysis of the unity of opposites stresses the principle of self-reliance in the revolutionary struggle. External causes are the condition of change and internal causes are the basis of change and that external causes become operative through internal causes. In a suitable temperature, an egg changes into a chicken, but no amount of temperature can change a stone into a chicken.

In political economy, Mao comprehended the Marxist critique of capitalism and the Leninist critique of monopoly capitalism. He critiqued the building of the socialist economy in the Soviet Union and he drew lessons from it. He put forward the line that agriculture is the base of the economy, heavy and basic industry is the lead factor and light industry is the bridge between the two. Revolutionization of the relations of production enhances the forces of production. Revolutionization of the superstructure enhances the mode of production.

As the bridge between agriculture and heavy and basic industry, light industry serves immediately the consumption and production needs of the people, especially the peasant masses, instead of increasing their burden as a result of overaccumulation and overinvestment in heavy and basic industries. Leadership in the factories was constituted by the representatives of the Party, the workers and the experts. They took turns in working on the bench to keep high their proletarian class stand, know the conditions and needs of the workers and sustain their close relations with the workers.

In social science, Mao made great contributions to the development and victory of the new democratic and socialist stages of the Chinese revolution. He developed further Lenin's teachings on building the Party as the advanced detachment of the working class. He elaborated on the strategy and tactics of protracted people's war by which the revolutionary forces could accumulate strength in the countryside until they could seize power in the cities. Upon the basic completion of the new democratic revolution through the seizure of political power, the revolutionary party of the proletariat is in the lead and at the core of the people's democratic republic and ensures that the people's army under proletarian revolutionary leadership is the main component of the socialist state.

Thus, the socialist revolution began in China even as transition measures had to be undertaken in order to complete the land reform and other bourgeois

democratic reforms, carry out agricultural cooperation and to socialize the economy. Socialist construction could also begin with the state taking over the commanding heights of the economy such as the strategic industries, the main sources of raw materials and the system of transport and communications. After the basic socialization of the entire economy, the Right opportunists under Soviet revisionist influence demanded prolongation of the transition measures.

But Mao prevailed by launching the Great Leap Forward from 1959 to 1961 in order to establish the communes and socialist industry. This came on time to overcome the imperialist blockade, the Soviet withdrawal of economic cooperation and the natural calamities. By 1962 China was producing bumper crops in agriculture and building major heavy and light industries. Mao called for a socialist education movement to counter the attacks on his line during and after the Great Leap Forward. Capitalist roaders in the Party and State leadership sabotaged the movement to render it ineffective.

Ultimately, Mao put forward in 1966 the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through the GPCR in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate the socialist system. The struggle to consolidate socialism is envisioned as taking a historical epoch, entailing a series of cultural revolutions. The GPCR won one victory after another from 1966 to 1976 under the leadership of Mao even as it was constantly being undermined and sabotaged by the revisionists headed by Liu Shaoyi and Deng Xiaoping. However, after the death of Mao, Deng and his associates made a coup in 1976 and started to roll back the gains of the GPCR.

The GPCR scored great achievements in socialist revolution and construction. But all of these were negated by those who have restored and maintained capitalism. Even the GDP of China had an average annual rate of growth of 10 percent from 1966 to 1976. But this rate would be brought down by the obvious falsification of downside figures by the capitalist roaders after 1976. The Dengist bourgeois counterrevolution and capitalist restoration in China have proven conclusively that Mao was correct in posing the problem of modern revisionism and putting forward the theory of continuing revolution under the proletarian dictatorship through the GPCR.

The defeat of the GPCR does not mean the invalidation or permanent death of its principles and methods but these can be studied further, developed and propagated to answer the taunt that there is no alternative to capitalism. The

lasting value of GPCR is that it posed and answered the question whether socialism can be consolidated and capitalist restoration can be prevented. Lessons can be learned from the victories and defeat of the GPCR. The main attack came from the revisionists but the Marxist-Leninists also committed certain errors. As in the study of the victory and defeat of the Paris Commune in 1871, questions can be raised and answered and the tasks of the proletarian revolutionaries can be better defined in a continuing study of the GPCR.

During the GPCR, the ideological debate between the CPC and the CPSU intensified. New Communist Parties were formed to uphold Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and to oppose Soviet modern revisionism. The Central Committees of Marxist-Leninist parties sent permanent and occasional delegations to Beijing. But eventually by 1974 in its foreign policy and diplomatic relations, China veered towards the Right when it defined three worlds: the first world of the two superpowers, the US and Soviet Union, the second world of less developed capitalist countries and the underdeveloped countries in Asia, African and Latin America. The proletarian revolutionaries continued to consider the many countries of the third world as the mainstay for an international united front with socialist countries against any of the two superpowers. But the Chinese modern revisionists laid stress on rapprochement with the US to lay the ground for alliance with the US and integration in the world capitalist system.

Part V. The future of imperialism and socialism

After the foregoing analysis of the past and current situation of imperialism and the socialist cause, we can now try to predict their probable course and future. Imperialism or monopoly capitalism is a dying system of greed and terror beneficial only to a few at the expense of the proletariat and the people who create the social wealth but are exploited and oppressed. Such a system cannot last forever. Socialism is the only alternative. Because of the ever-worsening crisis and destructiveness of imperialism, the objective conditions have become favorable for the advance of the subjective forces of the antiimperialist, democratic and socialist movement.

Following the full restoration of capitalism in revisionist-ruled countries and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the US appeared as the winner in the bipolar world of the Cold War and as the sole superpower in the capitalist world for an indefinitely long time. Since then, some people have even imagined that

imperialism is forever and that history cannot go beyond capitalism and liberal democracy. However, instead of the promised economic bonanza and so-called peace dividends resulting from the full restoration of capitalism in revisionist-ruled countries, the US imperialists have carried out ideological, political, economic and military offensives aimed at further aggrandizing themselves but in fact resulting in extremely high and self-debilitating costs and inciting the people to resist the escalation of exploitation, state terrorism and wars of aggression.

The US originally adopted the neoliberal economic policy as early as 1979 to solve the problem of stagflation. Reagan proceeded to carry out the policy by concentrating on the production of high-tech military goods and outsourcing the production of consumer goods in the 1980s. This undermined employment in the manufacture of consumer goods and the US turned from being the biggest creditor to being the biggest debtor, indebted mainly to Japan, China and other economies in East Asia. US policymakers calculated that subcontracting sweatshop operations to China would keep it in the world capitalist system. And production of high-technology and capital-intensive goods and war materiel by the military-industrial complex and financialization of the US economy would maintain the US as the No. 1 economic power.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the US became more aggressive in the Middle East (Iraq), Central Asia (Afghanistan) and Eastern Europe (Yugoslavia). The trend would continue from the regime of Bush the elder to that of Clinton in the 1990s. The latter regime estimated that the US could stay as the No. 1 economic and military power by being ahead in information technology, financialization of the economy and stepping up military production. The high-tech boom went bust at the start of the 21st century and signaled the end of the unipolar world with the US as the unchallenged sole superpower. Bush aggravated the US and global economic and financial crisis by undertaking loose credit and other measures that ultimately led to the mortgage meltdown of 2006-2008.

Bush took advantage of the 9/11 events to declare a perpetual global war on terror, apply the neoconservative policy of aggression using high-tech military weapons, further step-up war production and practically boast of this as military Keynesianism to pump prime the economy. When the US unleashed its war of aggression against Iraq on the false pretext that this held nuclear and chemical weapons of mass destruction, China and Russia appeared to support or at least

condone the aggressive actions of the US against Iraq. But they could not miss the dangers of US expansionism to them and noticed how the US was undermining itself with the extremely high costs of aggression and the soaring US public debt. Thus, they became more determined to strengthen the BRICS economic bloc for the purpose of economic development independent of the US and the multilateral agencies it controls; and form the Shanghai Cooperation Organization for the purpose of collective security.

A multipolar world has arisen to replace the US-dominated unipolar world. This is the result of China and Russia joining the ranks of the capitalist powers, changing the balance of forces in the world capitalist system and ending the status of the US as the unchallenged sole superpower. All the capitalist and imperialist powers are beset now by socioeconomic and political crisis and are escalating their economic competition and political rivalry. Inter-imperialist contradictions are intensifying. The imperialist powers are driven to redivide the world. In the process, they aggravate the crisis and further engage in wars. Wars are going on in around 50 countries today. They have grown in number since 1968 and have been caused by imperialism and domestic reaction.

In the face of the ever-worsening crisis of monopoly capitalism and the spread of wars, we can confidently say that imperialism is doomed and that we are on the eve of a worldwide upsurge of the socialist revolution. We are in transition from a world dominated by imperialism to one in which socialism would resurge and become more established than ever before. The objective conditions for advancing the antiimperialist, democratic and socialist movements are favorable. But the subjective forces of the revolution must take advantage of such conditions and wage fierce anti-imperialist and class struggle against the exploitative and oppressive classes.

As a result of the temporary defeat and strategic retreat of the socialist cause, the imperialists have carried out a policy of doing everything to exploit the proletariat and broad masses of the people and to extract super profits. They have adopted unprecedentedly higher technology for civil and military production and for communications and transport. The result is a severe contradiction between the means of production and the people in production and between the forces of social production and the capitalist relations of private appropriation. It is the root cause of the recurrent and cumulative economic and financial crisis and the outbreak of aggressive wars. After the monopoly capitalists benefit from said technology, the proletariat and people take their turn

in wielding it to carry out socialist revolution and construction. The high social character of high technology production suits socialism rather than monopoly capitalism.

The recurrence of the crisis of overproduction and the propensity of the imperialist power to engage in state terrorism and launch wars of aggression generate social turmoil and goad the people to engage in anti-imperialist and democratic struggles and grasp socialism as the only lasting alternative to capitalism. Anyone who says now that history cannot go beyond capitalism and liberal democracy would be considered a nut case. The people's demand is to get rid of capitalism.

The calls for studying and applying the revolutionary principles and accomplishments of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao are resounding. The imperialist propaganda against these revolutionary thinkers and leaders, especially against Mao and Stalin who accomplished the most in actual socialist revolution and construction, has failed to discourage the proletariat and the people. The entire range of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution provide answers to questions about the future of imperialism and socialism, even as the worsening conditions of crises and wars push the people to resist the imperialists and reactionaries and take the revolutionary road to socialism.

The subjective forces needed to engage in revolutionary mass struggles against imperialism and domestic reaction are the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the mass organizations of the toiling masses of workers and peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie, the self-defense units of mass organizations and offensive armed units of the people's army and the organs of political power. These subjective forces can arise and develop only if there is a determined core of proletarian revolutionaries who adhere to the line that there can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory and neither can there be a successful revolution without arousing, organizing and mobilizing the people and building the people's army under the firm leadership of a revolutionary party of the proletariat to smash the military and bureaucratic machinery of the bourgeois state. The revolutionary party of the proletariat must take the ideological line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. This grasps the fundamental principles of repudiating capitalism and embracing the socialist cause, the experience and lessons of socialist revolution and construction in the era of

imperialism and proletarian revolution and the theory and practice of cultural revolution to combat modern revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate the socialist system. Such a party must have the correct general political line based on the concrete conditions and demands of the people. To be able to lead the people in political struggles, it must arouse, organize and mobilize the masses to pursue the aims and purposes of the revolution. Such a party must follow the principle of democratic centralism. It must make the best possible and necessary decisions on the basis of democratic discussion, promptly concentrate the will of the collective and the masses, and carry out resolutely the decisions. At the rate that imperialism is discrediting itself and offending the people with its recurrent and worsening crisis, state terrorism and wars of aggression in the early decades of the 21st century, we are confident that the revolutionary anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist movements will thrive and become far more successful than those of the 20th century. There is plenty of time allowance for socialism to prevail over capitalism in several countries in the current century. When the time comes that socialism is dominant on a global scale as a result of the defeat and end of imperialism, the way would become wide open for reaching the stage of communism on the basis of the achievements of socialist revolution and construction.

Message to Participants in the Launch and Forum on Lenin's "Imperialism" in the 21st Century

July 21, 2017

First of all, I congratulate the Institute of Political Economy (IPE) and IBON International for publishing the book Lenin's "Imperialism" in the 21st Century and for organizing this book launch and forum to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of Lenin's Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism.

I extend warmest greetings of solidarity to all those who are present, including the authors contributing to the book, the officers and staff of IPE and IBON International, all the leaders and activists of the people's organizations and all those others who are interested in buying and reading the book.

I am happy to be honored twice for the invitation to keynote today's program and being one of the authors to have contributed articles and essays serving as chapters and dealing with various aspects of imperialism in the past and present as well as in the probable future.

The book is a major contribution to the worldwide celebration of the centenary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It exposes the ever-worsening global conditions of crisis, depression and war generated by US imperialism and its cohorts. It serves to inspire the proletariat and people to take the road of resistance for national liberation, democracy and socialism.

Antonio Tujan critiques the neoliberal "globalization" project in the 21st century. Paul Quintos examines the operations of cartels, the emergence of supercartels and vertical integration. Demba Moussa Dembele exposes the new forms of exploitation by foreign monopoly capitalism in Africa. Paoyu Ching describes

the current phase of imperialism and China. Fred Engst discusses imperialism, ultra-imperialism and the rise of China. Roland G. Simbulan reviews Lenin's theory of imperialism in relation to the American empire in the current century. Pio Verzola, Jr. presents the rivalries and wars proving Lenin right up to now. This speaker ventures to outline the future of imperialism and socialism.

I recommend the book to be distributed in connection with the worldwide study conferences, seminars, forums and cultural festivals being held to celebrate the October Revolution under the sponsorship of the People's Resources for International Solidarity and Mass Movement and the International League of Peoples' Struggle.

The book gives us a comprehensive and profound understanding of how much imperialism has been debilitated by its own economic and financial crises and its propensity to engage in war production and unleash state terrorism and wars of aggression and how the seeming strategic victory of imperialism over socialism in the years from 1989 to 1991, as a result of betrayal by revisionist ruling cliques, has proceeded to the accelerated strategic decline of US imperialist power and the rise of a multipolar world of intensified contradictions among capitalist powers.

Under the current circumstances, the broad masses of the people are suffering acutely from the global crisis of imperialism and are goaded to fight for their own salvation and emancipation. But while inter-imperialist contradictions are escalating, the resurgence and space for maneuver has widened for the revolutionary mass movement of the proletariat and people in the capitalist countries and of the oppressed nations and peoples in the less developed countries.

The great Lenin and the October Revolution teach us that we can prevail over imperialism and all reaction and aim for socialism by building the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the mass organizations of the workers, peasants, women, youth, professionals and others, the organizations of self-defense, the organs of political power and the intraclass and interclass alliances of the progressive and revolutionary forces.

Anti-imperialist struggles for national liberation, democracy and socialism need to be waged in various countries by the patriotic and progressive forces. But being international in scale of operations, imperialism must be confronted and

combated as a common foe by all peoples of the world. The international anti-imperialist solidarity of peoples must provide the broad base for proletarian internationalism and all efforts to advance the cause of socialism in the world proletarian revolution.

The Filipino people can be proud of being in the forefront of the antiimperialist struggles. They have dared to resist US imperialism and the local reactionary classes of big compradors and landlords. They have heroically waged various forms of struggles and have achieved great victories. They are the target of ever escalating attacks by the US and its puppets. But they are determined more than ever before to continue the new democratic revolution towards socialism and thus strive to win ever greater victories and contribute further to the revolutionary advance of peoples and revolutionary forces on a global scale.

Uphold the Validity of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Fight to Defeat Imperialism and Advance the Proletarian Revolution

Keynote Speech to the Study Conference to Celebrate in advance the 100th anniversary of the October Revolution in Amsterdam,

The Netherlands, September 23, 2017

I am honored and grateful to address you in this two-day study conference to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and to uphold its validity and relevance to the struggle of the proletariat and people for national liberation, democracy and socialism against US imperialism and all reaction. Let me extend to all the participants and guests my warmest revolutionary greetings on behalf of the International League of Peoples' Struggle (ILPS).

My task today is to give an overview of the four major topics to be presented by subsequent speakers and discussed in the interaction with the other participants. I shall comment briefly on the topics and try to whet your interest in the presentations of the speakers and in the subsequent open forum.

Re Topic 1: Achievements of the October revolution: celebrate the historic significance of the October revolution

The great Lenin extended and developed the theory and practice of Marxism to that of Marxism-Leninism in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. He led the Bolsheviks and the people in turning the inter-imperialist World War I into a revolutionary civil war, thus overthrowing Tsarism through

the February 1917 revolution and subsequently the bourgeois Kerensky government in the Great October Socialist Revolution. All power passed on to the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers, which led to the establishment of the Soviet Union on one-sixth of the surface of the earth.

By 1920, the Red Army defeated the White Armies and by 1922, the foreign allied interventionist forces of the United Kingdom, France, Greece, Canada, Australia, United States, Japan, Italy, Romania and China. Under conditions of civil war, the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (or in common parlance Soviet Russia) adopted the economic and political policy of “war communism” from 1918 to 1921. Subsequently, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) adopted the New Economic Policy in 1922 in order to revive the economy by giving concessions to small and medium entrepreneurs and traders. Thereafter, starting with the first five-year economic plan in 1928, Stalin carried out full-scale industrialization and the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture.

The Soviet Union stood as the world’s center of socialist revolution and construction. It served as the bulwark of socialism against imperialism and all reaction. Through the Communist International (Comintern), it propagated the principles of the October Revolution and inspired the proletariat and peoples in various countries to build their revolutionary parties, alliances and mass movements in the face of colonial and imperialist plunder, crisis and aggression.

During World War II, the Soviet Union became the target of a massive invasion and occupation by Nazi Germany. It waged the Great Patriotic War. It launched a determined and victorious counteroffensive and played the key role in the defeat of fascism in Europe. Consequently, several socialist countries arose in Eastern Europe and in East Germany. In Asia, the Communist Party of China and its Red Army fought and defeated the main bulk of the Japanese fascist aggressors in orchestration with the resistance of other communist parties and peoples in Asia.

Consequently, national liberation movements arose and aimed for socialism. In 1949, China won nationwide victory in its people’s democratic revolution and became the biggest bulwark of socialism with a quarter of the world’s population. The US waged wars of aggression against Korea in 1951-53, and Vietnam and the rest of Indochina in the 1960s and 1970s but failed to subjugate them. By the early 1950s, one third of humankind were governed and led by the revolutionary parties of the proletariat.

Re Topic 2: Revisionist betrayal and consequences: draw and share lessons from the reversal of the October revolution

After the death of Stalin, modern revisionism gained ascendancy in the Soviet Union under Khrushchov in 1956. It spread the wrong notion that the working class had accomplished its historic mission of building socialism. This notion was traceable to the premature declaration in the Soviet Constitution of 1936 that classes and class struggle had ended, except the struggle between imperialism and the Soviet people. Learning from capitalism to advance socialism was considered creative. The Soviet state and economy were decentralized. The factories were autonomized and made responsible for their costs and profits and managers were allowed to hire and fire workers. The agricultural collectives were likewise autonomized and became the owners of the machine and tractor stations.

Bourgeois populism was propagated through such concepts as the state and party of “the whole people”, and bourgeois pacifism with such concepts as “peaceful transition” to socialism, “peaceful economic competition”, and “peaceful co-existence” as not only the line for diplomatic relations among states but as the general line for both the Party and the state in all types of international relations. These bourgeois concepts violated the principle of proletarian internationalism, thus discouraging or undermining the revolutionary struggles for national liberation and socialism. Khrushchov was obsessed with developing détente with the US and its imperialist allies, in general discouraging armed revolutions despite instances of adventurism.

Brezhnev deposed Khrushchov in 1964 supposedly for bungling agricultural policy and irresponsible actions in foreign relations. But he adopted the basic revisionist notions of Khrushchov. Thus, Brezhnevism was sometimes defined as Khrushchovism without Khrushchov. But there were some real differences between them. Brezhnev had to recentralize certain ministries in order for the central government to have the resources for its bureaucratic operations and for the arms race with the United States. He allowed not only the bourgeoisie to flourish but also the criminal syndicates to thieve on state enterprises and deliver the goods to the expanded free market. Under his rule up to his death in 1982, the Soviet economy conspicuously stagnated from the middle of the 1970s onwards.

He practised social imperialism, socialism in words but imperialism in deeds, at

the expense of other countries he regarded as having “limited sovereignty” under the international “proletarian dictatorship” of the Soviet Union. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the deployment of a million Soviet troops on the borders with China were signal acts of Soviet social-imperialism. However, the Soviet Union extended considerable support and assistance to Cuba, the struggles of the Palestinian and Arab peoples, and the wars of national liberation in Indochina and Africa in the 1970s. The invasion of Afghanistan became a quagmire for the Soviet Union, repeating the error of the US in Vietnam.

The successors of Brezhnev plodded in the political and economic stagnation he bequeathed, until Gorbachov emerged as the Soviet leader who appeared akin to Khrushchov in terms of blatant opposition to Marxism-Leninism and socialism, by promoting glasnost (new thinking) and perestroika (restructuring). During his reign, Gorbachov systematically sabotaged or dismantled public institutions and publicly owned means of production while favoring privatization. He manipulated shortages of basic commodities to discredit the state stores and to push the organization of Yugoslavia-type cooperatives. Ultimately, he collaborated with Yeltsin in liquidating the Soviet Union and replacing it with the fictive Commonwealth of Independent States against the referendum vote of the Soviet people that favored the retention of the Soviet Union.

Modern revisionism centered in the Soviet Union led ultimately to the conspicuous 1989-91 events of rapid and full restoration of capitalism. All the countries ruled by revisionist ruling cliques engaged in the rapid, undisguised and full restoration of capitalism. Revisionist parties in or out of power discarded their communist names and disintegrated, with the exception of the Chinese ruling party. The Soviet Union no less collapsed. US imperialism emerged as the winner in the Cold War and the sole superpower in the world.

The betrayal of socialism by the ruling revisionist renegades resulted in the strategic defeat and retreat of proletarian revolutionary parties and mass movements for national liberation and socialism. It further allowed the US to engage in all kinds of offensives against the people of the world who stand for national independence, democracy and socialism in all fields: ideological, political, economic and military.

Re Topic 3: The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution as counter to the rise of modern revisionism

The dominance of modern revisionism in the Soviet Party and State resulted in two conflicting currents within the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese state. The dominant current in China was spearheaded by Chairman Mao Zedong who asserted Marxism-Leninism against modern revisionism. He led the CPC and the Chinese people from victory to victory in the new democratic and socialist stages of the Chinese revolution.

But opposite bourgeois currents were bred by old and new factors in Chinese society after the 1949 nationwide victory of the revolution. The traditional worship and mimicry of Soviet practices, even when inapplicable or already revisionist, also had adverse influences as a result of the large numbers of students and worker-trainees who went to the Soviet Union when Khrushchovite revisionism was already on the rise. Thus, there were Rightists and revisionists who opposed the leadership of Mao in the Eighth Congress of the CPC, the Great Leap Forward, the socialist education movement and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR).

The GPCR sought to carry out the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. It upheld materialist dialectics, the proletarian-socialist stand, viewpoint and method and the line that class struggle is the key link against the revisionist line that classes and class struggle had already withered or were withering away and that it was necessary merely to attend to developing the productive forces. The GPCR asserted the need for the continuous revolutionization of the mode of production and the superstructure. It put forward and practiced the principles and methods for consolidating and advancing socialism.

On the whole, in its ten-year span from 1966 to 1976, the GPCR led by Mao won great victories in socialist revolution and construction, despite revisionist opposition and the twists and turns in the class struggle. But after the death of Mao in 1976, the Deng Xiaoping revisionist clique succeeded in making a coup against the proletarian revolutionaries and the legacy of Mao. It capitalized on certain ultra Left errors even if already rectified in order to whip up a Rightist backlash in domestic affairs that paved the way for capitalist-oriented and anti-socialist reforms. It took advantage of the rapprochement with the US to push forward the integration of China into the world capitalist system under the pretext of opposing Soviet social-imperialism.

There are far more positive lessons to learn from the GPCR than from the negative lessons laid bare by its shortcomings and eventual defeat from the revisionist capitalist-roaders. The correct attitude to take is that of Marx in thoroughly studying both the victory and defeat of the prototype of the proletarian dictatorship in the Paris Commune of 1871. We learn the positive lessons to do better in the proletarian revolution in the next round of struggle and we learn the negative lessons to prevent the bourgeoisie from prevailing.

The restoration of capitalism in China proves beyond doubt the correctness of the GPCR in posing the problem of capitalist restoration through modern revisionism. This scourge has been even more lethal than outright imperialist aggression against socialism. The GPCR provides us with the principles and methods for summing up and analyzing experience and facing up to new circumstances and challenges. The epochal struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is long and is subject to retrogressions and further advances. The struggle for socialism will take a long historical epoch in ridding the world of imperialism and paving the way for communism. The communist objective of making a radical rupture from millennia of private ownership of the means of production is no small task.

Re Topic 4: Continuing validity of the principles of the October Revolution against imperialism and for socialism

Since the restoration of capitalism in the revisionist-ruled countries and the collapse of the Soviet Union in the years 1989-91, drastic changes have occurred in the position of US imperialism in the world capitalist system. For a while from 1991 to the first decade of the 21st century, it appeared as the winner of the Cold War and the sole superpower. It launched an ideological and political offensive, claiming that the socialist cause was dead and that capitalism under US hegemony was endless. It pushed harder the offensive of unbridled imperialist greed in the form of the neoliberal economic policy as well as the most brutal of military offensives, state terrorism and wars of aggression under the neoconservative policy of full-spectrum dominance.

Since 2008, however, the US has been on a much-accelerated state of strategic decline. It is confronted by a self-generated economic and financial crisis that the US-controlled multilateral agencies cannot solve until now. It is weighed down by the rising costs of crises and wars and by a public debt of unprecedented proportions. It is still the single biggest economic and military

power but it can no longer dictate to several other capitalist powers in a multipolar world. The entry of China and Russia in the top circle of capitalist powers has intensified inter-imperialist contradictions and the struggle for a redivision of the world.

It is a growing problem for the capitalist powers to modulate their contradictions at the further expense of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations that have too long suffered and are compelled to resist. All major contradictions in the world are intensifying as the crisis of the world capitalist system is recurring and worsening at an accelerated rate. The broad masses of the people in the imperialist and non-imperialist countries are suffering grievously from the escalation of oppression and exploitation and are waging various forms of resistance. The objective conditions are favorable for the rise of the subjective forces of the revolution.

The most resolute and militant revolutionary parties and seminal party groups are those guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. They are in various industrial capitalist and undeveloped countries. They are the best motivated and best equipped ideologically to carry forward the world proletarian revolution, combat the counterrevolutionary and anti-socialist campaigns of imperialism, revisionism and other counterrevolutionary currents.

They are in various stages of development in arousing, organizing and mobilizing the proletariat and broad masses of the people. In the future, after they win the socialist revolution, they can avail of and develop further the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution in socialist society in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

We are still in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, especially because of the betrayal of socialism by modern revisionism and the full restoration of capitalism in revisionist-ruled countries. But we are confident of the prospects for the next wave of revolutionary struggles and the subsequent advance of socialism. We are now in a period of great transition to the full resurgence of the anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist movements.

The key to the advance and victories of the proletarian revolution is the building of the revolutionary parties of the proletariat under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the application of this theory on the history and

circumstances of every country through the adoption and implementation of the general line of struggle of the revolutionary forces and the people against imperialism and all reaction for the purpose of seizing political power and building socialism.

Re: General declaration on the continuing validity of the October revolution in the 21st Century

In conclusion, I hope that my general comments, the more focused contributions of the other speakers and the discussions in open forum would help in constructing and polishing The General Declaration: The Continuing Validity of the October Revolution in the 21st Century to be issued by the conference for signing and approval by all interested parties and groups.

I am confident that the Declaration shall describe and define clearly the historical background and current conditions of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and peoples of the world and set forth the tasks in building the subjective forces of the world proletarian revolution in ideological, political and organizational terms.

On the Significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution

Message to the Freedom Road Socialist Organization

October 14, 2017

I am highly honored and deeply pleased to convey warmest greetings of solidarity to the Freedom Road Socialist Organization on the occasion of its celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and to give some brief remarks on the significance of this earthshaking revolution.

The epochal struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie was first defined by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto of 1848 in the era of free competition capitalism. The objective conditions of 19th century Europe gave rise to a series of historic events: the workers' uprisings in 1848, Marx's thoroughgoing critique of capitalism, the International Workingmen's Association, the Paris Commune of 1871 as prototype of the proletarian dictatorship, the Second International and the rise of Marxism as the main trend in the European working-class movement in the last decade of the 19th century.

Lenin extended and developed the theory and practice of Marxism to the stage of Marxism-Leninism in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. He made significant contributions to Marxist philosophy, political economy and social science. He upheld, defended and advanced the revolutionary essence of Marxism not only against the overt ideologists of the bourgeoisie but also against the classical revisionists headed by Kautsky in the Second International.

Most important of all, Lenin led the Bolsheviks in the overthrow of Tsarism in

Russia in February of 1917 and then in the overthrow of the bourgeois Kerensky government on October 25, 1917 in order to establish the first durable socialist state on one-sixth of the surface of the earth. The most crucial element in socialism is the class dictatorship of the proletariat defeating that of the bourgeoisie and nationalizing the land and strategic industries, despite the vestiges of feudalism and medievalism, the exigencies of civil war and resistance to foreign intervention and transitory measures like “war communism” and the New Economic Policy.

Even while he was preoccupied with the immediate tasks of consolidating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Lenin paid attention to the prospective stage of socialist construction and the promotion of the world proletarian revolution through the Third International or the Comintern against the rule of the monopoly bourgeoisie in the centers and periphery of imperialism. After the death of Lenin in 1924, Stalin followed up the New Economic Policy with full-scale socialist industrialization and the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture and expanded the work of the Third International, especially to the colonies and semi-colonies where the bourgeois democratic and socialist stages of revolution are well defined.

As a pioneering socialist country, the Soviet Union demonstrated how in so short a time through a series of five-year economic and related plans, the proletariat, peasants and other working people could lift themselves up politically, economically, socially and culturally. In the face of the imperialist powers and the rise of fascism, the Soviet Union was able to strengthen itself in an all-round way and build a powerful Red Army under the leadership of the Communist Party. In World War II, the Allied Powers could defeat the Axis powers because of the decisive role of the Soviet Union in defeating the Nazi German invasion and in rolling back the fascists in an epic counter-offensive.

After World War II, the Soviet Union recovered fast from the destruction wrought by the Nazi German invasion on 75 percent of Soviet industry and the death to 27 million Soviet citizens. It continued to be the bulwark of socialism and the national liberation movements in colonies and semi-colonies. It was able to develop its own nuclear weapons in order to counter the US nuclear monopoly and blackmail. It stood as an inspiration to the proletariat and oppressed peoples of the world. Within the first half of the 1950s, one third of humankind lived in socialist countries and people’s democracies led by communist and workers’ parties.

But after the death of Stalin in 1953, the modern revisionists headed by Khrushchov were able to split the followers of Stalin and gain power in the Soviet Union in 1956. They instituted capitalist-oriented reforms within the ruling party, the state and the economy and propagated bourgeois populism and pacifism. Brezhnev took power in 1964, continued the restoration of capitalism, recentralized the ministries, plunged into an arms race with the US and engaged in social imperialism. The Soviet Union went into serious economic stagnation and deterioration from the latter half of the 1970s. By the time of Gorbachov, it was ripe for social disorganization and undisguised restoration of capitalism. It collapsed in 1991.

We are still in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution because the modern revisionists betrayed socialism and succeeded in subverting socialism and restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, causing a temporary retreat of the socialist cause and preventing socialism from becoming dominant in the world for the time being. However, upon the integration of former socialist countries in the world capitalist system, with Russia and China becoming big capitalist powers themselves, contradictions among the imperialists, between capital and labor, between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and between the imperialists and countries assertive of independence have intensified more than ever before in what is now a multipolar world.

For a while, from the time of the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, US imperialism appeared to be the sole superpower in a unipolar world in which it could impose its will and brute force on the people of the world. But since then, the US neoliberal economic policy and neoconservative policy of full-spectrum dominance have resulted in more frequent and worse crises and wars that have in fact undermined and debilitated US imperialism. The strategic decline of US imperialism has accelerated in the 21st century. The US is upsetting the world capitalist system with further crises and wars by desperately trying to reverse the trend. Its former hubris over Francis Fukuyama's perpetuity of capitalism has turned into anxiety over Graham Allison's Thucydides Trap.

The October Revolution remains highly significant and urgently relevant today to the proletariat and peoples of the world. It tells us to develop the subjective forces for winning the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and for socialism. We need to build the Bolshevik-type of revolutionary party of the proletariat that has a mastery of materialist dialectics and struggles against

imperialism, revisionism and all reaction. Lenin teaches us that it takes a whole historical epoch for socialism to prevail over capitalism on a world scale and Mao also teaches us that in socialist countries there must be continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship to combat revisionism and consolidate socialism.

Under the leadership of the proletarian party with communist foresight, we need the revolutionary trade unions and the mass organizations of various oppressed classes and sectors of society. We need the Red Guards or the self-defense units of mass organizations and communities and the Red Army or people's army wherever possible and necessary. We need to build the soviets or the local organs of political power that will become the base of the socialist state. We need the alliances in every country, the anti-imperialist solidarity of peoples and proletarian internationalism. We need to develop all the revolutionary forces and resources for waging all forms of struggle and winning the revolution against imperialism, revisionism and all reaction.

The October Revolution Lives, Conclusions for the Revolutionary Class Struggle Today

Paper for International Theoretical Seminar held by the ICOR and ICMLPO to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the October Revolution

October 27, 2017

First of all, I wish to thank Comrade Stefan Engel, the International Coordination of Revolutionary Parties and Organizations (ICOR) and the International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations (ICMLPO) for inviting me to speak on item 6, “The October Revolution Lives. Conclusions for the revolutionary class struggle today,” in this international theoretical seminar to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

It is a pleasure and honor to have this opportunity to exchange ideas and views with the comrades in ICOR and the 12th ICMLPO. I convey to you warmest greetings of solidarity from the International League of Peoples’ Struggle, which has been undertaking study conferences and other activities to celebrate the centenary of the October Revolution.

I propose to draw conclusions from the development of subjective forces of the revolution before, during and after the October Revolution. I wish to focus on how Lenin and his loyal successors built the Bolshevik Party ideologically, politically and organizationally. The aim of making the conclusions is to define the lessons to learn from the example of the Bolsheviks and the tasks to carry out in the revolutionary class struggle today.

Part I Conclusions from the development of subjective forces in the October

Revolution

1. Ideological building

Before he turned twenty years old, Lenin had already read and studied thoroughly *The Communist Manifesto* and *Das Capital*, which educated him on the application of materialist dialectics in the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and in the critique of the capitalist political economy, respectively. When he read the works of the Marxist forerunner Georgi Plekhanov, he agreed with him that Russia was moving from feudalism to capitalism and that the proletariat would carry the development further to proletarian revolution and socialism. This view repudiated that of the agrarian-socialist Narodnik movement, which had presumed that the peasantry could establish socialism by building peasant communes. However, Lenin recognized the importance of the revolutionary role of the peasantry in alliance with proletariat.

By the time that Lenin published his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* in 1909, it was clear that he had surpassed Plekhanov in comprehending Marxist materialist philosophy. The latter could not recognize the prime importance of social practice over personal experience. Lenin contended with the “third party” philosophy of bourgeois subjectivists, especially of the type of Hume and Bishop Berkeley, who regarded reality as mere constructs of sense-data. He took into full account the spiralling interaction of theory and social practice. Outstandingly, he identified the unity of opposites as the most fundamental law of material dialectics. This is rigorously demonstrated in the analytical writings of Marx and Lenin himself.

The first major work of Lenin, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1899), showed his comprehensive and profound knowledge of Russian economy and society and laid the ground for understanding the role of Russia in the international context of modern imperialism. Russian imperialism was of the military feudal kind but already had industrial enclaves, which were comparable to those of the cities of Western Europe and whose capital accumulation was fed by the oppressed nationalities in an ocean of feudalism and medievalism.

Lenin had a clear view of Russia as the weakest link in the chain of imperialist countries and as a huge country subject to the law of uneven development, oppressing and exploiting the toiling masses of workers and peasants and yet

imposed upon by stronger imperialist powers. He could lead the October Revolution to victory because he understood the nature and laws of motion of imperialism as he explicated in his 1916 book, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, more comprehensively and more profoundly than the earlier critics of this phenomenon like John A. Hobson (*Imperialism*, 1902) and Rudolf Hilferding (*Finance Capital*, 1910). Most important of all he opposed Kautsky's notion of ultra-imperialism in 1912.

Such notion presupposed that the imperialist powers invest abroad, develop the less developed countries and bring about the growth of industry and the proletariat on a unilinear line. It paved the way for social chauvinism and supporting the imperialist war budgets in the run up to World War I. Lenin countered Kautsky and the Second International by stressing the law of uneven development, the imperialist struggle for a redivision of the world and the spasmodic flow of investment that results in crises and wars. He was firm on describing imperialism as crisis-stricken, decadent, moribund and aggressive. Having led the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin further repudiated Kautsky in 1918 with the book, *The Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky*.

Lenin correctly defined modern imperialism or monopoly capitalism as the highest and final stage of capitalism and described the era as that of modern imperialism and proletarian internationalism. He identified the five features, such as the following: a) the dominance of monopoly capital in capitalist economies, b) the merger of industrial and bank capital to form a finance oligarchy, c) the growing importance of the export of surplus capital over the export of surplus goods, d) the formation of cartels, syndicates and other international combines of monopolies, and e) the complete division of the world among the capitalist countries as economic territory (sources of cheap labor and raw materials, markets, fields of investments and spheres of influence; be these colonies, semicolonies and dependent countries). The fifth feature leads to a struggle for redivision of the world among the imperialist powers upon the unceasing change in the balance of forces.

The economic crisis of the world capitalist system and the contradictions among the capitalist powers had already broken out into World War I when in 1916 Lenin wrote *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. The inter-imperialist war and the victory of the October Revolution vindicated and proved correct a series of his propositions: the uneven development of the imperialist countries,

Russia as one of the weakest links in the chain of imperialist countries, imperialism as the eve of socialism, turning the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war and the possibility of the revolutionary victory of the Bolsheviks first against Tsarism and then against the bourgeoisie.

He predicted the victory of the October Revolution as well as the emergence of a worse general crisis of the world capitalist system after World War I. Indeed, a more severe socioeconomic and political crisis afflicted a number of imperialist countries, especially the losers in World War I. The struggle between revolution and counterrevolution continued in Germany in the 1920s. Fascism took power in Italy in 1922. The ever-worsening crisis of the Weimar Republic and the bourgeois incompetence and bunglings of the social democrats led to the rise of the Nazis to power in Germany in 1933. The Great Depression engulfed the entire capitalist world in the 1930s and led to World War II.

2. Political building

In his major work *Two Tactics of Social Democracy* (1905), Lenin put forward the general line of the revolution by which the Bolsheviks could arouse, organize and mobilize the broad masses of the people against Tsarism and the bourgeoisie. He elaborated on the teaching of Marx that the battle for democracy must be won in order to win the battle for socialism. He called for the basic democratic alliance of the workers and peasants in sharp contrast to the narrow losing line of the 1905 revolution, which prematurely called for all power to the workers.

Under the leadership of Lenin, the Bolsheviks maintained their leading role and solidity as a proletarian revolutionary party but also saw the importance and necessity of alliance with other political forces in order to overthrow Tsarism in the February Revolution. In preparation for the October Revolution, Lenin paid attention to developing comprehensive leadership over the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers. He made sure that upon the overthrow of the Provisional Government under Kerensky, power would pass on to the soviets. As early as 1914, he wrote the *Right of Nations to Self-determination* in order to undermine the military-feudal foundation of Russian imperialism.

From the study of the Paris Commune of 1871 by Karl Marx, Lenin learned the most essential lesson that for the proletarian dictatorship and the proletarian revolution to prevail, the bureaucratic and military machinery of the bourgeois

state must be smashed. He wrote and published *State and Revolution* in 1917 while he was preoccupied with the practical problems of the proletarian revolution. The strategy and tactics for defeating the enemy and winning the revolution must be consonant with and appropriate to the history and conditions of the imperialist country where the proletariat leads and carries out the armed revolution. The imperialist war, the terrible consequences on Russian troops and the revolutionary work done by the Bolsheviks among them created the conditions for the overthrow of Tsarist rule in February 1917 and then of the Kerensky-led bourgeois government in October 1917 through urban uprisings.

But the fighting extended from the cities to the countryside until 1920 because of the sizeable remnants of the reactionary army and the forces of Western imperialist intervention. The Bolsheviks became well prepared for the fighting in the countryside because they had gained all-round leadership in the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers, had built up a formidable Red Army and had control over the centers and lines of logistics and communications. The successful strategy and tactics employed by the Bolsheviks in the urban uprisings and in the battles of fluid movement in the countryside became a rich source of lessons and inspiration for the proletarian revolutionaries all over the world under the auspices of the Third International.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks concentrated on leading the October Revolution to victory in 1917, and the subsequent tasks of building Soviet power such as reconstituting the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party as the All-Russian Communist Party in 1918, defeating the White Armies in the Civil War and foreign interventionist powers until 1920, founding the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics in 1922 and reviving the economy and consolidating Soviet power through the New Economic Policy. But even amidst the Civil War in 1919, Lenin promptly paid attention to the founding of the Third International in Moscow in order to advance the world proletarian revolution and to further demonstrate the difference between the Communists and the opportunists and revisionists in the Second International, which had dissolved in 1916.

At first, Lenin expected that the first inter-imperialist war and continuing crisis of the world capitalist system would generate revolutionary conditions in the imperialist countries in Europe, especially in Germany where the working-class movement became strong under communist leadership. But unlike Trotsky, he did not depend exclusively on victory of the proletarian revolution in Germany or Western Europe for the consolidation of Soviet power and the continued

advance of the world proletarian revolution. Indeed, if the world proletarian revolution could not advance through Berlin it could do so through Beijing. Lenin extended the call of the Communist Manifesto for the workers of the world to unite against capitalism to the call for the workers and all oppressed peoples and nations to unite against imperialism.

Early on after the victory of the October Revolution in 1917, Lenin paid great attention to the role and work of the Third International in the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations in the East and made sure that communist parties were formed among them. He laid the ground for the theory and practice of two-stage revolution (new democratic revolution and then socialist revolution) in the underdeveloped countries. After the death of Lenin, Stalin continued the proletarian revolutionary leadership of the Bolsheviks in socialist construction and revolution. He built the strong foundation of the Soviet economy through socialist industrialization and through the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture.

In the further experience and clarification of the new democratic and socialist stages of the revolution after the October Revolution, Mao and the Chinese Communist Party have outstandingly demonstrated the correctness and effectiveness of the strategic line of protracted people's war by encircling the cities from the countryside and accumulating strength until conditions are ripe for seizing power in the cities in predominantly agrarian and underdeveloped countries. At any rate, the various forms of legal and armed struggles that enabled the rise of people's democracies and several socialist countries after World War II are worthy of study for appropriate application in various types of countries under various conditions. In the course of World War II partisan warfare could be waged in both urban and rural areas in Europe.

3. Organizational building

In *What Is to be Done* (1902) Lenin stressed the decisive vanguard role of the revolutionary party of the proletariat, with full-time Marxist professional revolutionaries at the core. He gave much importance to the Party newspaper *Iskra* as a propagandist and organizer of the Party. Indeed, to recruit new members and firm up the old stock of members, the Party must always invigorate them with the correct revolutionary outlook and stand on vital issues and must account how many members are buying and reading the Party newspaper, and how many members and unorganized people are responding to

calls for mass mobilization.

In his debate with Martov on organizational matters, Lenin opposed the view that the Party must be constituted by the trade unions. He pointed out that if the Party would exclusively arise out of the narrow confines of trade unionism, then it would be like the bourgeois laborite party. He called for individual Party membership subject to the principles of proletarian revolutionary remoulding, active party life, militant activism among the masses and democratic centralism conducive to freedom and discipline. The Party cadres and members must be able to look over the entire society from the vantage of the working class, become a partisan to this class and further remould themselves as proletarian revolutionaries.

Because revolution is a mass undertaking, the Party must be at the helm and at the core of the trade unions, peasant associations, cooperatives, study circles and other mass organizations. These must be under the direction of the competent Party offices and cadres. And within mass organizations, there must be fractions, groups or cells of the Party at the core. The masses organized by the Party are the reservoir of new Party members and can serve as the hard core of the spontaneous masses who rise up during revolutionary situations and crises.

Giving due importance to its central revolutionary task, which is to seize political power, the Party must consider how to smash the military and bureaucratic machinery of the reactionary state. The Bolsheviks sent cadres into the Tsarist army to organize revolutionary cells within and also participated in parliament. Thus, by the time the revolutions of 1917 occurred, the soviets of soldiers were already a major revolutionary force. From the masses of workers and peasants who were organized as Red Guard, the Red Army grew bigger as the soviets contributed troops and supplies for winning the civil war and the resistance against foreign interventionist forces. According to circumstances, the revolutionary parties of the proletariat must build the mass organizations of various classes and sectors, self-defense organizations, the Red Army or the people's army, the organs of political power, the intraclass and interclass alliances, the international unity of communist and workers' parties and the international solidarity of peoples. By learning from the October Revolution and the subsequent revolutionary struggles, we come to know what subjective forces of the revolution must be organized in order to advance and win victory. As we wage revolutionary class struggle, we can expand and consolidate these forces, strengthen them in stages and look forward to a fundamentally better and

brighter future in socialism.

Part II. Further conclusions from the building of socialism in the Soviet Union and later developments to the present

1. Building socialism in one country and inspiring the world proletarian revolution

Lenin upheld the building of socialism in one country as a necessity in connection with building the international communist movement. He considered the Soviet Union as the bulwark of the international communist movement and the Third International. He set the line that building socialism in one country was possible because of the moribund and decadent character of imperialism and its recurrent and ever-worsening crisis and proneness to war. Lenin led the Bolsheviks in building and consolidating Soviet power in the Soviet Union even as he wished that more socialist countries would help to consolidate socialism and even as he thought that it would take a whole historical epoch for socialism to defeat imperialism and bring about the withering of the proletarian state and the rise of communism as a classless society.

Stalin followed the line of Lenin in building socialism in one country against the defeatist line of Trotsky that it was impossible and that the path forward was through a Europe-wide revolutionary conflagration; and as well as against the Rightist line of Bukharin to extend the New Economic Policy indefinitely. Stalin actually succeeded in carrying forward the socialist revolution and construction. He was able to build socialist industry and accomplish the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture. He was also able to direct the Third International to promote the building of communist parties and revolutionary mass movements in dozens of countries. But the victories in socialist construction led to the premature declaration in the Soviet Constitution of 1936 that classes and class struggle had come to an end, except the one between the Soviet people and imperialism.

During World War II, the Soviet Union resoundingly defeated the invasionary forces of Nazi Germany and rolled them back, enabling several countries in Europe to establish people's democracies and socialism. The victory of the October Revolution extended to the rise of several socialist countries and national liberation movements during and after World War II. China emerged in 1949 as one more big and powerful socialist country to challenge imperialism.

That same year, the Soviet Union broke the US monopoly of nuclear power. The Korean people fought US imperialism to a standstill from 1951 to 1953. The Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea frustrated US aggression and subsequent blockades and sanctions after the 1953 armistice. The Vietnamese, Laotian and Cambodian peoples inflicted defeats on US imperialists and their allies until their stunning succession of nationwide victories in 1975.

2. Revisionist betrayal and capitalist restoration

Until 1956 it could be said that one-third of humankind had come under the governance of socialism under the leadership of revolutionary parties of the proletariat. But 1956 was also the year when the Krushchov revisionist clique came to power in the Soviet Union and totally negated the achievements of Stalin under the pretext of condemning the personality cult. Krushchov made a coup and brought about a comprehensive set of anti-socialist reforms in the CPSU, the State, and in industry and agriculture. He propagated such bourgeois populist notions as “party of the whole people” and “state of the whole people” and such bourgeois pacifist notions as “peaceful transition to socialism,” “peaceful economic competition” and “peaceful co-existence” as the general line of the international communist movement.

Brezhnev also made his own coup and replaced Krushchov in 1964. He paid some lip service to Stalin but in fact he hewed closely to the revisionist line of Krushchov. He recentralized some ministries and enterprises only to ensure funds for the federal center and for the arms race. The anti-socialist reforms continued. Worse, Mafia-type criminal syndicates arose to thieve on the state enterprises and delivered goods for their private profit to the expanded “free market”. Brezhnev practised social imperialism and pushed such notions as the “international dictatorship of the proletariat” and “limited national sovereignty” of other countries.

By the time that Gorbachov became the top leader of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union was already mired in grave and deep going economic crisis due to rampant bureaucratic corruption and the extremely burdensome costs of the arms race and military operations. Gorbachov used all these to accelerate the restoration of capitalism under the rubric of “new thinking” (glasnost) and “restructuring” (perestroika). He fully realized capitalist restoration upon the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 after emboldening the revisionist ruling cliques in Eastern Europe to adopt outrightly capitalist and antisocialist policies

and measures.

Mao Zedong is responsible for the most significant and the greatest effort to confront the phenomenon of modern revisionism. He launched the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) in 1966 and put forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. In most of the ten-year course of the GPCR, Mao and the Chinese Communist Party provided effective leadership in revolutionizing the mode of production and the social superstructure. But soon after Chairman Mao's death, the Deng revisionist clique successfully staged a coup, purged at least 30 percent of the membership of the CCP and imprisoned thousands of cadres. Thereafter, it carried out anti-socialist reforms at an accelerated rate from 1978 onwards.

3. Intensifying inter-imperialist contradictions and new upsurge of the world proletarian revolution

We are still in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution because of the success of the revisionist ruling cliques in subverting the previous socialist countries for several decades and converting nearly all of them into undisguised capitalist countries from 1989 to 1991. For a while after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, US imperialism boasted of itself as the winner in the Cold War and the sole superpower. It launched ideological, economic, political and military offensives in order to proclaim the "death" of socialism and the perpetuity of capitalism, and to take practical advantage of the dire conditions of those countries that have restored capitalism as their social system.

Within its national borders and abroad, the US has pushed hard the neoliberal economic policy, imagining that this could solve the problem of stagflation beginning in the 1970s. But this policy of unbridled greed has served to bring about faster and more deep-going recurrence and worsening of the economic and financial crises. The attempts to counter the crisis of overproduction with ever-larger doses of public, corporate and household debt have brought about bigger busts. Until now, the imperialist countries have failed to solve the financial crisis that broke out in the US and spread globally since 2008. China, which used to enjoy US accommodation for its cheap labor and cheap manufactures, is now in the throes of severe economic and financial crisis due to domestic glut of goods and bad debts. It is now desperately looking for more ways to export its surplus capital earned from previous trade surpluses.

The US has also pushed hard its neoconservative policy of full spectrum dominance, with Pax Americana in the 21st century boosted by high-tech military power. It uses war production for buoying up its economy and launches wars of aggression and sponsors regional proxy wars in order to sell weapons and expand economic territory. There has been no end to the wars instigated by the US and its NATO allies since the 1990s. But for the US, the costs have far outweighed the benefits and are compounded by steady losses in its economic competition with other capitalist powers under conditions of global depression since 2008. The US has accelerated its strategic decline from an unchallenged hyperpower to being one among the imperialist powers in a multipolar world. The G-7 and its multilateral agencies and military treaty alliances are now being challenged by the Sino-Russian partnership, the BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.

All major contradictions in the world today are intensifying. There is not a single capitalist power today that is not beset by intensifying struggle between capital and labor amidst serious economic and financial crisis. The contradictions between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations rage most violently where the US and its NATO allies are carrying out wars of aggression as in Iraq, Afghanistan, former Yugoslavia, Libya, Ukraine, Syria, Yemen, Sudan, Somalia, and elsewhere. The imperialist powers are being confronted by countries with increasing sense of independence as they resist imperialist impositions and see opportunities for maneuver in the multipolar world. Contradictions are intensifying among the imperialist powers because of the integration of China and Russia as major powers in the capitalist world.

As the socioeconomic and political crises worsen at an accelerated rate, the proletariat and people suffer intolerable exploitation, deprivation and poverty. They will never accept oppression and exploitation without resistance. The objective conditions are becoming ever more favorable for building the subjective forces of the revolution and waging various forms of revolutionary struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism. Towards fulfilling the central task of seizing political power, the revolutionary parties of the proletariat must build themselves as Bolshevik-type parties ideologically, politically and organizationally in the direction of socialism and communism.

Favorable Conditions for the Subjective Forces of the Revolution

Message of Solidarity to Participants in Peace, Bread and Land Celebrating the Centenary of the 1917 October Revolution

October 28, 2017

It is my honor and pleasure to convey warmest greetings of solidarity to all of you as participants in the event titled Peace, Bread and Land celebrating the Centenary of the 1917 October Revolution. For successfully sponsoring and organizing this event, I congratulate the International League of Peoples' Struggle-Australia, Migrante Australia, Philippines-Australia Union Link and the Federation of Italian Migrant Workers and their Families.

I anticipate that you will enjoy the cultural presentations, such as the performances of the Sydney Trade Union Choir and Migrante Kultura Singing Collective and the video excerpts from Sergei Eisentein's 1927 film October: Ten Days That Shook the World and from Warren Beatty's 1981 movie The Reds.

I am sure that you will learn much from the discourses on the events of 1917 in Russia and on the cultural impact of the Revolution on the Russian people as well as on the wider political impact on various countries, including Australia and the Philippines. You will learn even more by raising questions and interacting with the speakers.

I hope that you will be able to discuss the significance of the October Revolution in the advance of human civilization, the great achievements of the Soviet Union in socialist revolution and construction, the rise of several socialist countries and

national liberation movements, the revisionist betrayal of socialism and continuing crisis of monopoly capitalism and the continuing validity of the October Revolution.

The great Lenin led and built the Bolshevik Party to serve as the advance detachment of the working class in the revolution ideologically, politically and organizationally. He developed further the fundamental principles of Marxism laid down by Marx and Engels in the fields of philosophy, political economy and social science in the era of free competition capitalism. He put forward the principles, policies, line and methods for winning the democratic and socialist stages of the revolution in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution.

For the first time in the entire history of humankind, through the October Revolution of 1917, an exploited class – the working class – was able to seize political power and engage in socialist revolution and construction for several decades. The Bolsheviks established the Third International in 1919 after all power went to the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers. The October Revolution opened the road towards the end of class oppression and exploitation, the doom of imperialism and the bright future of socialism as transition to communism.

After overcoming the rigors of the inter-imperialist war, the Civil War and the foreign interventionist war by undertaking “war communism” and the New Economic Policy, the Soviet Union under the leadership of Stalin proceeded to build socialist industry and to collectivize and mechanize agriculture through a series of five-year economic plans starting in 1928. The Soviet economy became a strong and powerful basis for great advances in the social, political and cultural fields. The Soviet Union became a bulwark of socialism and proletarian internationalism against imperialism and the rising threat of fascism.

In World War II Nazi Germany invaded the Soviet Union and wrought great havoc in the Soviet Union, especially the killing of 27 million Soviet people and destruction or incapacitation of more than two-thirds of Soviet industry. The Soviet resistance and counter-offensive broke the backbone of the fascist forces, rolled them back and enabled the rise of people’s democracies and socialist countries in Eastern Europe and in East Germany.

In China, the most populous country in the world, the people led by the

Communist Party of China defeated the Japanese occupation in 1945 and subsequently the Guomindang regime in 1949, causing the biggest breach on the imperialist front in the East. In the aftermath of World War II, wars of national liberation also broke out in Korea, Southeast Asia and elsewhere against US imperialism and other Western colonial powers. By 1956 one-third of humankind could be described as belonging to the socialist camp under the leadership of communist and workers' parties in various countries. But alas this was also the year when modern revisionism under Khrushchov took power in the Soviet Union and started in a big way to subvert and undermine socialism not only in the Soviet Union but also in other countries. Under the leadership of Comrade Mao, the Chinese Communist Party took a Marxist-Leninist stand against modern revisionism centered in the Soviet Union.

The great Mao put forward the theory and practice of cultural revolution under proletarian dictatorship to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) was victorious during most of the decade from 1966 to 1976 but was defeated by the Dengist coup and counterrevolution soon after the death of Mao in 1976. To this day the GPCR remains a reservoir of principles and methods for upholding the socialist cause against the imperialists, revisionists and reactionaries who claim that socialism is dead and can no longer resurge against them.

The rapid and full restoration of capitalism in revisionist-ruled countries and the collapse of the Soviet Union in the years from 1989 to 1991 have vindicated the Marxist-Leninist teachings of Lenin and Mao against revisionism. For a while, until the end of the 20th century, the US appeared to be the sole superpower. But the crisis of the world capitalist system has become worse in a wider and deepgoing way under the neoliberal policy regime. The economic and financial crisis has become more frequent and worse. It has given rise to a ceaseless series of wars which are inflamed by the US neoconservative policy of full-spectrum dominance.

The US has unwittingly undermined itself and accelerated its strategic decline through the financialization of its economy, ever-rising war production and proneness to wars of aggression. Wishing to stop its strategic decline and maintain economic and military dominance, the US is foolishly exacerbating all major contradictions in the world: those between the working class and the monopoly bourgeoisie in industrial capitalist countries; those between the

imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples; those between imperialism and countries assertive of national independence; and those among the imperialist countries themselves that are now hard-pressed by the general crisis of capitalism to struggle for a redivision of the world.

This is a time for the workers and all oppressed peoples of the world to unite and intensify their revolutionary struggle against imperialism, revisionism and all reaction. The ever-worsening socioeconomic crisis, the political disorder, the rise of state terrorism and the wars of aggression inflict grave suffering on the broad masses of the people. But they also drive the people to wage various forms of resistance and to aim for a fundamentally better life of greater freedom, democracy and socialism. Thus, they constitute favorable conditions for the subjective forces of the revolution to arise, resurge, advance and win victories, as in the October Revolution and further revolutions led by the proletariat.

Requisites in Revolutionary Class Struggle for Building Socialism

June 25, 2019

There are five general requisites for building the socialist future. First, learn from the historical experience of the revolutionary proletariat in building socialism in the 20th century. Second, grasp the potential for socialist revolution in various countries in the current circumstances. Third, build the subjective forces of the revolution, such as the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the mass organizations, effective alliances, the people's army or self-defense units, and the organs of political power. Fourth, carry out the various forms of revolutionary struggle to overthrow the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Fifth, build the socialist state of the proletariat on the basis of a broad people's alliance, and engage in continuous socialist revolution in the political, socio-economic and cultural fields.

Learn from the historical experience of building socialism!

In the emergence and development of industrial capitalism, it has been unavoidable for the capitalist class to create and expand the working class from which it extracts surplus value and enables it to accumulate capital. It is a given fact that the modern industrial proletariat is the most advanced productive force. And in the course of class struggle against exploitation and oppression, it has become the most advanced political force capable of liberating itself and other exploited classes, and of building socialism as a result of being developed ideologically, politically and organizationally to fight and overthrow the exploitative and crisis ridden capitalist system.

As a revolutionary class for itself and for other exploited people, the working class has been involved in and benefited from the three stages of development of its revolutionary theory and practice. In the first stage, in the era of free competition capitalism, Marx and Engels laid the fundamental principles of Marxism in philosophy, political economy and social science, and engaged in initial efforts to build the communist and workers' movement. In the second

stage, in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the Bolsheviks led by Lenin and Stalin prevailed over the revisionism and opportunism of the Second International and the Mensheviks in order to lead the October Revolution that overthrew the Tsarist rule and establish a socialist state, victoriously engaged in the socialist revolution and construction in the Soviet Union.

After Lenin died in 1924, Stalin brought the New Economic Policy to a successful conclusion. He adopted the series of five-year economic plans to bring about socialist industrialization, the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture, the education training and deployment of the biggest corps of scientists and engineers, the promotion of socialist culture and art and the mass mobilization of the Soviet people of various nationalities. After the arrest and trial of the traitors in the 1930s, the German Nazi intelligence could not find a fifth column for the Nazi invasion. Stalin victoriously led the Great Patriotic War against the fascists who killed 27 million Soviet people and destroyed 85 per cent of Soviet industry. He proceeded to industrialize the Soviet Union for the second time and encouraged the oppressed nations and peoples of the world to fight for national liberation and socialism.

In the same stage of the Leninist development of Marxism, the Communist Party of China led by Mao made a still far greater breach on the imperialist front in the East by winning the people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war and proceeding to carry out the socialist revolution. Mao can be credited with the consolidation of the revolutionary victory amidst the devastation brought about by the Japanese invasion and the civil war unleashed by Guomindang, the basic socialization of the Chinese economy, the Great Leap Forward to socialist industry and to establish communes, the socialist education movement, the critique of and improvement on the Soviet model of economic development and the vital support extended by China to the Korean people and the Indochinese people in their struggles for national liberation and socialism against US imperialist aggression and to all the peoples of Asia, African and Latin America.

It became the responsibility of Mao to confront the full-blown phenomenon of modern revisionism of Khrushchov and then Brezhnev. This paved the way for the third stage, that of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, when Mao put forward the theory and practice of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of

capitalism and consolidate socialism. The GPCR prevailed from 1966 to 1976. But a coup d'état headed by Deng Zhao Ping, behind a combination of Rightists and Centrists, overthrew the socialist state and began a series of capitalist reforms. This was a repeat of the coup d'état headed by the revisionist chieftain Khrushchov in the Soviet Union in 1956.

It is of crucial importance for the scientific socialists or communists of today to learn the historical experience of the revolutionary proletariat in building socialism. We must appreciate the great socialist achievements of the proletariat, entire people and their leadership in the philosophical, political, social, economic and cultural fields, against imperialism, revisionism and opportunism. And we must criticize and repudiate the "Left" and Right opportunist errors of certain leaders at certain times and the biggest of all errors modern revisionism, which destroyed socialism under the pretext of creatively improving it through capitalist reforms. The positive and negative lessons from the past are a legacy to learn from.

The imperialists and their petty bourgeois camp followers are systematically using the total negation of the socialist revolution and socialist construction, especially from 1917 to 1956 in the Soviet Union and from 1949 to 1976 in China, in order to attack entirely the revolutionary cause of socialism. They use the cheap reductionist psychological trick of the total negation of Stalin and Mao as the short cut to the total negation of socialism, and the proletariat, people and party that built socialism. In times of either the most strident or most subtle anti-communist propaganda anywhere, the communists and revolutionary people must resolutely uphold their principles and militantly do their work.

In what is already an extended period of strategic retreat for the international communist movement, as a result of the revisionist betrayal of socialism, the scope and impact of the revolutionary ideological and political work of the persevering communists may appear limited and ineffectual on a global scale or in certain countries. The imperialists may even appear invincible as they unleash the most brutal forms of class struggle and aggressive wars as the petty bourgeois reformists and neorevisionists seem to steal the struggle from the communist revolutionaries. But the resolute and steady ideological and political work of the communist revolutionaries will eventually resound, amplified by the ever-worsening crisis of the bourgeois ruling system, and will certainly lead to the upsurge and expansion of the revolutionary movement.

Grasp the potential for socialist revolution in the current circumstances!

At present, all major contradictions in the world capitalist system are intensifying. These are the contradictions between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the working class in the imperialist countries; those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations; those between the imperialist powers and some countries assertive of national independence; and those among the imperialists themselves. The objective conditions are favorable for waging revolution. The broad masses of the people are in extreme suffering and are desirous of revolutionary change. There is a high potential for the rise of revolutionary forces for people's democracy and socialism against imperialism.

In the imperialist countries, the contradiction between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the working class has been exacerbated by the rapidly accelerating adoption of higher technology in production, distribution, finance and communication, and the intensification of profit-taking by the monopoly bourgeoisie under the neoliberal economic policy. The crises of overproduction have recurred more frequently and more gravely. The attempts of the monopoly bourgeoisie to counter the crisis of overproduction and the tendency of the profit rate to fall by resorting to the tricks of finance capitalism, mainly the expansion of the money supply and credit to stimulate production and consumption, have led from one financial crisis to another until the financial meltdown of 2008, which has caused what is in fact a protracted global depression.

The contradiction between the social character of production and the private mode of appropriation has become utterly conspicuous, and the destructiveness and irrationality of capitalism are well manifested by high rates of unemployment, lower incomes among the working people, the thinning out of the middle social strata, and the growing poverty and misery even in imperialist countries. But the incipient people's resistance is not yet being turned into a resounding demand for system change and for socialism because the revolutionary parties of the proletariat have not yet arisen or are still too few, small and weak to overcome the long running and current strategy and tactics of repression and deception employed by the state and private instruments of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The contradiction between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations has become far worse than ever before. The fact of neocolonialism in most underdeveloped countries has been aggravated by the rampage of

neoliberalism. The broad masses of the people are suffering from rising levels of exploitation, oppression and aggression. They suffer the main brunt of imperialist plunder and war. Even in the so-called emergent markets favored by the imperialist outsourcing of manufactures and special flows of hedge funds, the people suffer from unemployment, reduced real incomes, and other dire consequences of the global depression.

As a result of extreme oppression and exploitation, there are revolutionary parties of the proletariat persevering in armed revolution for national liberation, people's democracy and socialism in a number of underdeveloped countries. There are also similar parties preparing for armed revolution. Where the imperialist powers have unleashed wars of aggression, as in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and Syria, political and social turmoil among Islamic sects and ethno-linguistic communities has continued, and conflicting armies have arisen. But no communist party has yet taken advantage of this kind of situation.

Communist parties still exist in former revisionist-ruled countries but have not gone beyond parliamentary struggle. Certain states like Cuba, Venezuela, Bolivia and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea stand out today for upholding their national independence and socialist aspirations against the blockades and provocations by US imperialism. They are holding their ground, even while the US has succeeded in destroying the Qaddafi government in Libya and is trying to overthrow the Assad government in Syria for the benefit of the US-Israeli combine in the Middle East.

The contradictions among the imperialist powers in economic, financial, security and other policy matters are fast coming to the fore. The US is now worried to death about the growing tendency of Russia and China to act independently and pose a challenge to its status as No. 1 imperialist power and sole superpower, in contrast to the previous period when the US gloated over the full restoration of capitalism in the two countries and proclaimed it as the final doom of the socialist cause. The ruling parties of both Russia and China have indeed betrayed the cause of socialism but they have brought to the top rung of capitalist powers the high sense of sovereign power and social capital that they had acquired under socialism.

The struggle for a redivision of the world has become more intense. It is a struggle for sources of cheap labor and cheap raw materials as well as for markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence. The US resents the

Shanghai Cooperation Organization as a counter to NATO, the formation of the BRICS economic bloc, the Eurasian economic and security alliance of China and Russia, and the Belt and Road Initiative. Thus, under Obama it carried out the strategic pivot to East Asia to contain China, and made provocations on the borders of Russia to destabilize Russia.

Under Trump, the US has started a trade war against China, stepped up sanctions against Russia and unleashed military intervention and wars of aggression in several regions. is making provocations on the borders of Russia to destabilize Russia. Inter-imperialist contradictions in general, and inter-imperialist wars in particular, offer opportunities for developing revolutionary civil wars for national liberation and socialism. Remember how the first socialist state arose in connection with World War I and several socialist countries in connection with World War II.

Build the subjective forces of the revolution!

In relation to such objective conditions as the system of exploitation, the crisis, and the moods of the spontaneous masses, the subjective forces of the revolution are highly conscious solid organizations of people who are determined to wage various forms of revolutionary struggle in order to discredit, isolate and ultimately destroy the bourgeois ruling system. The objectives of the scientific socialists are to smash and destroy the bourgeois state and establish the proletarian or socialist state. Definite types of organizations are needed to realize these objectives.

Just as the bourgeoisie was the class agent to establish and develop capitalism, the modern industrial proletariat is the class agent to establish and develop socialism. Whatever is their level of consciousness about socialism at a given time, or whatever is the degree of influence of petty bourgeois and anti-socialist ideas on them, the blue collars and white collars in the labor force have their class interest which is increasingly under vicious assault by the monopoly bourgeoisie and which can, in due time, rouse them to rise up when the boiling point is reached. They are objectively the overwhelming majority in the well-developed capitalist economy, in contrast to the minority consisting of the capitalist owners and their highest paid subalterns. They have the potential of becoming conscious that they can get rid of the bourgeois rule and can run and expand the national industrial economy without the bourgeois proprietors and managers.

No matter how large is the peasantry in a country, it cannot lead the socialist revolution because its perspective is, at best, to own the land through democratic revolution or reform, and the possibility for socialist cooperation and mechanization is made possible by the proletariat in power. At any rate, the proletariat cannot seize and hold power without a strong alliance with the peasantry in any agrarian country. The class tendency of the petty bourgeoisie is to serve the bourgeois system and even to climb to the level of the big bourgeois. Marx himself had to change his petty bourgeois outlook and remould himself into a proletarian revolutionary to become a scientific socialist.

The most important subjective force to build for socialist revolution is the party of the revolutionary proletariat – the Communist Party or the workers’ party. It is the advanced detachment of the entire working class and the trade union movement. It builds and strengthens itself ideologically, politically and organizationally for winning the battle for democracy by mobilizing the workers and other working and exploited people; for smashing the state power of the bourgeoisie; and for building socialism in transition to communism. It propagates the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat. It proclaims and carries out the general political line, and the strategy and tactics in the revolutionary struggle. It recruits as Party members the most advanced elements in the revolutionary mass movement.

The proletarian revolutionaries must rely on the masses and do mass work. They must engage in social investigation in order to learn from the masses their basic problems and urgent needs, and how to arouse, organize and mobilize them in order to unite and strengthen themselves against their powerful adversaries. In industrial capitalist countries, they must focus mass work among the workers in their work places and communities. They must build revolutionary unions where no unions yet exist or even if they must at first form and multiply communist cells within the reactionary unions. They must trust the workers in embracing the revolutionary theory and practice of their own class. In agrarian or underdeveloped countries, they must build the revolutionary trade unions and peasant associations at the same time, and strengthen the basic alliance of these two classes. The revolutionary worker’s party must field cadres and organizers to the countryside to arouse, organize and mobilize the peasants and develop proletarian revolutionaries from among their ranks.

It is not enough to build the basic class organizations of the toiling masses of workers and peasants. The proletarian revolutionaries and mass activists must

build certain types of organizations like people's cooperatives and organizations of the youth, women, teachers, health workers, cultural workers and other low-income people. They must encourage the petty bourgeoisie to form its own progressive organizations in rejection of the exploiting classes and in support of workers and other working people. Revolutionary alliances of the working people with the progressive organizations of the petty bourgeoisie are of great importance. The progressive petty bourgeoisie carries with it to the socialist cause their various professional and technical skills and can serve as articulators and molders of public opinion. The progressive bourgeois can become allies of decisive importance and can remould themselves into proletarian revolutionaries.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat answers the central question of revolution when it builds a people's army for seizing political power. But the situation may not yet be ripe for establishing the people's army in certain countries. In preparing for the eventuality of creating a people's army and waging an armed revolution, the Party and the pertinent mass organizations can form discreet self-defense units and engage in mass training for self-defense, but always avoiding provocations that lead to unnecessary or untimely armed clashes that give the enemy to unleash white terror against the revolutionary forces and people. In the US and certain countries, it is a matter of constitutional right for ordinary citizens to bear arms to restrain or prevent the state from misusing its armed power against the people. Practical legitimate reasons for the private possession of firearms include self-defense against common criminals, fondness for hunting, and membership in a sports club.

In the application of the strategy of protracted people's war by encircling the cities from the countryside in underdeveloped countries, people's committees of self-government are formed as organs of political power in local communities. Even in the absence of a revolutionary civil war, such organs of political power can be established with the support of the mass organizations and can perform certain non-violent functions of local government in communities of the working people. Even at the national level, an alliance of progressive political parties and mass organizations can appear and act like a government by forming a people's shadow cabinet, with major departments that monitor and criticize the policies and actions of the reactionary government and voice out the demands of the people and the mass movement.

Carry out various forms of struggle to overthrow the capitalist system!

Ideological building is the first requisite and continuing fundamental task in building the revolutionary party of the proletariat. It avails of the treasury of Marxist-Leninist works written by the great communist thinkers and revolutionary leaders in the course of victorious revolutionary struggles against the capitalist system, reaction and revisionism of the classical and modern type. These works provide the principles and methods to guide the analysis of the history and circumstances of the people in a country, the formulation of the revolutionary program of action, and the concrete practice of revolution by the proletarian revolutionaries and the people.

The theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism is ever developing in relation to the world and to the particular country where it is applied. It is comprehensive and profound as it musters the proletarian revolutionary outlook and scientific knowledge in criticizing and repudiating class exploitation and oppression; in drawing up the general political line, strategy and tactics; in striving to end the capitalist system; and in proposing socialism as the preparation of communism. It requires the concrete analysis of concrete conditions, and the testing of ideas in social practice. It demands within the proletarian party a struggle against petty bourgeois subjectivism, be it in the form of dogmatism or empiricism. The consequence is that the party is well equipped to wage ideological struggle against the theorists and ideologues of the bourgeoisie and in constantly combating non-proletarian ideas and tendencies inside the party.

Ideological building serves to firm up the political building of the proletarian revolutionary party and reinforces the line of political struggle against the big bourgeoisie in different conditions. In the developed capitalist countries, the proletariat can regard the forces of social production as the basis for socialism, but it also has to win the battle for democracy by winning over the petty bourgeoisie and all disgruntled sections of capitalist society, in order to have the overwhelming majority of the people for the uprisings to overthrow the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The capitalist class never gives up its power and wealth voluntarily but uses violence and deception to hold on to these, and it does not hesitate to use fascism to suppress the forces of socialism and the people. It is therefore necessary for the proletarian party to develop a revolutionary mass movement and prepare the means for frustrating or defeating state terrorism, and for establishing the state power of the proletariat. The proletariat cannot fulfil the historic mission of building socialism without state power. This is proletarian class dictatorship

against bourgeois class dictatorship, and is at the same time proletarian democracy for the proletariat and the rest of the people.

In the underdeveloped or agrarian countries, where the peasantry still comprises the majority of the population, the proletarian revolutionary party adopts the line of people's democratic revolution led by the proletariat but is based mainly on the worker-peasant alliance. It can adopt the strategic line of protracted people's war, encircling the cities from the countryside in order to accumulate the political and armed strength to eventually seize power in the cities and on a national scale. In addition to the basic worker-peasant alliance, the party can build further alliances with the urban petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie, and take advantage of splits among the reactionaries.

In all kinds of countries, legal and illegal forms of struggle need to be carried out by the proletarian revolutionaries who lead a broad range of revolutionary forces. Even where there is yet no armed revolution by the proletariat and the people, the bourgeois can be repressive and outlaw activities that are legal in other times or other countries. When armed revolution is already surging, certain legal forms of struggle are still possible and necessary to isolate and weaken the enemy. In the general run of third world countries, the people suffer the main brunt of imperialist exploitation, oppression and aggression, thus the conditions for waging revolutionary wars are far more favorable than in the imperialist countries. The best possible situation for the world proletarian revolution is the interaction of revolutions in countries with different levels of development.

The revolutionary mass movement can pursue certain kinds of economic struggle, like strikes and blockades by the workers and peasants, boycotts or interdiction of goods and enterprises of the imperialist enemy, undertaking industrial cooperatives of workers, handicraft cooperatives of artisans, land reform and improvement of agricultural production. But it cannot rely mainly on these to take over the national economy. It is the politico-military struggle that makes the bourgeoisie lose its economic power and bureaucratic offices.

The proletarian revolutionaries, the cultural activists and the people can also engage in cultural struggle. They can create and promote cultural works to inspire more people to join and support the revolutionary movement. But only the politico-military struggle can make the reactionaries lose their control over the secular cultural institutions. Even then, unlike the power and wealth of the big bourgeoisie which can be confiscated, the ideas, sentiments and habits of the

reactionaries will persist and can only be overcome or re-channelled persuasively by persevering in the revolutionary education of the current and future generations.

Build the socialist state and engage in socialist revolution in all fields!

Consequent to the smashing and dismantling of the military and bureaucratic machinery of the bourgeois state, the proletarian revolutionary party, the proletariat and the broad masses of the people can establish the socialist state and carry the socialist revolution forward, uphold and defend the national independence and socialist revolution, promote socialist democracy, socialize the commanding heights of the economy, carry out land reform and other bourgeois democratic reforms when necessary as transition measures, foster a patriotic, scientific and socialist system of education and culture, establish diplomatic and trade relations with all countries, and uphold proletarian internationalism and anti-imperialist solidarity.

The democratic state power must protect and defend the proletariat and the people against imperialism and the exploiting classes. It must ensure and encourage the exercise and enjoyment of rights among the broad masses of the people individually and collectively. The revolutionary party of the proletariat must take the lead in the correct handling of contradictions of the people and must give full play to democracy. It must take care that the contradictions among the people are not confused with those between the people and the enemy.

The state must have a republican socialist constitution and must be under the leadership of the revolutionary party of the proletariat, on the basis of the participation and support of the broad masses of the people, and in cooperation with other democratic parties and mass organizations. The main component of state power is the people's army under the absolute leadership of the Party, and must be capable of defending national sovereignty and the socialist revolution against internal and external threats.

The constitution must prohibit imperialist intervention and domination, and the rule of any exploiting class. It must have a bill of rights which gives full play to democracy among the citizenry and all the patriotic and progressive forces within the framework of socialism. It must provide for the distinct executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, their powers and their obligations, and the methods for constituting them.

The national people's congress or parliament must have an Upper House of Labor which upholds the socialist constitution and ensures that legislation by the Lower House of Commons conforms to the constitution and to the socialist principles, policies and plans for developing the political, socio-economic and cultural system. The members of the House of Labor must be elected representatives of the Party and the workers of all major industries. The House of Commons must be a bigger body which includes representatives of the patriotic and progressive classes, forces and sectors and national minorities who are elected by the people at the appropriate levels of political subdivision. The national people's congress or parliament may be replicated at lower levels. And people's consultative assemblies may be formed at any level to prepare and support the work of their respective congress or parliament.

As soon as the socialist republic is established, such commanding heights of the economy as strategic industries, sources of raw materials, and the major means of transport and communication will come under public ownership. Transitory measures may be adopted to allow land reform and other bourgeois democratic reforms, overcome the consequences of war and enemy blockades, and revive the economy in the quickest way possible. But all these measures are subject to the steady process of cooperativization and socialization. As soon as possible, a series of 5-year economic plans must be adopted and implemented to develop socialist industry, agricultural cooperation and mechanization, and such social services as public education, cultural work, health care, housing, sports and recreation.

The centralized economic planning must provide for a well-balanced allocation of resources and development. The strategic industries must be in the lead of development and agriculture must be the base of the economy, ensuring food self-reliance and some major raw materials. But light industries, which will provide basic consumer and producer goods as well as the social services, must be developed as quickly as possible in order to serve the immediate basic needs of the people.

There must also be a well-balanced distribution of economic development tasks between the central and lower levels of economic and social ministries or departments. The objective is to spread economic development nationwide, even as various levels of processing can be located close to the source of raw materials, and certain light industries and social services can be assigned to lower levels of the government.

In socialism, the general principle of compensating people for their work is to each according to his or her deeds. There will still be wage differentials on the basis of the quantity and quality of the work done. But certainly, the needs of those who have retired and those who are unable to work permanently or temporarily (children, women on maternity leave, the elderly, the sick, those with physical or mental impairments, and so on) will be provided for. As productivity rises and production expands, it becomes possible to decrease the number of working hours and raise the real income, unlike in the capitalist system in which the capitalists press down wages in order to maximise private profit. In the socialist system, aside from the assurance of full employment and rising real wages, the surplus value that used to be privately accumulated by the exploiters becomes social capital for expanding and improving production, infrastructure, social services, efficient administration, scientific and technological research and development, artistic cultural work and public performances, defense capabilities and environmental improvement.

It is realistic and reasonable to expect that, in so many vital respects, socialism advances towards communism. The rise in the quantity and quality of production and the efficiency in its organization, the decrease of working hours and increase of real income, and the expansion of social services move towards a classless society in which the needs for subsistence, good health, recreation and cultural upliftment of the individual and the entire community are fulfilled. But to proclaim prematurely the end of classes and the class struggle, and the withering away of the worker state is to encourage the abandonment of the proletarian revolutionary stand, viewpoint and method of thinking. This translates to becoming blind to the persisting reactionary die-hards and potentially new shoots of the bourgeoisie in socialist society and to the continuing threats from imperialism and the international bourgeoisie.

Lenin pointed out that socialism will take a whole historical epoch because of the persistence of imperialism and the increased resistance of the defeated domestic bourgeoisie by tenfold. By virtue of the proletarian revolutionaries' respect for the freedom of thought and belief, the bourgeoisie can still persist and grow by using the bureaucracy, religious institutions and modern cultural institutions as refuge and cover, and ride on old customs and habits that favor reactionary thinking and acting. Mao observed the emergence and growth of the phenomenon of modern revisionism with a growing petty bourgeoisie as its social base in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and also the persistence of the bourgeoisie in Chinese socialist society. Thus, he fought against modern

revisionism since the 1950s and eventually put forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship.

It is easy to understand that it is foolish to suggest the withering away of the worker state in the face of imperialism still riding roughshod over the people of the world. After the full restoration of capitalism in former revisionist-ruled countries, it should also be easy to understand that modern revisionism has been the most lethal poison to socialism. It is proven by history that it is possible to build socialism in one country and then several countries for several decades. But communism cannot be achieved without defeating imperialism, modern revisionism and reaction on a global scale. Thus, proletarian revolutionaries consider it of the highest importance to uphold proletarian internationalism against these anti-socialist and anti-communist adversaries.

The proletarian revolutionary parties and revolutionary mass organizations of the world must unite. They must strive to develop mutual understanding, fraternal relations, and mutual support and cooperation. Giving life to the slogan, “Workers of all countries, unite!”, the socialist state must give uppermost importance to the internationalist unity of the working class through the establishment and development of fraternal relations of working-class parties and socialist states. It must strive to strengthen solidarity of all peoples, revolutionary parties and mass movements around the world in order to fight and defeat imperialism on a worldwide scale. Upon the global defeat of imperialism, communism is realizable.

The World Capitalist System Is Bankrupt and Breaking Down, Causing the Resurgence of the World Proletarian Revolution

**Message of Solidarity and Gratitude to the Participants in the Launch of
Reflections on Revolution and Prospects and Ein Leben im Widerstand**

December 21, 2019

I express to you warmest greetings of solidarity! Thank you for coming to this joint launch of Reflections on Revolution and Prospects and its German version Ein Leben im Widerstand. It is an honor and pleasure to be with you in this event.

I wish to give special thanks to my co-author Dr. Rainer Werning, our editor Julieta de Lima, the publishers International Network for Philippine Studies and the Verlag Neuer Weg, the book reviewers, the moderator Coni Ledesma and the host of this event, the NDF International Office.

I am pleased that on this occasion Rainer has ample opportunity to talk about our cooperation since we were young and his steadfast solidarity with the Filipino people's struggle for national and social liberation.

I am glad that as book reviewer Louie Jalandoni will focus on Philippine issues and refer to the 51st anniversary of the Communist party of the Philippines and Peter Weispfenning will focus on global issues in relation to German-Filipino solidarity.

The two books being launched appear to sum up my life, views and work and to say goodbye to the Philippines and to the world. But not really. I still have some

years to go. I am determined to express my views on Philippine and global issues and call for militant actions by the people's mass movement against imperialism and all reaction.

It would be a pity to say goodbye in the year 2019 when the world is on fire and great masses of people are rising up in anti-imperialist and democratic struggles against the depredations of neoliberalism, state terrorism, economic blockades, military intervention and wars of aggression.

The scale and intensity of the mass protests are unprecedented. They manifest the resistance to the extreme oppression and exploitation of the proletariat and people of the world in the hands of the imperialists and local reactionaries. I dare to foretell that these mass protests will lead either to reforms or fascism and on the whole will stimulate the growth of revolutionary movements.

Fifty years ago, it was said during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution that if the problem of modern revisionism were solved, then imperialism would be heading towards total collapse and socialism would be marching towards total victory. But Mao cautioned that it would take another 50 to 100 years for such a possibility to become real. Indeed, in the zigzag course of history, the world proletarian socialist revolution would suffer major setbacks.

After the death of Mao in 1976, the Dengist counterrevolution seized power from the proletariat and enabled the capitalist restoration in China. In 1991, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, US imperialism became the sole superpower. But subsequently, the frequently recurrent economic and financial crisis of the US and world capitalism and the ceaseless US wars of aggression accelerated the strategic decline of US imperialism.

We are now living in a world of intensifying inter-imperialist contradictions, chiefly between the US and China which used to be the main partners in neoliberal globalization from the 1980s to the first decade of this century. But since the economic and financial crash of 2008, the smartest guys of the capitalist world have failed to solve the problem of prolonged global depression. The US is the chief instigator of neoliberalism but is increasingly protectionist and remorseful over its trade and technological concessions to China.

While the traditional and new imperialist powers are locked in a struggle for a redivision of the world, they continue to shift the burden of crisis to the

proletariat and people of the world who are made to suffer the ever-worsening conditions of oppression and exploitation. The accelerated capital accumulation by a few, bureaucratic corruption, military overspending and the growing tax and debt burden have aggravated the conditions of low income, unemployment and poverty among the toiling masses.

In their own homelands and in the client states, the imperialist powers push the use of state terrorism and fascism to suppress the people's resistance and perpetuate the neoliberal methods of exploitation. They engage in military buildup, foreign military intervention and wars of aggression in order to expand their sources of cheap labor and raw materials, markets, fields of investments and spheres of influence.

Imperialism ruins the lives of the people through class exploitation and threaten the very life of humankind with the degradation of the environment and the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. But the proletariat and people of the world can rise up and unite to fight imperialism. The current worldwide mass protests against neoliberalism, fascism, war and ruination of the environment expose the rottenness of the world capitalist system and signal the transition to a world of resurgent revolutionary struggles, characterized by mass protests, people's wars and great victories of the cause of national liberation, democracy and socialism.

The Filipino people can be proud that they have persevered in their new democratic revolution through protracted people's war, have overcome adversities from within the Philippines and abroad and have won significant victories. Through their revolutionary struggle, they have served as the torch bearer of the world proletarian revolution at a time that the toiling masses have taken severe punishment as a result of neocolonialism, anti-communism, revisionist betrayal of socialism, neoliberalism, state terrorism, wars of aggression and other weapons in the arsenal of imperialism.

The Filipino people have excelled at waging armed revolution and becoming stronger through struggle against escalating campaigns of military suppression designed by US imperialism and its Filipino puppets. They have overcome the Marcos fascist dictatorship and a series of pseudo-democratic regimes. They have been able to carry out the program of new democratic revolution against the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system and to build the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the people's army, a wide array of mass organizations,

alliances and the organs of democratic political power on a nationwide scale.

But since 2016, there has been a retrogression of the ruling system towards fascist dictatorship by the Duterte regime. The tyrannical, treasonous, genocidal, plundering and swindling policies and acts of this regime can only drive the Filipino people, especially the toiling masses of workers and peasants, to raise their revolutionary strength and intensify their revolutionary struggle, as they did during the Marcos fascist dictatorship. They have the rich experience, the ample strength and abundant international solidarity and support to avail of.

Regarding the recent offer of Duterte to resume peace negotiations with the National Democratic Front of the Philippines, I think that he has made the offer because his military efforts have failed to destroy the revolutionary movement and, by committing grievous crimes against the people, he and his military minions have instead caused this movement to grow in strength and advance. But for the peace negotiations to be resumed, the regime must agree to the reaffirmation of previous joint agreements made since 1992 and must do away with all the presidential issuances that have terminated and prevented said negotiations.

So long as there is no final agreement on a just peace that addresses the roots of the armed conflict through comprehensive agreements on social, economic and political reforms under the principles of national independence, democracy, all-round development and social justice, the Filipino people together with all their revolutionary forces have all the sovereign right to wage all forms of revolutionary struggle until they win complete victory. Sincerity in the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations can be proven only by a willingness to agree on respect for the national and democratic rights of the Filipino people and on what is beneficial to them in clearly substantial and realizable social, economic and political terms.

I hope that the two books being launched today will contribute to the understanding of Philippine and global issues, promote the unity of the Filipino people and inspire them to raise the level of their revolutionary struggle to a new and higher level. The world capitalist system is bankrupt and breaking down, incapable of solving social and environmental problems, and is generating the conditions for antiimperialist and democratic struggles, the upsurge of militant solidarity of all peoples and the resurgence of the world proletarian-socialist revolution. Thank you.

In Transition to the Resurgence of the World Proletarian Revolution

March 15, 2020

Introduction

I wish to trace certain developments in recent history and current circumstances that have led to worldwide mass protests taking up the current burning issues of neoliberalism, fascism, austerity measures, gender discrimination, oppression of indigenous peoples, wars of aggression and environmental destruction.

I daresay that the current wave of mass protests signals the transition to a new era of unprecedented anti-imperialist and anti-fascist resistance by the peoples of the world and the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution. I am confident that the transition will be accomplished by the intensified revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and peoples of the world.

I. Advances of the proletarian revolution soon after World War II

As a consequence of the struggle against the fascist powers in World War II, several socialist countries and newly-independent countries arose. It could be said by the early 1950s that one-third of humankind was under the governance of communist and workers' parties. National liberation movements grew strong in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

However, the US emerged as the strongest imperialist power. It launched the Cold War since 1947 and unleashed propaganda campaigns of anti-communism, touting "free enterprise" as the guarantee to democracy. It violently opposed the people's movements for national liberation, democracy and socialism. It waged wars of aggression in Korea from 1950 to 1953 and in Vietnam and the rest of Indochina from 1955 onward.

The Korean people and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) fought and stalemated US imperialism. And the Vietnamese and the rest of the Indochinese people inflicted on the US its first categorical defeat in 1975. All the

while, China was engaged in socialist revolution and construction and stood as a bulwark against US imperialism.

Meanwhile in the Soviet Union, modern revisionism rose to power and totally negated Stalin in 1956. It overthrew the state of the working class and allowed the bourgeoisie and the factors of capitalism to grow within socialist society. It pushed reformist and pacifist lines under Khrushchov and then social-imperialism under Brezhnev.

The Communist Party of China (CPC) opposed the modern revisionist line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in the international communist and workers' movement. It also opposed within China the blatant Rightists as well as the home-grown and Soviet-influenced revisionists. It prevailed over a number of anti-socialist elements before, during and after the Great Leap Forward but there were those who persisted.

Recognizing the crucial importance of upholding Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, Mao carried out the socialist education movement to cleanse politics, economy, organization, and ideology from 1962 to 1966. But this did not suffice. And thus, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) was carried out from 1966 to 1976 on the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution in order to combat revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

The CPC thought in 1969 that the victory of the GPCR and defeat of the revisionist capitalist-roaders in China would pave the way for imperialism to head for total collapse and socialism to march towards world victory. But Mao cautioned that it would take 50 to 100 years to defeat imperialism and pave the way for the world victory of socialism.

II. Monopoly bourgeoisie inflicts major defeats on the proletariat

In fact, the GPCR went through twists and turns and ups and down. It may be said that while Mao was alive the CPC under his leadership prevailed over the revisionists from 1966-1976. But soon after his death in 1976, the capitalist roaders led by Deng Xiaoping successfully carried out a counterrevolutionary coup against the proletarian revolutionaries and the socialist state of the working class.

Consequently, the Dengist counterrevolution carried out the restoration of

capitalism in China through capitalist reforms and opening up to the US and world capitalist system. It was able to suppress the mass protests at Tiananmen in Beijing and in scores of other cities in China in 1989 against inflation and corruption. And it became even more determined to strengthen capitalism in China

By 1991 the Soviet Union collapsed and its satellite revisionist-ruled states in Eastern Europe disintegrated. The bourgeoisie took full control of all the countries in the Soviet bloc. US imperialism became the sole superpower. And its ideologues and publicists proclaimed the death of socialism and the end of history with the supposed permanence of capitalism and liberal democracy.

Further the US proceeded to propagate and impose on the world the policy regime of neoliberal globalization and unleash wars of aggression in the Middle East (in Iraq, Libya), and Syria), in Central Asia (Afghanistan) and in the countries near or adjoining Russia (former Yugoslavia, Georgia and Ukraine). It sought to expand NATO to the borders of Russia. It overestimated its role and its capabilities as sole superpower and continued to adopt and implement policies that appeared to advance its interests but which in fact aggravated the problems that had caused its strategic decline since the middle of the 1970s.

As a result of the reconstruction of the capitalist countries ruined in World War II, the US had become afflicted by stagflation. This was the offshoot of the crisis of overproduction in the US and the world capitalist system. In trying to solve the problem of stagflation, the US adopted neoliberalism and favored the military-industrial complex to strengthen the US military as well to sell weapons to the oil-producing countries.

But ultimately, neoliberalism never solved the crisis of overproduction which had been the root cause of stagflation. The increased production of the military-industrial complex was profitable within the US economy and in sales to oil-producing countries. But it was counterproductive and unprofitable in the failure of the wars of aggression to expand stable economic territory for US imperialism abroad.

Under the neoliberal policy regime, the dogma is to accelerate the centralization and accumulation of capital in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie supposedly in order to create more jobs. Thus, the monopoly bourgeoisie is favored by tax cutbacks, wage freezes, erosion of social benefits, privatization of

profitable public assets, antisocial and anti-environmental deregulation and denationalization of the economies of client-states.

The money supply and interest rates are either expanded or contracted to prevent inflation or stagnation but always favoring the monopoly bourgeoisie by expanding the public debt and subjecting the working class to further austerity measures and reduction of real wages. At the same time, legal and political measures have been undertaken by the monopoly bourgeoisie to attack job security and curtail trade union and other democratic rights.

III. US-China collaboration in neoliberal globalization

The US was in need of expanding its market due to the recurrent and worsening crisis of overproduction. Thus, it took in China as its main partner in neoliberal globalization by conceding to it low technology for sweatshop consumer manufacturing and a big consumer market in the US and elsewhere. The US thought that it could concentrate on manufacturing the big items (especially by the military-industrial complex) and on financializing the US economy.

The export income of China swelled. Before the end of the 1980s the US became the biggest debtor from being the biggest creditor at the beginning of the decade. But in the aftermath of the nationwide mass protests against inflation and corruption in China in 1989, China pleaded to the US to loosen up on the restrictions on foreign investments and technology transfer.

The US agreed on the condition that China privatized the state-owned enterprises, desisted from providing state subsidies to enterprises, opened itself further to foreign investments and entered the World Trade Organization (WTO). China concurred but actually continued to use state planning and state-owned enterprises and copy without permission foreign technology in order to achieve its own strategic economic and security goals.

The US-China economic and trade partnership seemed to be going well, especially after China entered the WTO in 2001. The US and other imperialist powers were pleased that every time there was a major global financial and economic crisis the growth of China's GDP served to compensate for the stagnant growth of the world economy. It took 10 more years from the financial crash of 2008 before the US started to accuse China of unfair economic practices in their relationship.

The crash caused a global depression which would protract up to now. It has adversely affected China's economy. The growth rate has slowed down. China suffered in 2015 a stock market crash that wiped out 30 per cent of stock values. Foreign investors transferred their plants to other countries with cheaper labor in the Asian mainland. The huge mountain of unpaid debts by Chinese local governments and corporation and high ratio of public debt to GDP became exposed even while China deployed capital for its Belt Road Initiative (BRI).

IV. Growing conflict between US and Chinese imperialism

Trump started in 2018 to accuse China of maintaining a two-tiered economy of state monopoly capitalism and private monopoly capitalism, stealing US technology, providing state subsidies to economic enterprises, manipulating finance and the currency, adopting Chinese brands on products previously patented by US and other foreign companies and using stolen technology to build the military might of China.

By this time, US imperialism was already strained by its stagnant economy, the loss of competitiveness of US products, the extreme cost of overseas US military bases and endless wars of what should I do to register aggression and the rapid rise of its public debt. The wars of aggression cost at least USD 6 trillion and failed to expand and stabilize the US economic territory abroad. The US strategic decline accelerated and became more conspicuous.

Consequent to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the US emerged as the winner in the Cold War and as sole superpower. But it actually continued to decline as a result of the high costs of its military bases overseas and its wars of aggression and its investment, trade and technological concessions to China. The US is still the No. 1 imperialist power but has declined to being one among several imperialist powers in a multipolar world.

China has risen as the main economic competitor and political rival of the US. It has become so ambitious as to design and implement the Belt Road Initiative in order to make a radical departure from the pattern of maritime global trade which the Western colonial powers had established since the 16th century. But China also has serious economic problems, especially its sitting on a mountain of bad debts by local governments and corporations, the high ratio of public debt to GDP and the onerous terms of Chinese foreign loans which are vulnerable to debtors' default and revolt.

In the Philippines and other Southeast Asia countries, the peoples are confronted with the extraterritorial claims of China over the 90 per cent of the South China Sea in violation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. But in other regions of the world, certain governments that assert national independence and the socialist cause, have taken advantage of inter-imperialist contradictions and availed of China's cooperation in order to counter sanctions and acts of aggression instigated by the US and its traditional imperialist allies.

V. Intensification of contradictions due to crisis of world capitalist system

We see today the intensification of all major contradictions in the world capitalist system, such as those between labor and capital, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations, those between the imperialist powers and states that assert national independence and the socialist cause and those among the imperialist powers.

The intensification of contradictions between labor and capital within imperialist countries and among imperialist powers is due to the worsening crisis of overproduction relative to the drastically reduced income of the working class in imperialist countries and in the rest of the world capitalist system. The workers have become restless and rebellious due to unemployment, low income, rising prices of basic commodities, austerity measures, the curtailment of their democratic rights and the rise of chauvinism, racism and fascism.

Among the imperialist powers, the US and China have emerged as the two main contenders in the struggle for a redivision of the world. Each tries to have its own alliance with other imperialist powers. The traditional alliance of the US, Europe and Japan is still operative in such multilateral agencies like the IMF, World Bank and WTO and in NATO and other military alliances. Ranged against the traditional imperialist powers are China and Russia which have broadened their alliance in BRICS, Shanghai Cooperation Organization, BRICS Development Bank, the Belt and Road Initiative and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Fund.

Since so many decades ago when they developed nuclear weapons of mass destruction and missile delivery systems, the major imperialist powers have so far avoided direct wars of aggression against each other by undertaking proxy wars despite the frequent US wars of aggression against underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They have developed the neo-

colonial ways and means of shifting the burden of crisis to the underdeveloped countries. They engage in a struggle for a redivision of the world but so far, they have not directly warred on each other to acquire or expand their sources of cheap labor and raw materials, markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence.

They make the oppressed peoples and nations of the underdeveloped countries suffer the main brunt of the recurrent and worsening economic and financial crisis of the world capitalist system even as they make them the main source of super profits through a higher rate of exploitation. Currently they continue the policy of neoliberal globalization for the purpose. To suppress the people's resistance to oppression and exploitation, they provide their client-states with the means of state terrorism and fascist rule by the bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie. They also use their respective client-states for proxy wars and counterrevolutionary wars for maintaining their economic territory or for redividing the world.

Despite their attempts to shift the burden of crisis to the oppressed peoples and nations, the imperialist powers are driven to extract higher profits from their own working class under the neoliberal policy regime. To suppress the resistance of the proletariat and people to oppression and exploitation in both the developed and underdeveloped countries, they have enacted so-called anti-terrorist laws and are increasingly prone to the use of state terrorism and sponsor fascist organizations and movements to counter the growing revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

In the underdeveloped countries, US imperialism and its puppet regimes are unleashing the worst forms of aggression and state terrorism against the people in order to perpetuate the neoliberal policy of unbridled greed. Since the end of World War II, the wars of aggression and campaigns of terror unleashed by US have resulted in 20 to 30 million killed in Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria and other countries.

But US imperialism has also suffered outstanding defeats, such in north Korea, Cuba, Vietnam and other Indochinese countries. It has been unable to stop the decolonization of colonies and semi-colonies which is still an ongoing process. The proletariat and people have persevered in protracted people's war in the Philippines, India, Kurdistan, Turkey, Palestine, Peru, Colombia and elsewhere. The spread of arms where US imperialism have unleashed wars of aggression,

such as in the Middle East and Africa, can open the way to the rise of more armed revolutionary movements.

There are effective governments like the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Cuba, Vietnam, Venezuela and Syria that assert national independence and the socialist cause. They enjoy the support of the people, stand up against US imperialism and take advantage of the contradictions among the imperialist powers in order to counter sanctions, military blockade and aggression. The people and revolutionary forces led by the proletariat can strengthen themselves in the course of anti-imperialist struggles.

VI. Mass protests signify transition to the resurgence

of world proletarian revolution

Since last year, we have seen the unprecedented rise and spread of gigantic anti-imperialist mass protests occurring in both the underdeveloped and developed countries. These signify the transition to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution. They are a manifestation of the grave crisis of the world capitalist system and the domestic ruling systems and the inability of the imperialist powers and their puppet states to rule in the old way.

The massive and sustained mass protests in various countries of Europe, North America, Latin America, Asia and Africa bring to the surface the deep-seated detestation of the people for the extreme oppression and exploitation that they have suffered. The proletariat and people of the world are fighting back. We are definitely in transition to a great resurgence of anti-imperialist struggles and the world proletarian revolution.

The broad masses of the people are rising up against the worst forms of imperialist oppression and exploitation, such as neoliberalism, austerity measures, gender discrimination oppression of indigenous peoples, fascism, wars of aggression and environmental destruction. The starting points or inciting moments for the mass protests may be concrete issues of wide variability but they always rise up to the level of protests against imperialism and all reaction.

In the last 50 years, we have seen imperialism, neocolonialism., modern revisionism, neoliberalism and neoconservatism attack and put down the proletariat and people of the world. Now, the people are resisting as never before and generating new revolutionary forces, including parties of the proletariat and

mass organizations. These will ultimately result in the spread of armed revolutionary movements and the rise of socialist states and people's democracies with a socialist perspective.

The Filipino people and their revolutionary forces are gratified that they have persevered in the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war and with a socialist perspective in the last more than 50 years. Loyal to the just revolutionary cause, they have waged revolutionary struggle resolutely and militantly and have fought even more fiercely against the counterrevolutionary campaigns of the enemy. They have been inspired by the revolutionary victories of national liberation movements and socialism abroad and have become ever more determined to contribute the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

They take pride in being referred to as one of the torch bearers of the anti-imperialist struggles of the peoples of the world and the world proletarian revolution. Their revolutionary will and fighting spirit are more than ever higher as their revolutionary struggles are now in concert with the resurgent mass struggles of the proletariat and people on a global scale. We foresee that in the next fifty years the crisis-stricken world capitalist system will continue to break down and give way to the rise of anti-imperialist and socialist states and societies.

Long live the proletariat and peoples of the world!

Down with the imperialist powers and all reaction!

Long live the anti-imperialist and socialist cause!

Victory for the world proletarian-socialist revolution!

On Trotskyites and other Slanderers

Tsikahan with Tito Jo: On Trotskyites and Social Democrats

Questions by Host Anghelo Godino, Anakbayan-Europa

September 9, 2020

1. Before we progress to our week's topic, let us try to define some terminologies that should help the viewers understand our discussion. Tito, what is Trotskyism and who was Leon Trotsky? In the Philippines, the National Democratic Movement is long brushing with the Social Democrats; who are these National Democrats and Social Democrats, how did they arise in the Philippine political spectrum?

JMS: Trotskyism is a petty bourgeois anti-communist ideology which masquerades as more Left than the communist parties that have built socialist societies and have led anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles towards the goal of socialism. Leon Trotsky had no grounding on materialist dialectics and did not have a proletarian revolutionary stand and flip-flopped from ultra-Left to Right opportunism and back. He opposed Lenin and the Bolsheviks on all major issues in the revolution, such as the new type of party, class dictatorship of the proletariat, the worker-peasant alliance, the sequence of democratic and socialist revolution, and so on.

A primer for CPP cadres and members titled, Special Study on Trotskyism, defines Trotskyism in the following terms:

It is an ideological and political petty-bourgeois trend hostile to Marxism-Leninism and to the international communist movement. It conceals its

opportunist essence with radical, left-wing slogans. Trotskyism arose within the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party at the beginning of the 20th century as a form of Menshevism. It was named for its leader, Leon Trotsky (real name Lev Davidovich Bronstein, 1879-1940). It is carried over to the 21st century by adherents known as Trotskyists or Trotskyites.

Lenin described Trotsky in the following words:

Trotsky has never yet held a firm opinion on any important question of Marxism. He always contrives to worm his way into the cracks of any given difference of opinion, and desert one side for the other. He explained further: Trotsky was an ardent Iskraist from 1901 to 1903. At the end of 1903, Trotsky was an ardent Menshevik, i.e., he deserted from the Iskraists to the Economists. ...In 1904 and 1905, he deserted the Mensheviks and occupied a vacillating position, now cooperating with Martynov (the Economist), now proclaiming his absurdly Left 'permanent revolution' theory.

Trotsky had his final undoing when the Bolsheviks expelled him after he pontificated about the impossibility of building socialism in one country, opposed the socialist revolution and construction in the Soviet Union and engaged in counterrevolutionary activities. He led the so-called Left Opposition; Bukharin led the Right Opposition. They attacked the socialist line from the flanks. The more vociferous Trotsky made anti-Stalinism his trade mark.

Trotsky and his Trotskyite followers have served the fascists in World War II and the US and other imperialist powers before, during and after the Cold War by spreading lies and slanders against the communist parties and revolutionary mass movements which they simplistically attack as Stalinist. For instance, only recently in his diatribe against both the old Communist Party and the new Communist Party in the Philippines, the Trotskyite Joseph Scalice accuses the old Communist Party of Stalinism even after the Lavaite remnants of that party became revisionist and anti-Stalin like the Trotskyites when it sided with the CPSU after the Sino-Soviet split in the 1960s and more so when it collaborated with the Marcos fascist regime from 1972 to 1986.

For several decades already, the Trotskyites from the US, Western Europe, Japan and Australia have formed grouplets of Trotskyites in the Philippines. These have tried to worm their way into the Communist Party of the Philippines and the revolutionary movement and have failed miserably. These grouplets quarrel

among themselves but they directly and indirectly assist the reactionary government, especially the current Duterte terrorist regime, in slandering the CPP and red-tagging leaders and members of the patriotic and democratic forces of the national democratic movement.

The national democratic movement is a mass movement of workers, peasants, indigenous peoples, women, youth, professionals and other people in the Philippines who demand and struggle for full national independence, democracy, social justice, economic development through genuine land reform and national industrialization, cultural progress and international solidarity with all peoples against imperialism and all reaction. The national democratic movement is inspired by the Philippine Revolution of 1896 against Spanish colonialism and by all revolutionary struggles of the Filipino people against US imperialism and the local exploiting classes.

After the defeat of the armed revolutionary movement in the early 1950s, the Student Cultural Association of the University of the Philippines (SCAUP) became the starting point of a renewed national democratic movement. It further developed into the comprehensive youth organization, Kabataang Makabayan, which embraced the student and the young workers, peasants and professionals. Together with trade unions and peasant associations, the KM became the strongest nationwide base for the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines in 1968.

The so-called social democrats (soc-dems) in the Philippines are not really the same as the classical social democrats in Europe who have garbed their petty bourgeois liberalism and pacifism with the language of Marxism or the bourgeois laborism of the labor aristocracy. They used to be called clerico-fascists up to the 1960s because of their religious sectarianism and glorification of feudal institutions as models of good society. Subsequently, they called themselves social democrats like the US puppet Nguyen van Thieu in Vietnam, using a hodgepodge of religiosity, liberalism, social reformism and anti-communism which they use to attack the anti-imperialist and democratic forces in the national democratic movement.

The antecedent of the soc-dems was the Christian Social Movement, whose leader Raul Manglapus gained national prominence as propagandist for the CIA-supported presidential candidate Ramon Magsaysay and who occupied high positions in the reactionary government. The most notorious of the soc-dems in

recent times is Norberto Gonzales of the Nagkakaisang Partido Demokratiko Sosyalista ng Pilipinas (NPDSP) who became national security adviser and then defense secretary of the Arroyo regime and was responsible for fouling up the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations, teaming up with General Esperon in the series of terror campaigns called Bantay Laya I, II and III and requesting the US government to designate the CPP, NPA and myself as terrorists.

2. In the 2016 election, Duterte claims that if he wins, he will be the first socialist president of the Philippines. Many said that because of this statement and the supposed “support and aid” he provided for the ND movement, particularly in Mindanao, that the communists endorsed and supported his presidential bid. Is this true? And by the definition of socialist, is Duterte a socialist?

JMS: The Trotskyites are grossly lying when they claim that the CPP supported the presidential candidacy of Duterte. The CPP is banned from the electoral exercises of the reactionary government and as a matter of principle the CPP is waging a people’s democratic revolution through people’s war and is building the revolutionary government of workers and peasants in the guerrilla fronts.

The BAYAN MUNA and others in Makabayan Bloc, well-known electoral parties of the national democratic movement, supported the presidential candidacy of Grace Poe and not Duterte. In this regard, the Trotskyites are also grossly lying. And desperately grasping for a semblance of evidence of ND support for Duterte before and after the 2016 presidential elections, they cite the diplomatic and tactful words and gestures to Duterte encouraging him to engage in peace negotiations and cooperate in realizing the People’s Agenda.

Before, during and after the 2016 presidential elections, nobody in his right mind believed Duterte when he said that he was Left and socialist. The most discerning knew that he was the candidate of big comprador-landlord dynasties and former presidential plunderers with links to the US and Chinese imperialism, especially the Marcos, Arroyo and Estrada families. In his entire political life, Duterte has never explained what he meant by calling himself a socialist. Definitely, he is not socialist in any sense by word or deed.

3. Duterte has killed over 30,000 Filipino people under the War on Drugs. Our country is now on the second spot as Asia’s deadliest country to be activists. A certain contributor to the World Socialist Website wrote that the CPP called on

the revolutionary forces to cooperate with Duterte's War on Drugs and published it in Ang Bayan, calling the Party and the entire ND movement "enabler." What can you say about this?

JMS: In principle, before and after Duterte became president, the CPP has always been for the solution of the drug problem as a health problem and for cracking down on the drug lords, especially at the top level of illegal manufacturers, smugglers and governors and generals who were protectors. The CPP has always wished that the drug problem be solved the way Comrade Mao did in the early years of the People's Republic of China.

As soon as it was clear that the Duterte regime was listing and killing the urban poor as drug users and drug peddlers, Comrade Oris as spokesman of the CPP and NPA condemned Duterte's bogus war on drugs in July 2016, the very first month of Duterte's presidency. Since then, the CPP has been the most outstanding in condemning Duterte for using the bogus drug war to intimidate the people and install himself as the supreme drug lord. The Trotskyites make themselves complicit with Duterte in the drug trade and in his commission of grave crimes by trying to discredit the CPP and trying to disable it from fighting Duterte on the issue of illegal drugs and extrajudicial killings.

4. In the beginning of the Duterte administration, he seemed to be really bringing the change that he promised. Duterte appointed Leftist personalities in his cabinet such as Ka Paeng Mariano, Liza Maza, Joel Maglunsod, and Judy Taguiwalo. Because of this, speculations arose such as the Left, by that the Party – is already turning revisionist. Some say that the ND movement is forming a coalition government with the Duterte administration. Do you subscribe to this? Why did the Left allow the appointment of these personalities? How is it beneficial to the people they are serving?

JMS: When Duterte said publicly that he wanted to appoint communists to his cabinet and government agencies, I answered him publicly that he could not appoint persons to the cabinet or other government positions as representatives of the CPP or NDFP because the peace negotiations and the people's war were still going on. And I told him publicly, he could appoint people to positions on the basis of individual merits of being patriotic, competent, honest and diligent.

The Trotskyites and other anti-communists are red-tagging the persons that you have mentioned by insisting that they were appointed as communists to

government position by Duterte. They pretend to be more revolutionary than the revolutionaries by dishing out the lie that the CPP engaged in coalition with the Duterte by letting him appoint patriotic and progressive people to his cabinet.

Scalice is a big liar for claiming or insinuating that the CPP coalesced with and supported the Duterte regime. The people's war went on and is still going on. Only a liar can try to make it appear that the armed conflict or civil war is a form of coalition or mutual support. The Trotskyites and other anti-communists, in their comfortable bureaucratic and academic chairs, utterly fail to make themselves appear revolutionary by casting scandalous lies and false accusations against the CPP exactly at a time that the Duterte regime is intensifying its murderous rampage on the people and their revolutionary movement against the regime.

5. Will the Left be open to a coalition government with Duterte or any administration for this matter? How do you see the alliance with the Liberals at this point? Conversely, if the Left will ally with the Liberals or form a coalition government, what would it mean? Will it not veer from its principles?

JMS: Since May 2017, when Duterte aborted the fifth round of the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations, he has done everything to prevent serious peace negotiations. On November 23, 2017, he formally terminated the peace negotiations and on December 5, 2017 he designated the CPP and NPA as 'terrorist' organizations. Subsequently, he formed the National Task Force to eliminate the CPP and the armed revolution and he has licensed himself to engage in state terrorism in the name of anti-terrorism. There is no longer any basis for peace negotiations and there is absolutely no prospect of coalition with the Duterte regime.

If you mean by Liberal the Liberal Party, it is premature to talk about forming a coalition government with them even as there is a basis for discussing and forming a formal or informal alliance against the Duterte regime. At the same time, there are soc-dems, militarists and other rabid anti-communists around Robredo who are bent on opposing such alliance. The US is also cultivating her as successor to Duterte and coaxing him to resign or simply finish his term. The possibility of a coalition government with the Liberals can arise only if they take power from Duterte under the pressure of mass actions and then engage the NDFP in peace negotiations. The success of such peace negotiations can be the basis for a coalition government. Otherwise, there is no basis.

6. *Joseph Scalice who claims to be a Philippine historian wrote that the CPP is a “reactionary nationalist ideology of Stalin and its Maoist variant”, and even goes as far as saying that socialism is off the agenda in countries like the Philippines which he said is belated-capitalist. What does he mean by belated-capitalism and is socialism really off the agenda?*

JMS: Joseph Scalice is merely parroting the old line of Trotskyism that communist parties can only be nationalist if they seize power in one country after another and carry out socialist revolution and construction as Stalin and Mao did. The Trotskyites follow the crazy idea of Trotsky that it is impossible to build socialism in one country. But Stalin and Mao built socialism. What kind of a historian is Scalice who denies the great historic achievements of Stalin and Mao.

With regard to the oppressed peoples and nations still fighting for national liberation and democracy against imperialism and the local exploiting classes in semicolonial and semifeudal countries, the Trotskyites deny the necessity of the new-type bourgeois democratic and socialist stages of the revolution and have the perverse notion that being anti-imperialist is necessarily being bourgeois nationalist and winning over the national bourgeoisie, even as an unstable and unreliable ally, to the anti-imperialist alliance is necessarily merging with it and even being subservient to this social stratum. The Trotskyites are totally dishonest in misrepresenting communist revolutionaries and they obscure and cover up imperialism as the enemy of the proletariat and the people.

Actually, the Trotskyites and the pseudo-social democrats in the Philippines say that the Philippines is already ‘capitalist’ and no longer semifeudal, that socialism should be the immediate issue in the revolutionary agenda and that the CPP is being nationalist for first engaging in the people’s democratic revolution. But the Trotskyites are self-contradictory because they do not like socialism in one country. And the reformist social-democrats wish to conserve the exploitative system while improving the lot of the workers.

These imbeciles do not understand that semifeudalism is a form of capitalism dominated by the comprador big bourgeoisie in combination with the landlord class in subordination to foreign monopoly capitalism. They also do not understand that the people’s democratic revolution with a socialist perspective has first to defeat the forces of foreign and feudal domination before the proletariat and the people can obtain the basis and the power to begin the

socialist revolution and construction.

7. One of the most hackneyed arguments against the ND movement by the Trots and the Liberals is on Stalinism. According to them, Stalin's notoriety should not be celebrated or looked up to and yet the ND movement pays respect to this man. How should we respond to such claims? Why do the Left draw lessons from Stalin's experiences? As Filipino activists, what can we actually learn from him?

JMS: Stalin as the leader of the Bolshevik party engaged in socialist revolution and construction in the Soviet Union twice over (first before World War II, then again after the war when it rebuilt itself) and inflicted the most fatal blow on fascism during World War II. Roosevelt and Churchill had high praises for Stalin until the US and Britain launched the Cold War out of fear that the rise of several socialist countries and national liberation movements was endangering the world capitalist system. During World II, the Trotskyites collaborated with the fascists in Germany, Spain, the US, the Soviet Union, Indochina, Latin America and elsewhere.

The Trotskyites and the Liberals are against Stalin for the most despicable reasons. The CPP appreciate highly Stalin's great achievements in socialist revolution and construction and in defeating Nazi Germany but is critical of him for prematurely declaring the end of classes and class struggle in socialist society in 1935. As a consequence, Stalin failed in correctly handling contradictions among the people and failed to pre-empt the rise of modern revisionism. I have written extensively on these issues. You and our listeners can read my piece titled *Stand for Socialism against Modern Revisionism.*'

8. Tito, these Trots seem to be delving more on their attacks against the Philippine Left instead of exposing and opposing the tyrant that is Duterte. Why do they do this? Why do they seem to devote their time trying to bring down the Left movement instead of uniting against the common enemy?

JMS: The Trotskyites expose themselves as counterrevolutionaries by concentrating their attacks on the CPP and the revolutionary movement and red-tagging the legal forces of the national democratic movement, while these are now in the forefront of the struggle to oust Duterte from power. The Trotskyites are practically special agents of the Duterte terrorist regime.

In a perverse and absurd way, they hold the most resolute and consistent anti-

Duterte forces responsible for Duterte's crimes. This is a case of blaming the victims in order to minimize the culpability of the culprit and save him. The Trotskyites practically support the all-out war of Duterte against the people and revolutionary movement. Even if sometimes they shed crocodile tears over the martyrs murdered by Duterte, the Trotskyites make themselves complicit with him in his bloody crimes and they insinuate that the martyrs deserve their death for having supported him.

They are like their cultist idol Trotsky who fled the Soviet Union to attack Bolsheviks and the socialist cause. He and his followers have specialized in the role of posing as more revolutionary than the revolutionaries and then attacking the revolutionaries to favor the people's enemy. Trotskyites are traitors to the proletariat and the people. They are barefaced swindlers whose highest ambition is to sell information and analyses to anti-communist foundations, research groups and intelligence agencies.

9. Scalice went on with his lecture on August 26, during this lecture he showed what he called proof of the Left's support to Duterte. There were photos, quotes from you, and other Leftist personalities, even. To clarify this, does the Left really think that Duterte could bring hope? If you did so in the past, what changed? Scalice is not the only one using the past interviews, pictures and whatnot to support their allegation, a lot of anti-communists and Trots are using it as well. Do you have anything to say to them? To what extent should the Left support or commend the positive decisions of the Duterte or for this matter, any reactionary personalities?

JMS: The NDFP has long been engaged in peace negotiations since 1992 when the The Hague Joint Declaration was mutually approved by the NDFP and GRP principals in order to set the framework of purpose, agenda and methods for the peace negotiations. The purpose is to address the roots of the armed conflict, arrive at comprehensive agreements on social, economic and political reforms and thereby lay the basis for a just and lasting peace. The NDFP has stood by its revolutionary principles and policies and has never capitulated to the GRP, from the time of Ramos to Duterte.

Together with the CPP, NDFP and so many peace advocates from religious and nonreligious organizations and mass organization, I made statements to encourage Duterte to engage in peace negotiations because he himself asked for the peace negotiations, made promises about amnestying and releasing all

political prisoners; and declared that he was ready for social, economic and political reforms.

The GRP-NDFP peace negotiations have been characterized by diplomatic dialogue and principled objections of the NDFP to repeated attempts of the GRP to maneuver the NDFP into a position of capitulation. The NDFP has always rebuffed such attempts and thus the peace negotiations have been interrupted by the enemy so many times. It is utterly stupid for Scalice to pick out diplomatic statements and gestures of the NDFP and mine and disregard the firm adherence of the CPP and NDFP to revolutionary principles and the continuance of the people's war. Duterte has never stopped his all-out war against the revolutionary movement and the latter has never stopped its people's war. Only a Trotskyite and fake historian can deny such a glaring fact.

If for instance, I spurned Duterte's plea for peace negotiations from the beginning, the same anti-communist Trotskyites and Liberals would attack me as dogmatist, unreasonable and bellicose. The CPP and NDFP actually put Duterte under the test to prove whether or not he was for a just peace. And he was exposed as refusing a just peace, while the NDFP was able to publicize its program of social, economic and political reforms for a just peace. You have to be inside the peace process and on the side of the NDFP to know how Duterte came to be distrusted as early as in October 2016 when he refused to amnesty and release all political prisoners.

10. The Trots say that there is no longer need for protracted people's war—encircling the cities from the countryside is a romanticism of an obsolete belief. They even say that now more than ever, the world is ready for a spontaneous, synchronous revolution. Why was it wrong a few decades ago and why is it still wrong now? Is it still wrong even in the present context of the Philippine society where Duterte is extremely unpopular?

JMS: The Trotskyites expose themselves as counterrevolutionary agents of US imperialism and the Filipino reactionaries by spouting the propaganda that there is no longer need for a protracted people's war—that encircling the cities from the countryside is a romanticism of an obsolete belief.

And they repeat the old rotten line of Trotsky that revolution in any country is futile unless it is synchronized with a spontaneous and seamless world revolution. This is the stupid idea of having a permanent revolution but not

having a revolution anywhere if there are no simultaneous revolutions on a world scale. At best, it is the dogmatism of wanting to reach a mountain summit without any arduous climb, waiting instead for a cable-car to magically appear. It is an outright rejection of any serious effort at making revolution.

The conditions of the Philippines are semicolonial and semifeudal and thus there is a need for people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective through protracted people's war under the leadership of the CPP and under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The CPP wields the revolutionary armed struggle as the main weapon and integrates this with agrarian revolution and mass base-building. It also wields the national united front by relying mainly on the basic alliance of workers and peasants, winning over the middle social strata and taking advantage of the splits among the reactionaries in order to isolate and destroy the enemy one after the other.

Without the people's army in the Philippines, the Filipino people have nothing. The people's war is precisely what has compelled the GRP to negotiate with the NDFP. By engaging in peace negotiations, the NDFP has succeeded in propagating the people's demands for national and social liberation even as the GRP and Trotskyite special agents of the enemy have tried to misrepresent the principles and position of the NDFP.

What is the strength of the CPP and NPA, which are belittled and scorned by the Trotskyite counterrevolutionaries who wish to liquidate the armed revolution. Let me quote a recent statement of the NPA about its current strength:

The NPA continues to operate in more than 110 guerrilla fronts in 73 of 81 provinces across the country. It has several thousand guerrilla fighters. They are armed with high-powered weapons and small firearms seized from the enemy, security forces and other sources. The NPA employs grenades and command-detonated explosives. They also use indigenous methods of warfare such as booby traps and punji sticks. Units of the NPA operate under 14 regional operations command, which in turn are under the National Operational Command (NOC). The NPA is under the absolute leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines through its Central Committee and Political Bureau and its Executive Committee and the Military Commission of the Central Committee.

The NPA was able to mount at least 710 military actions of various sizes from

March 29, 2019 to March 29, 2020. These include harassment, disarming, demolition, sapper and partisan operations, punitive actions, raids against enemy detachments and ambushes. Most of these actions are not reported in the bourgeois media. At least 651 enemy troops were killed, while more than 465 were wounded in action, the equivalent of around 30 platoons or two battalions of enemy troops. All regions across the country were able to contribute to these tactical offensives. Among the most significant victorious tactical offensives were those in Southern Tagalog in Luzon, in Eastern Visayas and Negros in the Visayas and in North Central and Northeast Mindanao.

11. Some critics mentioned that the CPP-NPA is losing its foothold on the toiling masses because of sheer militarism, irrelevance of its advocacies, and duration of the war it's waging. Is there a truth in it? Are the masses already impatient?

JMS: As I have already explained, the CPP and NPA are not engaged in sheer militarism. They are guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and they are carrying out a program of people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective. They have grown in strength and advanced in the revolutionary struggle because they have won the support of the Filipino people in their millions. The NPA is not only a fighting force for developing the people's political power but it is also an organization for mass work and for helping the people and the people's government in carrying out social, economic, political and cultural programs.

The CPP has excellently built itself ideologically, politically and organizationally. It is deeply rooted among the masses and exists nationwide. It leads various types of mass organizations of workers, peasants, indigenous peoples, women, youth, professionals and people belonging to various sectors. Millions of people belong to these mass organizations.

At the same time, more millions of people are under the governance of the local organs of political power that comprise the People's Democratic Government. The various mass organizations and various types of alliances support this government.

The revolutionary mass movement led by the CPP is born out of the lessons from the revolutionary history of the Filipino people and from the concrete analysis of concrete conditions. The CPP and NPA have so far been the biggest and strongest revolutionary forces of their kind in the entire history of the

Filipino people. They have created the people's democratic government which continues to win victories against the reactionary government of big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists servile to foreign monopoly capitalism.

12. What makes Trotsky's writings so palatable, especially for philosophers and activists in Europe, especially in countries where he was exiled? He is still very popular now in France, for example.

JMS: To dispel any impression that Trotskyites are attractive in Europe or anywhere else, let me refer to Ho Chi Minh's exposure of Trotskyites as counterrevolutionary agents:

For example, in Spain, their names are Workers' Party of Marxist Unification (POUM). Did you know that it is they who are the nests of spies in Madrid, Barcelona and elsewhere in the service of Franco? It is they who organized the famous "fifth column," agency of the army intelligence of the fascist Italians and Germans. In Japan, they are called Marx-Engels-Lenin League (MEL). The Japanese Trotskyites attract young people to their league, then reported them to the police. They seek to penetrate the Japanese Communist Party in order to destroy it from within. In my opinion, the French Trotskyites, now organized around the Proletarian Revolution Group set a goal to sabotage the Popular Front. On this subject, I think you are better informed than I am. In Indochina, Trotskyites are grouped into formations like La Lutte, War against the Japanese, Culture and Red Flag.

In my own time, as a young trade union activist in the Philippines, in the early 1960s, I became aware of the notorious Trotskyite Jay Lovestone who was being denounced by the Filipino trade union leaders as a long-time agent of the Central Intelligence Agency. He exemplified the Trotskyite who wormed his way to the communist leadership and trade unions in the US in order to subsequently carry out anti-communist witch-hunts against alleged communist party members and trade unionists and make intelligence reports to the CIA. Since then, I have become alert to entryism or penetration by Trotskyites into revolutionary organizations. I have come across Trotskyites in the US, Australia, Japan, France, The Netherlands and other countries. They use a wide variety of party names and take various guises as activists and academics. And I have always managed to distance myself from them.

The writings and historical record of Trotsky appeal only to a few with a petty

bourgeois mentality. The Trotskyites are very often funded and used by the imperialists to attack communist parties because of their anti-communist, anti-Stalin and anti-Mao propaganda. The Trotskyite organizations are small and easily get split when someone among them starts accusing the leaders of being Stalinist for trying to centralize the decision-making and to require discipline. They are hostile to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, such as the class dictatorship of the party, the vanguard role of the communist party, the basic alliance of the workers and peasants, democratic centralism.

When a Trotskyite group grows relatively big, it is because it adopts a misleading name and self-description and attracts the petty bourgeois youth. But it is soon riven by factionalism and petty bourgeois wrangling. Most of those who join Trotskyite groups drop out after a short while because of internal rows, lack of revolutionary mass activity and disgust at being stridently anti-communist. At any rate, I have not seen any Trotskyite party winning revolution since Trotsky got himself thrown out of the Bolshevik party as a counterrevolutionary nearly a century ago.

Trotskyites persist as small groups railing against the truly revolutionary parties of the proletariat. They have long been exposed as using ultra-Left slogans as well as ultra-liberal and anti-Stalin slogans to mask their counterrevolutionary purposes. Because of their anti-Stalin and anti-communist views, Trotskyite groups are favorite recruiting pools of the imperialists and reactionaries for propagandists and spies against communist parties and revolutionary movements.

In the past, Trotskyite parties were relatively strong in Mexico and Sri Lanka. But they have disintegrated here because of their anti-communist ideology and political line, anarchism and adventurism, their preoccupation with slandering and attacking communist parties. At certain times, the Trotskyites appeared to be successful when they collaborated with social democratic institutions and groups as in France or with anarchist groups in mass actions. But eventually they dwindled because of their Trotskyite cultism and sectarianism.

13. Lastly, Tito, for the sake of our viewers from Europe. One of the most common questions of Western Leftists is if there are Trotskyites in the Philippines. Are there and how do you spot one? Why is it necessary to know about Trotskyism?

JMS: There are small Trotskyite groups in the Philippines. They have been formed by various foreign Trotskyite groups based in Western Europe, Japan, Australia and the US. They have tried to penetrate the CPP but have also failed ultimately because they are exposed for suddenly opposing Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the general line of people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective after pretending to adhere to them.

All of the Trotskyite groups are mere babblers and are most active with publications, especially now online. They have some academics and a few unions. But they have failed to hoodwink the people and the intelligentsia. Like Trotsky their idol, they do not do serious mass work and they do not struggle against the enemy but against the revolutionaries.

They have isolated themselves with their anti-Stalinist obsession, their opposition to the people's democratic revolution as a supposedly unnecessary stage in the Philippine revolution and their preoccupation with anti-communist attacks on genuine communist parties and revolutionary movements wherever they are in the world. They can only get themselves further isolated by joining Duterte in attacking the communist revolutionaries and the patriotic and democratic forces that are now rising up.

Rising Movement in the West

Questions from Kirsten Bueno:

October 16, 2020

1. *Regarding the rising movement in the west; as an internationalist, what can you say about the rise of Dengism inside the Western "left", particularly, the US "left".*

JMS: In the past, the big communist and workers' parties in the West and particularly in the US were revisionist and disintegrated or dwindled drastically, when the Soviet Union collapsed and the CPSU lost power in 1991 but they left a legacy of revisionist books and other study materials. There were several anti-revisionist parties that arose, influenced by Mao and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, but the party that propagated Maoism in the US and abroad in the 1980s and 1990s which seemed to be the strongest and most lasting, the Revolutionary Communist Party of the US, departed from Maoism when its chairman Bob Avakian put forward his so-called New Synthesis as something under his great leadership and above the so-called first wave of communist led-revolutions in the 20th century. Quite immodest for a guy who has not yet won a revolution in the US.

The RCPUSA and Revolutionary International Movement dwindled and disappeared, respectively, since the onset of the 21st century. In Europe, the imperialists unleashed neoliberalism since 1980 as an anti-communist campaign and eventually succeeded in taking away initiative from the old labor and social democratic parties as well as from the new social democratic parties put up by those who came from the old revisionist parties that disintegrated or dissolved in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union. Thus, for want of a big brother, the

Philistine type of “communists” were impressed by China and its Communist Party even as the Dengist coup and counterrevolution overthrew Maoism and the socialist system and condemned the GPCR in favor of the Dengist line of capitalist reforms and opening up to the capitalist world after the death of Mao. Those who accept Dengism seem to be blind to the fact that socialism has been supplanted by monopoly capitalism.

2. Many have thought of the current CCP as a vanguard against US imperialism, and has continued to deny China's imperialism and revisionism. Like this, for example:

<https://medium.com/@rainershea612/why-the-u-s-spreads-lies-about-china-ad19eb649b99>

JMS: This article practically engages in dishing out outright lies like China is not imperialist but is still socialist, it still has a socialist state and not a class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and it is still on the side of the world's poor and working people. China fulfils the 5 features of monopoly capitalism or imperialism as defined by Lenin. Even the stark aggressive character of China as an imperialist power is demonstrated by its violation of the sovereign rights of the Filipino people in the West Philippine Sea. For four decades, the Dengists have sold cheap the labour power of the Chinese proletariat to the Chinese and international monopoly bourgeoisie, especially the US. They have fallen silent on proletarian internationalism and engage in international usury and other imperialist practices in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

3. Although, we cannot consider it as a big threat yet, as they (parties that admire and follow Dengism) have no mass-line whatsoever, but this thought has to be suppressed for the movement in America to be successfully shifted to the left, yes?

JMS: Of course, those tiny groups that worship and trail after Dengism have no effective mass line and have no future. They can crumble on their own or be swept away by the struggle and advance of genuine communist and workers' parties. There is need for you to combat the Dengists ideologically and politically in the US. But I do not think that they are formidable enough to block the advance of the revolutionary movement in the US.

4. They usually base the "hate" for China from US reactionaries, so I believe this

Dengist myth could only be suppressed if they were to be told by revolutionaries themselves so I do hope you make a statement about it.

JMS: The Dengists outside of China assert that it is the US that is generating lies about China but the Dengists of China keep on insisting that the US should remain their best friend and best partner in neoliberal globalization even as the US has decided that it must deal with China as its main economic competitor and political rival as their inter-imperialist contradictions keep on sharpening.

Socialism and Capitalist Restoration in China

Book Review of Rethinking Socialism by Deng-Yuan Hsu and Pao-Yu Ching, November 7, 2020

I thank the East and Southeast Asian Studies section of the University of the Philippines-Center for International Studies for inviting me to do a review of Rethinking Socialism by Deng-Yuan Hsu and Pao-Yu Ching. I convey warmest greetings to Prof. Pao-yu Ching, Christophe Kistler of the Foreign Languages Press, the organizers and all participants in this event to review the aforementioned book and the book From Victory to Defeat: China's Socialist Road and Capitalist Reversal under the sole authorship of Prof. Ching. It is appropriate that this event coincides with the 103rd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. To understand the rise of socialism, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the defeat of socialism in China, we need a lot of interrelating the two greatest revolutions of the 20th century, the Russian revolution of 1917 and the Chinese revolution of 1949.

In the 2017 edition of Rethinking Socialism, Prof. Ching makes an introduction to withdraw the proposition, which was stated by the co-authors some two decades ago in their earliest edition of the book, that the Chinese socialist revolution had failed, and to replace it with the proposition that it had been defeated in a contest between socialist and capitalist projects that arose in what was supposed to be a socialist transition to communism.

Indeed, socialism in China did not fail because of inherent invalidity in theoretical and practical terms but because it was defeated in a two-line class struggle between the socialist line of Comrade Mao and the bourgeois line of the capitalist roaders headed by Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping, former President of the People's Republic of China and former General Secretary of the Chinese

Communist Party, respectively. The book provides important facts, insights and analysis regarding this struggle. The main concern of the book is about the conflicting socialist and capitalist projects but it also relates the economic issues to the political and cultural issues.

Basic principles and requirements for building socialism

I concur with Prof. Pao-Yu Ching on the following point: “To begin, I again quote Lenin: We do not claim that Marx or the Marxists know the road to socialism in all its completeness. That is nonsense. We know the direction of this road, we know what class forces lead along it, but concretely and practically it will be learned from the experiences of the millions who take up the task.”

And may I add that before the Great October Socialist Revolution occurred, only the basic principles and the basic political and economic requirements for building socialism were laid down by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto, such as the revolutionary overthrow of the class dictatorship or state power of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the class dictatorship of the proletariat or the socialist state and the replacement of the private ownership of the means of production by public ownership.

Marx considered and studied the Paris Commune of 1871 as the prototype of the proletarian class dictatorship in the Civil War in France. But with regard to the matter of building the socialist economy, he could only project in the Critique of the Gotha Programme how the liberation of the forces of production from the fetters of capitalist relations of production would accelerate the expansion of production to serve the needs of the people and how the total value created by the workers would be divided in just and reasonable proportions as funds for wages, accumulation or reinvestment, social welfare, administration and defense.

Lenin demonstrated how to establish the class dictatorship of the proletariat with the support of the broad masses of the people, seize the commanding heights of the economy and adopt transitory measures for the quickest possible recovery of the economy from the damages wrought by war. Even in his time, he prognosticated that it would take a whole historical epoch to build socialism as a stage towards the ultimate goal of communism. After the death of Lenin, Stalin continued the work of Lenin by building socialist industry and collectivizing and mechanizing agriculture in a series of five-year plans.

Mao benefited from the Soviet experience in socialist revolution and construction. He learned from both the positive and negative lessons. He went so far as to learn the root causes of the phenomenon of modern revisionism in terms of the continued existence and potentiality of classes and class struggle in socialist society. He aspired to improve on the Soviet experience of socialist revolution through the correct handling of contradictions and through a series of cultural revolutions as well as on the experience of socialist construction through a proper correlation of heavy industry, light industry and agriculture and relying on the mass movement to realize economic plans in connection with other revolutionary processes. In this regard, he wrote “On the Ten Major Relationships” and the Critique of Soviet Economics.

The soviet experience in socialist revolution and construction

The Russian revolution of 1917 and the Chinese revolution of 1949 were both guided by Marxism-Leninism and led to the building of socialism. They were both encompassed by the epoch of modern imperialism and the world proletarian revolution. Being the first to occur, the Russian revolution manifested and defined the essential conditions and requirements for establishing and building socialism.

In Russia, the industrial bourgeoisie and proletariat had arisen but the enclaves of industrial capitalism were still surrounded by the vast ocean of feudalism and medievalism. Thus, the need for a bourgeois-democratic revolution to get rid of Tsarism and solve the agrarian problem. But the great Lenin pointed out that the proletariat was the leading class in the democratic revolution and no longer the liberal bourgeoisie as in previous bourgeois-democratic revolutions.

In fact, the bourgeois democratic revolution of February 1917 that had brought about the Kerensky government could not be completed until the October revolution came about to complete the democratic tasks basically and at the same time begin the socialist revolution by virtue of the proletariat overthrowing the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, nationalizing the land of the landlords and availing of the worker-peasant alliance through the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers and the masses that these represented.

Thus, the October revolution is known as the Great October Socialist Revolution. It meant fulfilling the very first requirement of socialism, the emergence and effective authority of the worker state, the class dictatorship of

the proletariat, to make a fundamental transformation of society. The worker state enabled the issuance and implementation of the proclamations taking over the commanding heights of the economy, such as the banks and strategic industries, principal means of transport and communications, the sources of raw materials and nationalization of the land for the purpose of land reform and collectivization.

Due to the conditions of civil war on a widened scale and the foreign interventions, the Soviet Union could not go on a straight line to developing the socialist economy. Even after the defeat of its armed enemies, it had to adopt the New Economic Policy from 1922 to 1927 in order to revive the war-devastated economy in the quickest possible way by giving concessions to private entrepreneurs, traders and rich peasants.

It became the task of the great Stalin to launch in 1928 in the first of the series of Five-Year Plans (FYP) to develop socialist industry, collectivize and mechanize agriculture, expand the system of education and raise the political and cultural level of the socialist society. He took decisive steps to stop the Right Opposition and “Left” Opposition in opposing and sabotaging the building of socialism. The first FYP was so successful that Stalin thought classes and class struggle no longer existed in the Soviet Union and this misconception was written into the 1935 Soviet Constitution, paving the way for the mishandling of contradictions in society and for revisionism to arise.

The Soviet Union became strong enough economically, politically and culturally to defend itself against any overt counterrevolution and to defeat the Nazi invasion, defeat the forces of fascism in Europe, rebuild the socialist industry severely damaged by the German aggressors and develop it further from 1945 onwards. But after the death of Stalin in 1953, Khrushchov was able to split the leading cadres of the Left, rise to power with a coup and fully instituted modern revisionism in 1956. He proclaimed pretentiously that he was going to build the material and cultural foundation of communism by using material incentives and competition among economic units and working personnel to increase production.

The economic ministries were decentralized. The factories and collective farms were autonomized and made responsible for their cost-and-profit accounting. The workers were urged to compete with each other to show individual productivity but the managers were also given hire-and-fire power. All the

aforementioned measures were undertaken in order to undermine and disintegrate the socialist and communist spirit of collectivity and the class dictatorship of the proletariat, completely negate the achievements of Stalin and promote bourgeois ideas and values in the guise of supra-class humanism, pacifism, economism and using material incentives to raise production.

Despite the calls for peaceful coexistence and detente by Khrushchov, the US relentlessly pursued its Cold War against the Soviet Union and hot wars of aggression against the oppressed peoples and nations. Brezhnev took the reins of power from Krushchov and used the failed policies of Krushchov and the growing threats of the US as pretext to recentralize the economic ministries in order to gain more funds for the costly acts of Soviet social imperialism and the arms race. State monopoly capitalism became more consolidated, while it pushed capitalist-oriented reforms further. Bureaucratic corruption flourished as the free markets and other means of self-enrichment expanded and a Mafia-type criminal bourgeoisie arose to redirect social resources to private appropriation.

Rethinking Socialism describes correctly the years of 1949 to 1952 in China as a period of rehabilitation and consolidation consequent to the overthrow of the joint dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class, which had been run by the Guomindang Party and centered on the bureaucrat capitalists with a big comprador character. The newly born socialist state in the form of the people's democratic republic confiscated bureaucrat capital and foreign capital which amounted to 80 percent of the fixed assets of industry and transport. It nationalized the banks, manufacturing, large-scale trading, mining, construction, transportation and communications were nationalized. It completed the confiscation of land from the landlords and redistribution of the land to the landless peasants.

As in the earliest period of the Soviet Union, the Chinese socialist state reorganized and reconstituted the system of government and took over the commanding heights of the economy. The tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution were basically completed but transitory measures of a bourgeois-democratic character were still to be undertaken. Land reform was undertaken in order to pave the way for the development of agricultural cooperation in three stages. State-private enterprises were established to accommodate and absorb national capital. Workers' cooperatives were organized as the embryo of bigger enterprises. The general run of the employees of the overthrown government and confiscated enterprises were retained and were provided with socialist education.

Campaigns against corruption, waste and bureaucracy were launched in 1951 and so were campaigns against bribery, theft of state property, cheating on government contracts and stealing state economic intelligence.

By 1952 China was able to solve the problems in the transition period by ensuring adequate supply of necessities, controlling inflation, stopping corruption within the bureaucracy and in its relations with private entrepreneurs, fighting an anti-imperialist war in Korea, suppressing counterrevolutionaries and securing the borders of the huge country.

By late 1952 China was ready to carry out the first of its Five-Year Plans to develop the socialist economy. There was a high tide of enthusiasm in socialist construction. The Soviet Union was able to provide economic and technical assistance to augment self-reliant efforts of the Chinese people. The basic socialist transformation of the economy was accomplished during the First Five-year Economic Plan.

In keeping with the socialist character of the economy and society, public ownership of the means of production became predominant, with state ownership of industries and collective ownership in agriculture. But in 1956 the struggle between the socialist line represented by Mao and the bourgeois line represented by Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping emerged. Rethinking Socialism gives us a clear account of this two-line struggle in terms of conflicting socialist and capitalist projects.

Mao delivered his address “On the Ten Major Relationships” and made it his first point to stress that China’s path of socialist economic development would have heavy industry as the leading factor, agriculture as the base and light industry as the bridge between the two and that it would avoid the overconcentration of investments on heavy industry as in the Soviet experience. He paid close attention to the reports and recommendations of various economic ministries and agencies in preparation for the making the Second Five Economic Plan.

In the first session of the Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of China in 1956, Liu Shaoqi and the Deng Xiaoping exaggerated the negative side of the situation. They did not see the contradictions within and between the state and collective sectors of the economy as opportunities for solving them and advancing the socialist economy. They advocated the prolongation of

concessions to the national bourgeoisie, the small entrepreneurs and the rich peasants. They wanted the factories and communes to become autonomized and responsible for cost and profit accounting and the working people to compete with each other on a piece-rate basis.

The state-private corporations persisted and gained influence within the CPC and the state. The reform done was only to reduce the income of private capitalists to a fixed interest rate, amounting to 25 percent of corporate profit. They were inspired by the rise of modern revisionism and the capitalist-oriented reforms in the Soviet Union. They sent study teams to the Soviet Union to learn such reforms for application in China.

They harped on the line that the socialist system was advanced but that the forces of production were backward and needed to be developed first by contravening the character of the socialist system. They took inspiration from the Soviet Union's Political Economy: A Textbook, which said that the nature of China's revolution right after the establishment of the People's Republic was democratic. And they advocated the further development of a "new democratic" economy. Mao rejected the assertion of the textbook and argued that the main tasks of the democratic revolution had been completed and that the socialist revolution and construction had to proceed.

The adoption of the Second Five-Year Plan under the banner of the Great Leap Forward in 1958 essentially blocked the bourgeois line and capitalist projects of Liu and Deng. It was a well-proportioned and well-balanced plan of building the heavy and basic industries as the leading factor, developing agriculture and the communes as the base of the economy and light industry to serve immediately the consumer and production needs of the masses and to hasten accumulation. It was a plan of walking self-reliantly on two legs. It was carried out to overcome the imperialist blockade, the withdrawal of Soviet assistance and natural disasters. By 1962 industry was developed in the coastal and interior areas. The communes produced a bumper crop.

Tremendous odds were overcome, including the Soviet revisionist tearing up of contracts and blueprints and abandonment of ongoing projects and the persistent attempts of the capitalist roaders to sabotage the Great Leap Forward. Following their Soviet revisionist mentors, the capitalist roaders preached that the communes would fail because it was not preceded by mechanization. To counter the communes, they pushed the "three freedoms": 1) to enlarge private plots, 2)

to promote free markets, and 3) for each individual household to be responsible for its own profit or loss; and “one contract” to have each individual household sign a contract with the State for the production of a pre-set amount of crops. When the capitalist roaders were foiled, they resorted to an ultra-Left line, the “ill communist wind” to discredit and sabotage the communes.

While the general trend in the Great Leap Forward spelled a great victory for the socialist revolution and construction, adverse circumstances and mistakes were exaggerated to misrepresent it and ridicule the leadership of Mao. But the problems and difficulties were overcome. After the first bumper crop of the communes came in 1962, Mao launched the Socialist Education Movement in 1963. This coincided with the rapid economic growth and rise in the standard of living in China, the high prestige of China in the third world and the intensification of the contradictions between the Soviet Union and China.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

The capitalist roaders kept on harping that the Chinese people should maintain stability, enjoy the initial prosperity and enliven the market to develop the forces of production. And they systematically undermined and sabotaged the Socialist Education Movement. Thus, it became necessary to launch the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) in 1966 because of the growing manifestations of revisionism within the Party and the state and the deleterious influence and blatant threats of Soviet social imperialism. I had the good fortune to be in China when the GPCR started.

The Central Committee of the CPC issued the 16-Point Circular to guide the GPCR in 1966. The signal mass event was the rise up of the Red Guards among the student youth who rebelled against the work teams deployed by Liu Shaoqi. Mao hailed the Red Guards as revolutionary successors and called on them to bombard the bourgeois headquarters in the Communist Party. At the same time, he called on the People’s Liberation Army to support the Left. In January 1967 the workers established the Shanghai Commune to overthrow the Shanghai Municipal Committee but the instruction later came from the Party to form Revolutionary Committees to consist of the representatives of the Party, the PLA and workers.

The main objective of the GPCR was to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of modern capitalism and consolidate socialism and to revolutionize

the superstructure to further promote the development of the socialist mode of production. Instead of merely using top-down directives, the CPC under Mao's leadership aimed to arouse, organize and mobilize the masses to advance socialist politics, economy and culture, to press demands on the officials of the CPC and the state, criticize those who were errant and overthrow the incorrigibles. The right of the workers to strike was upheld. The broad masses of the people engaged in the most extensive democratic actions never before seen in the history of mankind.

The Revolutionary Committees were established as the new organs of political power. They were composed of the elected representatives of the cadres, the masses and the experts. Cadres were rotated to perform functions of leadership and to do low-level work among the masses. The Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company became a model. For the mobilization of the masses and material resources to achieve greater success, with revolutionary politics in command of production, the Taching model was used for industry and the Tachai model for agriculture.

With revolutionary politics in command of production and the mass movements stirring the entire country, the annual rates of economic growth went up beyond 10 per cent in the entire course of the GPCR. Inspired by the GPCR, the most experienced cadres, scientists, engineers and the educated youth fanned out from their urban concentration in order to serve and assist in the building of industries, development of communes and cultural upliftment of the people in the less developed and backward areas of China.

In art and literature, Mao's Talks at the Yen'an Forum became the guide. Theatrical models in the form of the opera were created and staged widely. All other literary and artistic forms were availed of to spread the line of the proletarian cultural revolution and to honor the workers, peasants and soldiers as heroes. The Red Book of quotations from Comrade Mao was read by hundreds of millions of people and reproduced far beyond the number of copies of the Bible circulated in so many centuries.

The youth were rallied to go to the factories and the communes to integrate and work with the masses. The students were required to do a period of mass work and were subject to evaluation by the masses. In the course of the GPCR, mass movements were generated not only to mobilize the people but also serve the people better by providing better and more effective social services. Rural clinics

became widespread. Barefoot doctors were trained and became available to provide health and medical services to the masses in far-flung areas.

In terms of delegates and elected officers of the Central Committee, the Ninth Congress of the CPC reflected the objectives of the GPCR and the main forces and cadres that became prominent in the years of 1966 to 1969. The leadership of Mao was upheld and so was Lin Biao as his closest comrade in arms. The Shanghai Group of Four (Jiang Qing, Wang Hongwen, Yao Wenyuan, and Zhang Chunqiao) was also on the rise. But there would be ensuing events indicating that those who were overthrown from their positions as capitalist roaders could still maneuver within and between the CPC and the state. There were domestic issues as well as international issues. And there were interactions of Left, Middle and Right positions concerning these issues.

Soon after the Ninth Party Congress in 1969, Lin Biao was accused of being overeager to take over the office of President vacated by Liu and displace the office of Chairman Mao and being imprudent and reckless with such lines as imperialism was moving towards total collapse and socialism was moving towards total victory and that China was the Yenan or central base of the revolutionary forces based in the countryside of the world which encircled the counterrevolutionary forces in the cities of the world. Worst of all, he was subsequently accused of plotting a coup against Mao, with his son having allegedly tried to assassinate him.

There were also reported incidents of clashes in certain garrisons of the PLA, which Chou Enlai referred to in persuading Mao to favor the middle course and counterrevolutionary coup against the GPCR in collaboration with the CPC Chairman Hua Guofeng.

Because it is focused on the contest between socialist and capitalist projects, Rethinking Socialism cites only a few personalities and groups in conflict in the twists and turns in the GPCR. Enough indicators are given for further research and discussion in order to know more about the identity and roles of the political actors in the zigzag of developments due to the two-line struggle within the CPC and the Chinese socialist state, the continuing influence of those who were overthrown, the susceptibility of the leading organs and the mass movement to factionalism, volatility or manipulation, the domestic and internal issues that generated Left, Middle and Right positions, the initiatives taken by the political actors and the consequences.

While still in office in the CPC and/or the state, the capitalist roaders could do a lot of mischief against the GPCR even after their bourgeois line and capitalist projects were rejected and they were held to account. They could fake repentance and beg for rehabilitation, sow intrigues in the ranks of the Left or raise the Red flag to run it down by taking ultra-left positions and actions. In certain areas at different times, they could turn one organ of the CPC, the PLA and government agency against the other. The capitalist roaders systematically used factionalism and even criminal acts to disrupt and discredit the mass movement and the entire cultural revolution. Mao had wished the mass movement to settle issues but there were certain issues that the central leaders had to debate and decide on promptly.

In foreign policy, China took a significant step in rapprochement and normalization of relations with the US in 1972, both to counter the threat of Soviet social-imperialism and to gain access to higher technology, foreign investments and wider market. Deng Xiaoping was able to replace the previous picture of the world as consisting of the first world of capitalist powers, a second world of socialist countries and a third world of oppressed nations and peoples with the picture of a first world of two superpowers, second world of less developed capitalist countries and the third world of countries and peoples in Asia, African and Latin America. Also set aside or played down was the picture of the world in which the oppressed peoples and nations were in the countryside of the world waging a people's war against imperialism in the urban bastions of the world.

Deng's new picture of the world was one of countries in diplomatic relations with the first world of two superpowers opening the opportunity for China to play off one against the other and draw advantages in the process. Soviet social imperialism was a major adversary of China in view of one million Soviet troops along the Sino-Soviet border. The US was also a major adversary and for a much a longer period of time previously. But rehabilitate some of those overthrown by the Left. Finally, Lin Biao and other top defense and military close to him were reported to be trying to escape to the Soviet Union on a plane without sufficient fuel. And quite a surprise to outsiders, Deng Xiaoping who was supposed to be one of the two biggest capitalist roaders was rehabilitated and returned to power no less than as Vice Premier and Chief of the General Staff of the PLA upon the recommendation of Zhou Enlai to Mao. The downfall of Lin Piao signified a severe split among those previously considered Left at the beginning of the GPCR and the ascendance of a Middle-Right combination. And the Group of

Four from Shanghai also kept their positions and increased their criticism of the late Lin Biao as well as Zhou Enlai who was referred to as Confucius and then as Chou in the novel Water Margin. But Zhou Enlai maintained his close comradeship with Mao. Twists and turns would occur in the GPCR, including the removal of Deng from his high office after the death of Zhou in February 1976 for spreading his “four modernizations” as comprador bourgeois ideology to his success after the death of Mao in September 1976 in making a this time Deng welcomed the offers of rapprochement from the US, which were done through bilateral talks of US and Chinese representatives in Poland and Pakistan, to pave the way for the Nixon visit to China in 1972 and start the process of engaging with the US and advancing the line of capitalist-oriented “reforms and opening up” to the US and world capitalist system and develop the forces of production through the “four modernizations”.

As a consequence of the 1976 Dengist coup, the socialist worker state or the class dictatorship of the proletariat was overthrown by the bourgeoisie. The counterrevolutionary plotters arrested and detained not just the so-called “Gang of Four” but tens of thousands of cadres aligned with the GPCR. And millions of CPC members were expelled and replaced by those hostile to the GPCR. Consequently, the Dengists declared the GPCR as a complete catastrophe and that Mao was 100 per cent in error for it. They blared out the brazen lies that the mass movement was complete chaos, destroyed cultural treasures and ruined the economy despite high annual rates of growth of more than 10 per cent, scaled down by the Dengists to an average 9 percent annual growth which was still high.

To destroy the base of the socialist economy and separate the peasantry from its alliance with the proletariat, they dismantled the commune system, derided collectivity as a system of irresponsibility in which idlers coup dip their hands into the common pot. They adopted the retrogressive “household responsibility system” and glorified the rich peasants to immediately pull the rug from under the socialist economy. The rural industries were privatized. The old big compradors bounced back as economic advisers, got one more round of war bond payments, gained access to the state banks and quickly became construction magnates in collaboration with Hongkong and Shanghai Chinese construction moguls.

The capitalist-oriented economic reforms and the opening up to the US and the world capitalist system encouraged the US to outsource manufacturing to China

at the level of technology suitable for sweatshop operations. These yielded enough export surplus to stimulate the Chinese economy but not enough to put aside popular complaints against misallocation of resources, corruption and inflation, which caused mass protests and the uprisings in Beijing and scores of other cities in 1989. The Dengists quelled the uprisings, consolidated their power and fully restored capitalism in China, with the two tiers of state monopoly capitalism and private monopoly capitalism.

China begged the US to make more investments in China and increase Chinese exports to the US. The US agreed and they became the main partners in promoting the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization. They benefited mutually from the exploitation of cheap Chinese labor and from the global supply chain so-called. They became the best of partners, especially after China entered the WTO in 2001. But the US policy makers took notice of China's economic and military rise as a threat to the US interests as early as during the time of Obama, especially in East Asia and the South China Sea and East Sea. And now during the time of Trump, the US is more than ever hard-pressed by the recurrent and worsening crisis of global capitalism to accuse China of using the state-owned enterprises and state planning to realize strategic economic and military goals, manipulating economic, trade and financial policies and stealing technology from US subsidiaries and US research laboratories. With the dictatorship of the proletariat having been overthrown and replaced by the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the state-owned enterprises and expanded private enterprises have become the properties of state monopoly capitalism and private monopoly capitalism, respectively. China has all the five features of imperialism, as defined by Lenin. Monopoly capitalism is dominant in the Chinese economy and society. Bank capital and industrial capital are merged and have brought about a financial oligarchy. The export of surplus capital has grown in importance over the export surplus commodities. The state and private monopolies of China have engaged in combinations with foreign monopolies. With the increase in the number of imperialist powers, as a result of the capitalist restoration in the biggest former socialist countries, the world has relatively become a smaller space for inter-imperialist competition and rivalry and is the landscape of intensifying inter-imperialist contradictions resulting from the adoption of ever higher technology and ever bigger crises of overaccumulation of capital and the overproduction of civil and military goods. Now, the inter-imperialist contradictions between the US and China are at the center stage of the crisis of the world capitalist system. The intensifying inter-imperialist contradictions have resulted in severe rounds of the crisis of overaccumulation

and overproduction, the escalation of neoliberal exploitation, state terrorism and wars of aggression on the one hand and the rise of the anti-imperialist and democratic struggles and the foreseeable resurgence of the world proletarian revolution on the other hand.

Conclusions

The victories of the GPCR from 1966 onwards proved the necessity and validity of waging it against the capitalist roaders within the CPC and the erstwhile socialist state. The defeat of the GPCR in 1976 proved further with the full and blatant restoration of capitalism that the waging of the GPCR was necessary and valid against the bourgeois line and capitalist projects of the likes of Liu and Deng. The GPCR was defeated. But it has left to us the principles and methods by which to uphold, defend and advance socialism.

Rethinking Socialism is an excellent summary and analysis of the victory of socialism and subsequent defeat in China. It is important to know and understand the causes and processes of achieving victory and suffering defeat so that in the future the proletariat and the people will know the basic principles and methods to apply and develop to win in the struggle for socialism as the transition to communism.

It was earlier demonstrated in the case of the Soviet Union, that the forces of socialism could win against powerful reactionary and imperialist armies and build socialism under the most difficult conditions but they could be defeated through peaceful evolution due to the loss of proletarian class stand and vigilance, lack of attention to or mishandling of classes and class contradictions, the persistence of reactionary ideas, degeneration of Party cadres and members, the rise of the petty mode of thinking and bureaucratic corruption.

In the case of China, Mao recognized the growing problem of modern revisionism and was able to put forward the theory and practice of cultural revolution to combat revisionism, restore capitalism and consolidate socialism. But the forces of modern revisionism and capitalist restoration prevailed over the GPCR. Like the Paris Commune, the GPCR was defeated but it has bequeathed to us the theory and practice and the positive and negative lessons for us to learn and improve on in order to understand and explain the process of capitalist restoration in both the Soviet Union and China and to frustrate the bourgeoisie and win greater and more lasting victories in future socialist societies and in the

socialist transition to communism.

In Transition to the Resurgence of the World Proletarian Revolution

March 15, 2020

Dear Comrades, it is an honor and privilege for me to be invited to the Symposium titled “The World is Opening a New Page: Revolution’s Time Has Come!” here in Istanbul. I thank the Socialist Party of the Oppressed and the Marxist Theory Journal for inviting me.

I convey warmest comradely greetings of revolutionary solidarity to all participating in the symposium, especially my fellow speakers from Tunis, Lebanon, Sudan, Argentina, Chile, Philippines and Rojava.

The symposium is prompted by the unprecedented scale and intensity of the people’s mass protests which have been breaking out in all continents since last year. These have come in the wake of the rise of proto-fascist regimes in the US, Brazil, India, Philippines and elsewhere. They are directed against imperialism and all reaction, especially against neoliberalism and fascism.

I wish to trace certain developments in recent history and current circumstances that have led to worldwide mass protests taking up the current burning issues of neoliberalism, fascism, austerity measures, gender discrimination, oppression of indigenous peoples, wars of aggression and environmental destruction.

I daresay that the current wave of mass protests signals the transition to a new era of unprecedented anti-imperialist and anti-fascist resistance by the peoples of the world and the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution. I am confident that the transition will be accomplished by the intensified revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and peoples of the world.

I. Advances of the proletarian revolution soon after World War II

As a consequence of the struggle against the fascist powers in World War II, several socialist countries and newly-independent countries arose. It could be said by the early 1950s that one-third of humankind was under the governance of communist and workers' parties. National liberation movements grew strong in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

However, the US emerged as the strongest imperialist power. It launched the Cold War since 1947 and unleashed propaganda campaigns of anti-communism, touting "free enterprise" as the guarantee to democracy. It violently opposed the people's movements for national liberation, democracy and socialism. It waged wars of aggression in Korea from 1950 to 1953 and in Vietnam and the rest of Indochina from 1955 onwards.

The Korean people and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) fought and stalemated US imperialism. And the Vietnamese and the rest of the Indochinese people inflicted on the US its first categorical defeat in 1975. All the while, China was engaged in socialist revolution and construction and stood as a bulwark against US imperialism.

Meanwhile in the Soviet Union, modern revisionism rose to power and totally negated Stalin in 1956. It overthrew the state of the working class and allowed the bourgeoisie and the factors of capitalism to grow within socialist society. It pushed reformist and pacifist lines under Khrushchov and then social-imperialism under Brezhnev.

The Communist Party of China (CPC) opposed the modern revisionist line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in the international communist and workers' movement. It also opposed within China the blatant Rightists as well as the home-grown and Soviet-influenced revisionists. It prevailed over a number of anti-socialist elements before, during and after the Great Leap Forward but there were those who persisted.

Recognizing the crucial importance of upholding Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, Mao carried out the socialist education movement to cleanse politics, economy, organization, and ideology from 1962 to 1966. But this did not suffice. And thus, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) was carried out from 1966 to 1976 on the theory and practice of continuing revolution under

proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution in order to combat revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

The CPC thought in 1969 that the victory of the GPCR and defeat of the revisionist capitalist-roaders in China would pave the way for imperialism to head for total collapse and socialism to march towards world victory. But Mao cautioned that it would take 50 to 100 years to defeat imperialism and pave the way for the world victory of socialism.

II. Monopoly bourgeoisie inflicts major defeats on the proletariat

In fact, the GPCR went through twists and turns and ups and down. It may be said that while Mao was alive the CPC under his leadership prevailed over the revisionists from 1966-1976. But soon after his death in 1976, the capitalist roaders led by Deng Xiaoping successfully carried out a counterrevolutionary coup against the proletarian revolutionaries and the socialist state of the working class.

Consequently, the Dengist counterrevolution carried out the restoration of capitalism in China through capitalist reforms and opening up to the US and world capitalist system. It was able to suppress the mass protests at Tien An Men in Beijing and in scores of other cities in China in 1989 against inflation and corruption. And it became even more determined to strengthen capitalism in China.

By 1991 the Soviet Union collapsed and its satellite revisionist-ruled states in Eastern Europe disintegrated. The bourgeoisie took full control of all the countries in the Soviet bloc. US imperialism became the sole superpower. And its ideologues and publicists proclaimed the death of socialism and the end of history with the supposed permanence of capitalism and liberal democracy.

Further the US proceeded to propagate and impose on the world the policy regime of neoliberal globalization and unleash wars of aggression in the Middle East (in Iraq, Libya), and Syria), in Central Asia (Afghanistan) and in the countries near or adjoining Russia (former Yugoslavia, Georgia and Ukraine). It sought to expand NATO to the borders of Russia. It overestimated its role and its capabilities as sole superpower and continued to adopt and implement policies that appeared to advance its interests but which in fact aggravated the problems that had caused its strategic decline since the middle of the 1970s.

As a result of the reconstruction of the capitalist countries ruined in World War II, the US had become afflicted by stagflation. This was the offshoot of the crisis of overproduction in the US and the world capitalist system. In trying to solve the problem of stagflation, the US adopted neoliberalism and favored the military-industrial complex to strengthen the US military as well to sell weapons to the oil-producing countries.

But ultimately, neoliberalism never solved the crisis of overproduction which had been the root cause of stagflation. The increased production of the military-industrial complex was profitable within the US economy and in sales to oil-producing countries. But it was counterproductive and unprofitable in the failure of the wars of aggression to expand stable economic territory for US imperialism abroad.

Under the neoliberal policy regime, the dogma is to accelerate the centralization and accumulation of capital in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie supposedly in order to create more jobs. Thus, the monopoly bourgeoisie is favored by tax cutbacks, wage freezes, erosion of social benefits, privatization of profitable public assets, antisocial and anti-environmental deregulation and denationalization of the economies of client-states.

The money supply and interest rates are either expanded or contracted to prevent inflation or stagnation but always favoring the monopoly bourgeoisie by expanding the public debt and subjecting the working class to further austerity measures and reduction of real wages. At the same time, legal and political measures have been undertaken by the monopoly bourgeoisie to attack job security and curtail trade union and other democratic rights.

III. US-China collaboration in neoliberal globalization

The US was in need of expanding its market due to the recurrent and worsening crisis of overproduction. Thus, it took in China as its main partner in neoliberal globalization by conceding to it low technology for sweatshop consumer manufacturing and a big consumer market in the US and elsewhere. The US thought that it could concentrate on manufacturing the big items (especially by the military-industrial complex) and on financializing the US economy.

The export income of China swelled. Before the end of the 1980s the US became the biggest debtor from being the biggest creditor at the beginning of the decade.

But in the aftermath of the nationwide mass protests against inflation and corruption in China in 1989, China pleaded to the US to loosen up on the restrictions on foreign investments and technology transfer.

The US agreed on the condition that China privatized the state-owned enterprises, desisted from providing state subsidies to enterprises, opened itself further to foreign investments and entered the World Trade Organization (WTO). China concurred but actually continued to use state planning and state-owned enterprises and copy without permission foreign technology in order to achieve its own strategic economic and security goals.

The US-China economic and trade partnership seemed to be going well, especially after China entered the WTO in 2001. The US and other imperialist powers were pleased that every time there was a major global financial and economic crisis the growth of China's GDP served to compensate for the stagnant growth of the world economy. It took 10 more years from the financial crash of 2008 before the US started to accuse China of unfair economic practices in their relationship.

The crash caused a global depression which would protract up to now. It has adversely affected China's economy. The growth rate has slowed down. China suffered in 2015 a stock market crash that wiped out 30 per cent of stock values. Foreign investors transferred their plants to other countries with cheaper labor in the Asian mainland. The huge mountain of unpaid debts by Chinese local governments and corporations and high ratio of public debt to GDP became exposed even while China deployed capital for its Belt Road Initiative (BRI).

IV. Growing conflict between US and Chinese imperialism

Trump started in 2018 to accuse China of maintaining a two-tiered economy of state monopoly capitalism and private monopoly capitalism, stealing US technology, providing state subsidies to economic enterprises, manipulating finance and the currency, adopting Chinese brands on products previously patented by US and other foreign companies and using stolen technology to build the military might of China.

By this time, US imperialism was already strained by its stagnant economy, the loss of competitiveness of US products, the extreme cost of overseas US military bases and endless wars of aggressions and the rapid rise of its public debt. The

wars of aggression cost at least USD 6 trillion and failed to expand and stabilize the US economic territory abroad. The US strategic decline accelerated and became more conspicuous.

Consequent to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the US emerged as the winner in the Cold War and as sole superpower. But it actually continued to decline as a result of the high costs of its military bases overseas and its wars of aggression and its investment, trade and technological concessions to China. The US is still the No. 1 imperialist power but has declined to being one among several imperialist powers in a multipolar world.

China has risen as the main economic competitor and political rival of the US. It has become so ambitious as to design and implement the Belt Road Initiative in order to make a radical departure from the pattern of maritime global trade which the Western colonial powers had established since the 16th century. But China also has serious economic problems, especially its sitting on a mountain of bad debts by local governments and corporations, the high ratio of public debt to GDP and the onerous terms of Chinese foreign loans which are vulnerable to debtors' default and revolt.

In the Philippines and other Southeast Asia countries, the peoples are confronted with the extraterritorial claims of China over the 90 per cent of the South China Sea in violation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. But in other regions of the world, certain governments that assert national independence and the socialist cause, have taken advantage of inter-imperialist contradictions and availed of China's cooperation in order to counter sanctions and acts of aggression instigated by the US and its traditional imperialist allies.

V. Intensification of contradictions due to crisis of world capitalist system

We see today the intensification of all major contradictions in the world capitalist system, such as those between labor and capital, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations, those between the imperialist powers and states that assert national independence and the socialist cause and those among the imperialist powers.

The intensification of contradictions between labor and capital within imperialist countries and among imperialist powers is due to the worsening crisis of overproduction relative to the drastically reduced income of the working class in

imperialist countries and in the rest of the world capitalist system. The workers have become restless and rebellious due to unemployment, low income, rising prices of basic commodities, austerity measures, the curtailment of their democratic rights and the rise of chauvinism, racism and fascism.

Among the imperialist powers, the US and China have emerged as the two main contenders in the struggle for a redivision of the world. Each tries to have its own alliance with other imperialist powers. The traditional alliance of the US, Europe and Japan is still operative in such multilateral agencies like the IMF, World Bank and WTO and in NATO and other military alliances. Ranged against the traditional imperialist powers are China and Russia which have broadened their alliance in BRICS, Shanghai Cooperation Organization, BRICS Development Bank, the Belt and Road Initiative and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Fund.

Since so many decades ago when they developed nuclear weapons of mass destruction and missile delivery systems, the major imperialist powers have so far avoided direct wars of aggression against each other by undertaking proxy wars despite the frequent US wars of aggression against underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They have developed the neo-colonial ways and means of shifting the burden of crisis to the underdeveloped countries. They engage in a struggle for a redivision of the world but so far, they have not directly warred on each other to acquire or expand their sources of cheap labor and raw materials, markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence.

They make the oppressed peoples and nations of the underdeveloped countries suffer the main brunt of the recurrent and worsening economic and financial crisis of the world capitalist system even as they make them the main source of super profits through a higher rate of exploitation. Currently they continue the policy of neoliberal globalization for the purpose. To suppress the people's resistance to oppression and exploitation, they provide their client-states with the means of state terrorism and fascist rule by the bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie. They also use their respective client-states for proxy wars and counterrevolutionary wars for maintaining their economic territory or for redividing the world.

Despite their attempts to shift the burden of crisis to the oppressed peoples and nations, the imperialist powers are driven to extract higher profits from their own

working class under the neoliberal policy regime. To suppress the resistance of the proletariat and people to oppression and exploitation in both the developed and underdeveloped countries, they have enacted so-called anti-terrorist laws and are increasingly prone to the use of state terrorism and sponsor fascist organizations and movements to counter the growing revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

In the underdeveloped countries, US imperialism and its puppet regimes are unleashing the worst forms of aggression and state terrorism against the people in order to perpetuate the neoliberal policy of unbridled greed. Since the end of World War II, the wars of aggression and campaigns of terror unleashed by US have resulted in 20 to 30 million killed in Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria and other countries.

But US imperialism has also suffered outstanding defeats, such in north Korea, Cuba, Vietnam and other Indochinese countries. It has been unable to stop the decolonization of colonies and semi-colonies which is still an ongoing process. The proletariat and people have persevered in protracted people's war in the Philippines, India, Kurdistan, Turkey, Palestine, Peru, Colombia and elsewhere. The spread of arms where US imperialism have unleashed wars of aggression, such as in the Middle East and Africa, can open the way to the rise of more armed revolutionary movements.

There are effective governments like the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Cuba, Vietnam, Venezuela and Syria that assert national independence and the socialist cause. They enjoy the support of the people, stand up against US imperialism and take advantage of the contradictions among the imperialist powers in order to counter sanctions, military blockade and aggression. The people and revolutionary forces led by the proletariat can strengthen themselves in the course of anti-imperialist struggles.

VI. Mass protests signify transition to the resurgence of world proletarian revolution

Since last year, we have seen the unprecedented rise and spread of gigantic anti-imperialist mass protests occurring in both the underdeveloped and developed countries. These signify the transition to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution. They are a manifestation of the grave crisis of the world capitalist system and the domestic ruling systems and the inability of the imperialist

powers and their puppet states to rule in the old way.

The massive and sustained mass protests in various countries of Europe, North America, Latin America, Asia and Africa bring to the surface the deep-seated detestation of the people for the extreme oppression and exploitation that they have suffered. The proletariat and people of the world are fighting back. We are definitely in transition to a great resurgence of anti-imperialist struggles and the world proletarian revolution.

The broad masses of the people are rising up against the worst forms of imperialist oppression and exploitation, such as neoliberalism, austerity measures, gender discrimination, racism, oppression of indigenous peoples, fascism, wars of aggression and environmental destruction. The starting points or inciting moments for the mass protests may be concrete issues of wide variability but they always rise up to the level of protests against imperialism and all reaction.

In the last 50 years, we have seen imperialism, neocolonialism, modern revisionism, neoliberalism and neoconservatism attack and put down the proletariat and people of the world. Now, the people are resisting as never before and generating new revolutionary forces, including parties of the proletariat and mass organizations. These will ultimately result in the spread of armed revolutionary movements and the rise of socialist states and people's democracies with a socialist perspective.

The Filipino people and their revolutionary forces are gratified that they have persevered in the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war and with a socialist perspective in the last more than 50 years. Loyal to the just revolutionary cause, they have waged revolutionary struggle resolutely and militantly and have fought even more fiercely against the counterrevolutionary campaigns of the enemy. They have been inspired by the revolutionary victories of national liberation movements and socialism abroad and have become ever more determined to contribute the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

They take pride in being referred to as one of the torch bearers of the anti-imperialist struggles of the peoples of the world and the world proletarian revolution. Their revolutionary will and fighting spirit are more than ever higher as their revolutionary struggles are now in concert with the resurgent mass struggles of the proletariat and people on a global scale. We foresee that in the

next fifty years the crisis-stricken world capitalist system will continue to break down and give way to the rise of anti-imperialist and socialist states and societies.

Long live the proletariat and peoples of the world!

Down with the imperialist powers and all reaction!

Long live the anti-imperialist and socialist cause!

Victory for the world proletarian-socialist revolution!

On the International Situation,

Covid-19 Pandemic and the People's Response

First Series of ILPS Webinars

April 9, 2020

Dear colleagues and fellow activists,

I am highly honored and delighted to be the first speaker in this series of webinars, billed as Teach-Ins or Interviews, online discussions on international events and people's struggles, under the auspices of ILPS Solidarity.

The format is simple. I make the presentation. And the audience can react with observations, questions and further discussions. My task today is to present the international situation, the Covid 19 pandemic and the peoples' response.

Let me state at the outset that the world capitalist system was already in trouble even before the Covid-19 pandemic arose. And the pandemic has unmasked and aggravated the crisis of global capitalism. It is of urgent importance to know how the people are affected and how they are responding.

1. Crisis of the World Capitalist System

Science has advanced so fast and so far, and has provided the technology to raise the productivity of the forces and means of production to such a high degree as to have the capability of eliminating class exploitation, gross inequality and mass

poverty and providing a comfortable and fruitful life for at least twice the population of the world today.

The social character of production has risen so high with the adoption of higher technology. But unfortunately, the monopoly bourgeoisie and its financial oligarchy own the means of production, control the relations of production and dictate the terms of employment and the use of the human and material resources for the maximization of private profit and the inflation of the value of private assets.

Abusing bourgeois state power over the toiling masses of workers and peasants and middle social strata, the international bourgeoisie has adopted the neoliberal economic policy in order to accelerate the accumulation and concentration of productive and finance capital in the hands of the few, the mere 1 per cent of the population to exploit, deprive and oppress the 99 per cent.

The neoliberal economic policy has liberalized trade and investments, provided tax cuts, incentives and bailouts to the monopoly bourgeoisie, pressed down wages and other incomes of the lower classes, privatized public assets, reduced social services, imposed austerity measures, removed social and environmental regulations and denationalized the less developed economies of the world.

The crisis of overproduction has therefore become more frequent and worse every time. The working people have suffered disemployment at so rapid a rate and cannot buy what is produced by the economy. The so-called middle class has dwindled and joined the ranks of the precariat. Yet, the monopoly bourgeoisie has proceeded to make the people suffer and insist on its system of unbridled greed.

Before the financial crisis of 2008 can be solved, another more serious crisis has come on top of it to further prolong and deepen the stagnation and depression of the global economy. All imperialist countries suffer from the crisis of overproduction due to the dwindling incomes of the working people and the underdeveloped countries.

All major contradictions in the world are intensifying: those between capital and labor in the imperialist countries, those among the imperialist powers, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations and those between the imperialist powers and a number of states assertive of their national

independence and socialist aspirations.

I mention first the contradiction between capital and labor in the imperialist countries to stress the point that even in their own national bulwarks of monopoly capitalism the imperialist powers have gone so far in exploiting their working class and diminishing the middle class as they have engaged in one round of austerity measures after another to cope with economic and financial crisis.

US imperialism has complemented the neoliberal policy to maximize profits from the production process and financial markets with the neoconservative policy to ensure government expenditures for the acquisition of weapons from the military-industrial complex for the maintenance of more than 800 overseas military bases and for endless wars of aggression, including proxy wars, and military intervention in support of local reactionary regimes.

After China became monopoly capitalist in 1976, it used to be touted as the main partner of the US in neoliberal globalization and as the exemplar of continuous capitalist growth. But since 2015, it has become conspicuously afflicted with unsustainable national, corporate and household debts and the same economic and financial crises that bedevil the traditional imperialist powers headed by the US.

The inter-imperialist contradictions are sharpening fast, with China having become the main rival of US imperialism. The US regrets and seeks to overcome the consequences of its previous concessions to China in terms of investments, trade and technology transfers. It is resentful that China has used state planning and state-owned enterprises in order to achieve strategic economic and military goals.

But of course, China has its own vulnerabilities, like having to deal with the trade war already started by the US and with the mountains of debt it has accumulated, to cite only a few major problems. The US is trying hard to cut the large export surpluses that China gains in trade with the US and reduce the amount of surplus capital that China uses to expand its own fields of investments, markets and sources of raw materials in various countries.

The US and China try to strengthen their respective positions by alliances with other countries. The US still has the main influence in the UN and controls the

multilateral agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO) and the NATO and other military alliances. China has its all-round alliance with Russia and has tried to broaden this alliance with BRICS, SCO, the BRICS Development Bank, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Fund and the Belt and Road Initiative.

The imperialist countries continue to shift the burden of crisis to their reactionary client states in the underdeveloped countries and therefore exacerbate the imperialist contradictions with the oppressed peoples and nations. They are detested for aggravating the underdevelopment of entire countries and continents in contrast with the false promises of development.

Such states are always and increasingly in an untenable position. They suffer from widening deficits in trade and balance of payments because their exports consist of raw materials and semi-manufactures. They have mounting difficulties in servicing previous foreign debts and getting new foreign loans to be able to get by.

The broad masses of the people detest the imperialists and their puppets for the state terrorism that they suffer. The conditions are increasingly becoming favorable for the rise of various anti-imperialist and democratic struggles. There are a number of countries where the revolutionary parties of the proletariat and the people persevere in armed revolution for national and social liberation. These serve as example to all the oppressed peoples and nations in the world

There are states of underdeveloped countries that are assertive of national independence and socialist aspirations. These include the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Cuba and Venezuela. They are dramatically standing up against US imperialism which is using economic sanctions, military blockades and threats of aggression.

Certain countries in Southeast Asia are also standing up to both the US and China. Vietnam is outstanding in opposing the invalid claim of China over ninety per cent of the South China Sea. It is in this part of the world where China is exposing itself as an aggressive violator of the sovereign rights of other countries in violation of international law and the UN Convention of the Law of the Sea.

But US imperialism still has the worst standing as the aggressor and violator of sovereign rights in Asia, Africa and Latin America. But it is paying dearly for its

wars of aggression and military intervention. It is on a course of accelerated strategic decline in an increasingly multipolar world in which the inter-imperialist contradictions which incite the proletariat and people of the world to rise up.

Since last year, there has been an outburst of mass protests all over the world, in both underdeveloped and developed countries. This is a clear manifestation of the people's resistance to all the evil workings of imperialism such as neoliberal exploitation, the rise of state terrorism, fascism, austerity measures, racism, gender discrimination and imperialist plunder and destruction of the environment.

We are now in the midst of the transition to the global resurgence of the anti-imperialist and democratic struggles for national liberation, democracy and socialism.

2. The Covid-19 Pandemic

Between the two main imperialist powers of today, the US and China, there are accusations and counter-accusations regarding the origin of Covid-19 and the malicious criminal motive behind it. There are speculations that one imperialist power is using the Covid-19 pandemic in order to weaken and defeat the other. These are manifestations of the growing contradictions between the US and China.

China accuses the US of having created Covid-19 in a bio-warfare laboratory in Fort Detrick in Maryland, USA, and having used the US athletic delegation to the World Military Games in Wuhan in October 2019 to bring into Wuhan the highly contagious virus. In turn, the US accuses China of having created the virus in its virological institute only to leak it to the Wuhan wet market through the sale of laboratory test animals.

There is the third view that the Chinese scientists themselves got the virus from a laboratory operated by the US military and somehow leaked the virus to the Wuhan meat market. Still there is the fourth view that Covid-19 is of purely zoonotic origin and has mutated from a previous virus, generated by an environment extremely devastated and imbalanced by imperialist plunder.

We let the independent scientists do their investigation and let the experts on international criminal law use the scientific findings and conclusions to

prosecute the culprit if possible. But in the meantime, we can discuss the impact and consequences of Covid-19 to the world capitalist system and to the people.

Covid-19 has exposed and aggravated the antisocial character of the world capitalist system, the unpreparedness of the monopoly bourgeoisie and the harsh consequences to the people who have long suffered class exploitation, gross inequality, mass poverty and deprivation of social services in the fields of public health, education and housing.

Under neoliberal economic policy, the broad masses of the people have become extensively and extremely vulnerable to the recurrent and worsening crisis of the world capitalist system, to the imperialist sanctions, threats of war, actual wars of counterrevolution and aggression, natural disasters and pandemics.

The vulnerability of the overwhelming majority of the people consists of having no income and property to tide them over in case of unemployment or being out of work even only for a week for whatever reason of emergency. This is absolutely clear in a lockdown situation in which the people cannot go to work and have no public transport to use in order to obtain medical treatment for Covid-19 or any other illness.

Worst of all, when so many people need testing and treatment in time of a pandemic, the public health system has been eroded by the neoliberal economic policy of privatizing and eroding what remains of the public health system so that there are not enough health personnel, facilities, equipment and medicines. The remaining tokens of the public health system are easily overloaded and break down. And the private hospitals can at will turn away patients because they are not intended to serve the public, they have inadequate facilities or the patients cannot pay for the medical treatment.

We have also seen the tragedy of doctors, nurses and other health workers themselves getting sick and dying from Covid-19 because of the lack of personal protection equipment. The neoliberal state and the hospitals have appreciated the role of private profit but have depreciated the role of the health workers and the social service that they must render to the people.

In quite a number of developed and underdeveloped countries, where neoliberalism has been imposed as a policy, there has been the pseudo-scientific notion that it is enough to do washing of the hands and social distancing and at

worst lockdown down on communities or entire regions because after the contagion has run rampant and claimed plenty of victims then the herd immunity develops in the rest of the population.

Thus, quite a number of governments have not made timely and adequate preparations and action plans to fight the pandemic. There is no mass testing for a long while. Thus, the spread of the contagion has not been measured well. And there is a lack or shortage of health personnel and resources for the treatment of those afflicted by Covid-19. The lack or shortage of ventilators has caused the death of many patients suffering from pneumonia, whether they are elderly or younger.

The ruling bourgeoisie and the entire ruling system have deprived the overwhelming majority of the people of the means of fending for themselves in time of lockdowns. And their political agents can only promise food rations and some compensation for the wages lost. But the promise is not kept in a timely and sufficient manner. The most victimized are those who are the millions of jobless and homeless as well those imprisoned in congested jails.

But ahead of any reasonable concession to the people, the monopoly bourgeoisie is assured of financial bailouts and stimulus packages in order to make up for their business losses. We are well aware of the policies and actions being undertaken by the rulers of imperialist countries to override the breakdown of the production chain and the drastic falls in the stock market.

In the underdeveloped countries, especially where the barefaced repressive regimes exist, the tyrannical and corrupt bureaucrats invoke the Covid-10 to divert public funds to their own pockets instead of providing for the urgent needs of the people. Whatever good or service is provided is ascribed to those in power in order to raise their political stock.

Worst of all, the fascist-minded rulers use the lock downs to tighten their command over the military and police forces of the state to promote further the notion through the exercise of repressive measures that they are the saviors of the people. In the meantime, they use state power to aggrandize the private interests of their families, political cohorts and business cronies.

3. The People's Response to the Covid-19 pandemic

It is correct for the people to use disinfectants, do social distancing and respect

the rules of quarantine and lockdown whenever these are needed in the face of Covid-19. The people must stay safe from the highly contagious virus and avoid prejudicing the health of other people.

But they retain their democratic rights to make demands from the state and health authorities mass testing of the people at the community level and treatment for the sick and the means of survival while they are locked down and deprived of their means of livelihood. They can ventilate their grievances in order to obtain positive results for the common good.

To any positive extent that public officials recognize the urgent needs of the people and try to satisfy them, it is absolutely clear that social needs are being met by policies and actions for the common good and for whoever is in dire need. But it is clear from the beginning that capitalism fails in the face of pandemic. What is needed is the spirit of service to the people and the desire for socialism.

In view of the utter bankruptcy and antisocial character of capitalism in a time of pandemic, the people and their anti-imperialist and democratic forces are justly demanding system change from capitalism to socialism and that everyone must be assured of a basic income in order to subsist and the social services like public health, public education and public housing.

Higher economic and social demands can be made in the developed countries, especially the imperialist countries. The level of economic development allows substantial social reforms and even socialism. But of course, the obstacle is the violence-prone rapacity of the monopoly bourgeoisie which would rather repress the people or aggress other countries than agree readily to the just economic and social demands of the people.

Consider the trillions of dollars wasted by the US on its high-tech armaments, overseas military bases and endless wars of aggression. The US military forces have been far worse than Covid-19 in killing people. They have killed 25 to 30 million people since the end of World War II.

The huge US military expenditures can be redirected towards the expansion and improvement of social services. Best of all, if the American people succeed at system change. They can build a socialist society of plenty, creativity, justice and peace, if the monopoly bourgeoisie ceased to engage in domestic oppression and exploitation and in wars of aggression and mass destruction abroad.

In the case of underdeveloped, especially pre-industrial countries, the tax levied on the exploiting classes can be increased instead of decreased in order to promote economic development through national industrialization and land reform and provide social services in the spheres of education, health, housing and so on.

But substantial reforms can be achieved only if the people have strong patriotic and progressive forces in order to remove from power those who harm the people; and promote those leaders that work for the benefit of the people. Best of all, the people and their revolutionary forces can strive for system change and achieve national and social liberation towards the goal of socialism.

In any kind of crisis such as the Covid-19 pandemic, the best of the people and their organized forces stand out and shine. The people's social activists make the demands in favor of the people and do what they can to arouse, organize and mobilize them for the common good. They gain the experience and strength for carrying out anti-imperialist and democratic struggle toward the goal of socialism.

At the community level, they create ways for the people to have food, shelter and medical care and to engage in mutual aid. They call for donations from those who can give these. And they do not get paid for the volunteer work that they render. The actions that they can carry out for the common good under the circumstances of fighting the pandemic are a means of gaining public support and strengthening the organized forces.

In certain countries, where the people have revolutionary movements against the ruling system, the leading revolutionary parties have responded to the UN secretary general's call for a global ceasefire in order to fight the Covid-19 pandemic. In these countries, the revolutionary movement have their organizations attending to the economic and health needs of the people.

As a result of the pandemic, the vile character and failings of the world capitalist system are exposed. Even after the pandemic, the systemic crisis will continue and worsen in both imperialist and in non-imperialist countries. And the anti-people regimes and leaders in many countries will be held accountable and hated as enemies of the people not only for mishandling and aggravating the pandemic but for continuing an unjust system.

But wherever they exist, the revolutionary movements of the people will grow further in strength and will make advances. Where they do not exist, they will rise and wage revolutionary struggles. The world capitalist system will continue to be crisis-stricken economically and politically and its crimes will generate more favorable conditions for the rise of the revolutionary movement for national liberation, democracy and socialism.

An Update on the International Situation for the International Coordinating Committee of the International League of Peoples' Struggle

March 30, 2020

Dear Colleagues,

As Chairperson Emeritus of the International League of Peoples' Struggle, I am happy to share with you my views on the international situation and try to clarify the major events and issues, the trends and direction of the crisis of the world capitalist system and what the peoples of the world can do in order to advance their anti-imperialist and democratic struggles for national liberation, democracy and socialism.

Background to the Current Situation

The Great Depression of the 1930s led to World War II as basically an inter-imperialist war in which the Allied Powers had to include the Soviet Union in order to defeat the Axis Powers. As a result of the war, one third of humanity came under the governance of socialist states and the struggles for national liberation broke out in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

But the US also emerged as the strongest imperialist power. It proclaimed the Cold War in 1947 in order to confront the rise of socialism and the national liberation movements. It waved the flag of anti-communism against the socialist challenge and offered neocolonialism as the alternative to decolonization as a process of national liberation from colonialism and imperialism.

The Soviet Union recovered from the death of more than 25 million people and the destruction of 85 per cent of its industrial capacity by the Nazi invasion, rebuilt its productive on an unprecedentedly scale and caught up with the US in the development of nuclear weapons in order to put the US in a nuclear stalemate.

After the death of Stalin, however, Krushchov rose to power in order to impose modern revisionism on the Soviet Union in 1956. He used methods of decentralization to breach the socialist state and economy. He was followed by Brezhnev who used methods of recentralization in order to further strengthen the monopoly bureaucrat capitalism and engage in social-imperialism.

Under the leadership of Mao, the Communist Party of China and China emerged as the strongest defenders of the socialist cause and the world proletarian revolution against Soviet modern revisionism and social-imperialism, from the start of the Sino-Soviet ideological debate and disruption of state-to-state relations in 1959 to the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of 1966 to 1976.

In the meantime, the national liberation movements surged forward. The Korean people fought US imperialism to a standstill in 1953. The Vietnamese people dealt a resounding defeat to US imperialism in 1975. The Cuban people moved out of the orbit of US imperialism in 1961 and inspired the peoples of Latin America to fight US imperialism. The process of decolonization accelerated in Africa from 1950s to the 1980s. The apartheid regime in South Africa came to an end in the 1990s.

Soon after the death of Mao in 1976, the capitalist roaders led by Deng Xiaoping successfully carried out a counterrevolutionary coup in China against the proletarian revolutionaries and the socialist state of the working class. The Dengist counterrevolution carried out capitalist reforms and opening up China for reintegration in the world capitalist system. It was able to suppress the mass uprisings against corruption and inflation in scores of Chinese cities in 1989 and it pleaded to US for further investments, trade and technological concessions in order to stabilize the economy.

In December 1991 the Soviet Union collapsed and its satellite revisionist-ruled states in Eastern Europe disintegrated. The bourgeoisie took full control of all the countries in the Soviet bloc. US imperialism became the sole superpower and sought to fill the vacuum left by Soviet social imperialism in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, the Middle East and Africa. The ideologues and publicists of US imperialism proclaimed the death of socialism and the end of history with the supposed permanence of capitalism and liberal democracy.

Strategic Decline of US Imperialism as Sole Superpower

Having become the sole superpower, US was at its strongest in propagating and imposing on the world the policy of neoliberal globalization and unleashing wars of aggression in the Middle East (in Iraq, Libya, and Syria), in Central Asia (Afghanistan) and in the countries near or adjoining Russia (former Yugoslavia, Georgia and Ukraine).

It sought to expand NATO to the borders of Russia and use it for aggression in Central Asia. It overestimated its role and its capabilities as sole superpower and continued to adopt and implement policies that appeared to advance its interests but which in fact were extremely costly and aggravated the problems that had caused its strategic decline since the middle of the 1970s.

Since becoming the sole superpower, the US has spent more than USD 6 trillion to unleash endless wars of aggression that have rapidly increased its public debt. And yet these wars have not resulted in expanding stable economic territory abroad to offset the crisis of overproduction in the imperialist homeland. By assisting China in capitalist restoration and development, the US has also unwittingly aggravated its crisis of overproduction.

This is reminiscent of how the US undermined itself by stepping up war production, building hundreds of military bases abroad and engaging wars of aggression and at the same assisting the reconstruction of the capitalist countries ruined in World War II and thereby bringing about the crisis of overproduction of the US and world capitalist system. As a result, the US became afflicted by stagflation in the mid-1970s.

In trying to solve the problem of stagflation, the US adopted neoliberalism and favored the military-industrial complex to strengthen the US military as well as to sell weapons to the oil-producing countries. But neoliberalism never solved the crisis of overproduction and excessive military spending which had been the root causes of stagflation.

The increased production of the military-industrial complex was profitable within the US economy and in sales to oil-producing countries. But it was counterproductive and unprofitable in the failure of the wars of aggression to expand stable economic territory for US imperialism abroad. In assisting the development of capitalism in China, it has ultimately brought about a new economic and political rival, despite the previous notion of the US that it could exploit China as a new big market.

The neoliberal policy regime has abetted the wrong notion of the US that it can without limits accelerate the centralization and accumulation of capital in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie supposedly in order to create more jobs by using in its favor tax cutbacks, wage freezes, erosion of social benefits, privatization of profitable public assets, antisocial and anti-environmental deregulation and denationalization of the economies of client-states. But the crisis of overproduction within an imperialist country arises from shrinking the domestic market by pushing down the incomes of the working and consuming public.

Another blinding factor in neoliberal policy is the manipulation of the money supply and interest rates supposedly to expand or contract them in order to prevent inflation or stagnation and to always favor the monopoly bourgeoisie by expanding the public debt and subjecting the working class to further austerity measures and reduction of real wages. At the same time, legal and political measures have been undertaken by the monopoly bourgeoisie to attack job security and curtail trade union and other democratic rights.

Collaboration and Contention Between US and Chinese Imperialism

Because the US was in need of expanding its market due to the recurrent and worsening crisis of overproduction, it adopted China as its main partner in neoliberal globalization and at first conceded to it low technology for sweatshop consumer manufacturing and a big consumer market in the US and elsewhere. The US calculated that it could concentrate on manufacturing the big items (especially by the military-industrial complex), financializing the US economy and ultimately making direct investments in China.

But it was depressing its own consumer manufacturing and disemploying millions of workers. The export income of China swelled as the US suffered trade deficits. From being the biggest creditor of the world, the US became the biggest debtor at the end of the 1980s. Further, the US expanded its foreign investments and technology transfer after China pleaded for these in the aftermath of the nationwide mass protests against inflation and corruption in China in 1989.

The US set preconditions for China to privatize the state-owned enterprises, desist from providing state subsidies to enterprises, liberalize further its policy on foreign investments and imports and enter the World Trade Organization

(WTO). China agreed but in fact continued to use state planning and state-owned enterprises and copy without permission US and other foreign technology in order to achieve its own strategic economic and security goals.

The US-China economic and trade partnership appeared to be running smoothly, especially after China joined the WTO in 2001. The US and other imperialist powers and their economic technocrats were glad that every time there was a major global financial and economic crisis the high growth rate of China's GDP served to buffer the stagnant growth rate of the world economy. But when the global financial crash occurred in 2008, the US began to accuse China of unfair economic practices in their relationship.

The crash resulted in a global depression that is still running now and is adversely affecting China's economy. The growth rate has conspicuously slowed down. China experienced in 2015 a stock market crash that wiped out 30 per cent of stock values. Foreign investors have transferred their plants to other countries with cheaper labor in the Asian mainland. The huge mountain of unpaid debts by Chinese local governments and corporations and high ratio of public debt to GDP have become exposed even while China deploys capital for its Belt Road Initiative (BRI).

Trump began in 2018 to accuse China of maintaining a two-tiered economy of state monopoly capitalism and private monopoly capitalism, stealing US technology, providing state subsidies to economic enterprises, manipulating finance and the currency, adopting Chinese brands on products previously patented by US and other foreign companies and using both imported and self-developed technology to build the military might of China.

Trump has taken special note of the challenge of Made in China 2025 and has countered with protectionist calls in sharp contrast to the long-running US line of neoliberal globalization. He has called for raising US consumer manufacturing and imposing high tariffs on imports from China. The obvious objective is also to cut down the export surpluses from which China has drawn the surplus capital for expanding its domestic economy and external economic relations.

US imperialism has been strained by its own stagnant economy, the loss of competitiveness of US products, the extreme cost of overseas US military bases and endless wars of aggression and the rapid rise of its public debt. The wars of aggression have cost at least USD 6 trillion and failed to expand and stabilize the

US economic territory abroad. The US strategic decline has accelerated and become more conspicuous.

Despite its emergence as the winner in the Cold War and as sole superpower in 1991, the US has further declined strategically as a result of the high costs of its military bases overseas and its wars of aggression and its investment, trade and technological concessions to China. Although still the No. 1 imperialist power, the US has become one among several imperialist powers in a multipolar world and has less space for unilateral actions than ever before.

China has become the main economic competitor and political rival of the US. It has become so ambitious as to design and implement the Belt Road Initiative in order to make a radical departure from the pattern of maritime global trade which the Western colonial powers had established since the 16th century. At the same time, it seeks to dominate the Indo-Pacific maritime route. But it has serious economic problems, especially its sitting on a mountain of bad debts by local governments and corporations, the high ratio of public debt to GDP and the onerous terms of Chinese foreign loans which are vulnerable to debtors' default and revolt.

In Southeast Asia, the peoples are confronted with the extraterritorial claims of China over the 90 per cent of the South China Sea in violation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. But in other regions of the world, certain governments that assert national independence and the socialist cause, have taken advantage of inter-imperialist contradictions and availed of China's cooperation in order to counter sanctions and acts of aggression instigated by the US and its traditional imperialist allies.

Worsening Crisis of World Capitalist System and Intensification of Contradictions

The crisis of the world capitalist system is rapidly worsening and all major contradictions are intensifying. The contradictions are those between labor and capital in imperialist countries, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations, those between the imperialist powers and states that assert national independence and the socialist cause and those among the imperialist powers.

The contradictions between labor and capital within imperialist countries and

among imperialist powers are rising as the crisis of overproduction worsens as a result drastically reduced incomes of the working class and the middle class in imperialist countries and in the rest of the world capitalist system. The workers and the shrinking middle class have become restless and rebellious due to unemployment, reduced incomes, rising prices of basic commodities, austerity measures, the curtailment of democratic rights and the rise of chauvinism, racism and fascism.

Among the imperialist powers, the US and China have emerged as the two main contenders in the struggle for a redivision of the world. Each tries to have its own alliance with other imperialist powers. The traditional alliance of the US, Europe and Japan is generally effective in such multilateral agencies like the IMF, World Bank and WTO and in NATO and other military alliances. On the other side, China has maintained closest all-round relations with Russia and they have broadened their alliance in BRICS, Shanghai Cooperation Organization, BRICS Development Bank, the Belt and Road Initiative and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Fund.

Afraid of mutual destruction through nuclear warfare, the major imperialist powers continue to avoid direct wars of aggression against each other by undertaking proxy wars despite the frequent US wars of aggression against underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They have developed the neo-colonial ways and means of shifting the burden of crisis to the underdeveloped countries. They engage in a struggle for a redivision of the world but so far, they have not directly warred on each other to acquire or expand their sources of cheap labor and raw materials, markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence.

They make the oppressed peoples and nations of the underdeveloped countries suffer the main brunt of the recurrent and worsening economic and financial crisis of the world capitalist system. They make them the main source of super profits through direct investments and loans and extractive enterprises. The policy of neoliberal globalization has served to accelerate the rate of exploitation and resource-grabbing. To suppress the people's resistance to oppression and exploitation, they provide their client-states with the means of state terrorism and fascist rule by the bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie. They also use their respective client-states for proxy wars and counterrevolutionary wars for maintaining and expanding economic territory.

Despite shifting the burden of crisis to the oppressed peoples and nations, the imperialist powers are driven to extract higher profits from their own working class under the neoliberal policy regime. They suppress the resistance of the proletariat and people to the ever-rising rate of exploitation in both the developed and underdeveloped countries. They have escalated oppression by enacting and enforcing so-called anti-terrorist laws and are wantonly using state terrorism and emboldening fascist organizations and movements to counter the growing revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the people.

In the underdeveloped countries, US imperialism and its puppet regimes are unleashing the worst forms of aggression and state terrorism against the people in order to perpetuate the neoliberal policy of unbridled greed. Since the end of World War II, the wars of aggression and campaigns of terror unleashed by US have resulted in 20 to 30 million killed in Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria and other countries. To complement its neoliberal economic policy, US imperialism has adopted and implemented the so-called neoconservative policy of using the full spectrum of violent and suasive means, especially its high-tech military weaponry, to maintain global hegemony in the 21st century.

But the US, which is now conspicuously in strategic decline economically and politically, cannot have its way as it pleases. Previously powerful socialist countries, such as the Soviet Union and China, have succumbed to capitalism as a result of modern revisionism. But as new imperialist powers, China and Russia are operating to hem in US imperialism, aggravate the crisis of the world capitalist system, sharpen the inter-imperialist contradictions and generate conditions that are more exploitative and oppressive than before but incite and drive the people to wage revolutionary resistance.

Even when it emerged as the strongest imperialist power after World War II, US imperialism suffered outstanding defeats, such as in China, north Korea, Cuba, Vietnam and other Indochinese countries. It has been unable to stop the decolonization of colonies and semi-colonies which is still an ongoing process. The proletariat and people have persevered in protracted people's war in the Philippines, India, Kurdistan, Turkey, Palestine, Peru, Colombia and elsewhere. The spread of arms where US imperialism have unleashed wars of aggression, such as in the Middle East and Africa, can open the way to the rise of more armed revolutionary movements.

There are effective governments like the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Cuba, Vietnam, Venezuela and Syria that assert national independence and the socialist cause. They enjoy the support of the people, stand up against US imperialism and take advantage of the contradictions among the imperialist powers in order to counter sanctions, military blockade and aggression. The people and revolutionary forces led by the proletariat can strengthen themselves in the course of anti-imperialist struggles.

Mass Protests Signify Transition to the Resurgence of World Proletarian Revolution

The unprecedented rise and spread of gigantic anti-imperialist mass protests in both the underdeveloped and developed countries since last year is a consequence of the bankruptcy and grave crisis of the world capitalist system and the domestic ruling systems. It manifests the inability of the imperialist powers and their client-states (neo-colonial and dependent states) to rule in the old way. It signifies the transition to unprecedentedly greater global anti-imperialist struggles and the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution from major setbacks since 1976.

The massive, sustained and concurrent mass protests in many countries of Europe, North America, Latin America, Asia and Africa bring to the surface the deep-going hatred of the people for the extreme oppression and exploitation that they are suffering. The proletariat and people of the world are fighting back. We are definitely in transition to a great resurgence of anti-imperialist struggles and the world proletarian revolution.

The broad masses of the people are rising up against the worst forms of imperialist oppression and exploitation, such as neoliberalism, austerity measures, gender discrimination, oppression of indigenous peoples, fascism, wars of aggression and environmental destruction. The starting issues and inciting moments for the mass protests may be of wide variability but they always involve the intolerable oppression and exploitation by imperialism and its reactionary agents.

In the last 50 years, we have seen imperialism, neocolonialism, modern revisionism, neoliberalism and neoconservatism attack and put down the proletariat and people of the world. Now, the people are resisting as never before and generating new revolutionary forces, including parties of the proletariat and

mass organizations. These will ultimately result in the spread of armed revolutionary movements and the rise of socialist states and people's democracies with a socialist perspective.

The financial crash of 2008 has led to worse crisis of the world capitalist system and to a far bigger fall of the financial and economic system in 2020 at a rate faster than that of the Great Depression of 1929 onward. The neoliberal policy regime has become more bankrupt than ever resulting in unprecedented overaccumulation and inflation of assets of the financial oligarchy and monopoly bourgeoisie, unsustainable debts of households, corporations and central banks, depression of the economy as the consuming public is impoverished and the escalating contest of the fascist and anti-fascist currents throughout the world.

The bailouts and lower interest rates are designed to favor the monopoly bourgeoisie at the expense of the proletariat and people. In accordance with the neoliberal bias, more capital is being put into the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie by the central banks for stimulating the economy from the top. And yet the economy continues to stagnate and fall. The crisis of overproduction keeps on worsening and making the financial bailouts fail. The so-called middle class in all the developed and underdeveloped countries is dwindling faster. The stage is set for the revolt of the 99 per cent of the people against the filthy 1 per cent.

The current plunge of the world capitalist system coincides with the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic. This has resulted in lockdowns and other repressive measures in many countries. It has resulted in the disemployment of working people and further breakdown of production. While suffering economic and social deprivations, the people do not receive adequate health care because the public health systems have been undermined and drastically weakened by the privatization of hospitals and the unbridled profit-making of drug companies. The economic and social crisis, aggravated by the pandemic, has high potential of causing bigger and more widespread protest mass actions.

Since its founding in 2001 the International League of Peoples' Struggle has played a major role in inspiring and generating the anti-imperialist and democratic struggles of the peoples of the world through mass organizations in so many concerns. We have become the largest and strongest international united front against imperialism and fascism and for national liberation, people's democracy and socialism.

We have made significant contributions to the upsurge of mass protest actions on a global scale. And we are further encouraged by this upsurge to further strengthen our ranks and to engage in consultative and consensual relations with similar international formations in order to expand the united front against imperialism and fascism.

We are confident that we are going to become stronger as the world capitalist system continues to break down and generate more favorable conditions for the rise of revolutionary forces. We are determined to invigorate the subjective forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist mass movement that can bring about the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution and the greater victories of national liberation and socialist movements.

In Prospect of Socialism

Questions from Master Class of Paaralang Jose Maria Sison,

January 3, 2021

Initial questions

1. Upon victory of the people's democratic revolution, how will we fight the blockade imposed by US imperialism?

JMS: Based on the current trend of world events, such as the uprisings of the toiling masses worldwide against imperialism and reaction, the fight of some independent countries against imperialism, and the contradiction among imperialist powers themselves, I have great confidence that upon the victory of the people's democratic revolution, the Filipino people can withstand and overcome the blockade that US imperialism will impose.

The Philippines can still use the strategy and tactics used by the Soviet Union and China when they won their respective revolutions and built socialism. They followed the principle and policies of relying on their own strength and planned efforts of the toiling masses, obtaining assistance from the international working-class movement, cooperating with other countries that are independent of imperialism, and taking advantage of the contradictions among imperialist powers.

2. China had the advantage of the support from the Soviet Union at the time of their victory, which helped in starting industrialization. Are there countries which we can approach to help us in our industrialization?

JMS: It is true that the Soviet Union helped in building the industrial foundation

of socialism in China from the start until 1959 but this was accompanied by the entry of modern revisionist influence. There are still other countries that have socialist characteristics and have advanced expertise in metallurgy and production of machine tools and electronic equipment like the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK).

The Philippines can acquire higher technology from the different independent countries and from the rivalry and competition of imperialist countries. There is a high potential for the Maoists in India can win their revolution. The former socialist countries that turned capitalist and imperialist have the potential to be squeezed by the capitalist crisis, turn fascist or become socialist again through the rising up of the proletarian masses.

It is difficult to give details on the future environment of the victory of the people's democratic revolution. But it is sure that the crisis of world capitalism today is worsening, the anti-imperialist and democratic struggles are spreading and we can see the resurgence of the world proletarian-socialist revolution.

3. In socialism, we respect the right to religion. It is clear that the Catholic Church, as an institution, is reactionary. How do we deal with Catholic schools like Ateneo, De La Salle, UST, etc.?

JMS: It is correct that the right to one's belief will be respected under socialism as long as religious organizations also respect the principle of the separation of church and state and the power and responsibility of the socialist state to spread and advance the patriotic, scientific and pro-masses education and culture.

The socialist state can take over the universities and schools that are controlled by religious institutions and are bulwarks of anti-socialism similar to those in Poland. The state should be in charge of education and involved in determining the content of the curriculum and implementing socialist and scientific education.

4. Under socialism we will change culture. Commercialization is widespread and, in the cities, going to the malls owned by bourgeois compradors like Shoe Mart's Henry Sy has become a habit. Under socialism, what can be the function and purpose of these malls?

JMS: With big spacious former commercial buildings, space could be given to productive work to improve the economy and to cultural work to advance

socialist, patriotic, scientific and pro-people culture and education. Space should be given to cultural and educational institutions and mass organizations.

5. Modern revisionist China is criticized for its strict control and censorship of the media and internet. It is clear that under socialism the freedom of expression is respected. But is there a limit to this? If they are peddling fake news, is it correct to ban them or tighten the control on social media platforms or ban them?

JMS: The socialist state is a class dictatorship of the proletariat against the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Therefore, the socialist state will not allow the imperialists, old reactionaries and revisionists to use the right of the people to free expression in order to fight proletarian state power and violate the rights and interests of the people and allow the interest of the bourgeoisie and counterrevolutionaries to grow and prevail.

It is in the nature of capitalist and imperialist countries such as China, US and others, and puppet reactionary governments to suppress the right of expression and to spread lies and deception to maintain an oppressive and exploitative system. When the crisis of the bourgeois ruling system worsens, it sheds its democratic pretensions and shows its fascist fangs, a regime's open reign of terror.

In a socialist society, the people have the right to free expression, criticize errors and weaknesses and propose solutions to problems. It is correct to prohibit the spread of lies because the toiling masses gain nothing from it except harm or injury. To violate the truth and spread lies can only be used by the enemy against socialism and the people.

6. In the former socialist countries, USSR and China, are there emerging new revolutionaries carrying the MLM?

JMS: Especially in China, there are groups and Maoist movements existing and growing in strength among the toiling masses and the youth due to the inspiration of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the worsening exploitation and oppression brought about by the betrayal of socialism and the rule of monopoly capitalism in the state and private sectors. The contradiction among classes in China is intensifying more so now that its rivalry with the US as imperialist powers is escalating.

In the entire scope of the former USSR, in Russia itself and other republics, oppression and exploitation are intensifying due to the betrayal of socialism and the rule of the monopoly bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie, born from and aggrandized by revisionism and social-imperialism of the former USSR, is excessive, openly greedy and cruel. In line with the tradition of the Bolsheviks and the impulse of the rapidly worsening crisis, the groups and movement of proletarian revolutionaries among the ranks of the toiling masses and intelligentsia are growing stronger.

7. Will the day care system under socialism be widespread so that workers can do their work well while others take care of their children, like in DPRK?

JMS: In countries striving to remain socialist like the DPRK and Cuba, there is a day care system to take care of the children while the parents are working. In the above-mentioned countries, there is still a strong system of social services in the field of child care, education, health, housing, aid and support against pandemic, protection of the environment, etc.

8. If the Trotskyites do not believe that the Soviet Union and China were socialist in the past, what kind of socialism are they espousing? Is it scientific or utopian? How will they be dealt with during the time of victory?

JMS: They reject the fact that Lenin and Stalin were able to build socialism in the Soviet Union from October 1917 to 1956 and Mao in China from 1949 to 1976. They claim that the bourgeoisie used Stalin and Mao so that the bourgeoisie and capitalism would eventually win. That is how they mock at the people's democratic revolutions with a socialist perspective and the socialist movement in industrial capitalist countries today.

Their contradictions among themselves and their being socialists and their being counterrevolutionary are blatant. While they want socialism to be the immediate line in all types of countries, they also say that socialism cannot be realized in any country unless all or majority of countries simultaneously become socialist. They come out zero and crazy. It cannot even be said that their empty socialism is utopian because utopian socialists partly use some amount of reality and cooperative work on which to base their dreams of a just society of socialism and from which socialism shall emerge from the goodwill of the people. The Trotskyites are special anti-communist agents of imperialism.

Beginning with Trotsky, they are ultra-Left in their writings and speeches “surpassing” and maligning the Left but in effect, they help the Right to misrepresent and vilify the Left. That is what they did in the Soviet Union. They fought against the socialist line of Stalin to connive with the Right opportunist Bukharinites. Because of their putschist line, they endangered and harmed the Chinese revolution in 1927 and favored Chiang Kaishek. They sided with fascism before and during World War II in order to fight communist parties; they were instruments of the US in the Cold War; and until now, they focus their attacks on revolutionary movements led by Communist Parties. Currently, their principal target is the Maoist Communist Party and they are shrewdly aided by the evil regime of Duterte in spreading lies that the communists are responsible for this regime. This is an example of the ultra-Left and anti-communist line to support the Right or counterrevolution.

Additional Questions from the Audience:

1. What is the commune as a basic unit of socialism, how big is it, how should it be run? What is its difference or similarity with the Soviet, what is its difference from an industrial commune, and what is its administrative system?

JMS: The Paris Commune became a model because it was used in establishing political power. But in essence, the communes were run by the revolutionary committees of the workers.

What became the trend was the soviet which in essence followed the commune—council of workers, peasants, and soldiers in their respective sectors. The soviets were leading committees or councils. These were the points of power at the basic level upward.

In China, when the political power was being established at Jinggangshan, the workers’ political power was also called soviet. Later, when they won victory, it was also called the same, soviet or council.

At present in the Philippines, the equivalent of the commune or soviet are the local organs of political power. They are the center of the people’s power under the leadership of the proletarian class.

In the course of the cultural revolution (GPCR), especially in 1967 when the Shanghai Commune arose, the workers of Shanghai rose in revolt. They took power from the former municipal party committee. They called themselves

Shanghai Commune, but they were told to call it a revolutionary committee, and this became the model of revolutionary committees established in different parts of China among the ranks of workers, peasants, and localities. It functioned as organ of political power and had representatives as delegates to the 9th Congress. Most of the delegates came from the revolutionary committees.

In the various parts of China, followers of the GPCR took over political power and overthrew leaders of party committees treading the bourgeois or revisionist line. In essence, the leading organs can be called committees or councils and have a structure from the basic level upward, collectively led, and have a republican character because it is the lower committees that send delegates to the higher-level committees.

In China, what had been called communes since the Great Leap Forward were particularly those in agriculture, and it was the highest form of cooperativization at the scale of a county.

You know, the most rudimentary base of the agricultural cooperative is the household. Then from this basic agricultural cooperation, production teams covering villages were established. Thereafter, agricultural cooperatives of the siang or municipality were established.

After this, the commune covered a wider area equivalent to a county, or if in the Philippines its closest equivalent would be a district or congressional district and possibly up to provincial level. But the commune had a particular meaning in the terminology of the Chinese revolution. It refers to the highest stage of agricultural cooperation. But its essential content was the collective leadership through a committee of peasants. The structured committee covered the entire commune and also the production brigades and the production teams, respectively at the level of townships and the villages.

Under the new socialist society, what Marx called the capitalist birthmarks of the new society will not be immediately eradicated. There are elements in the former old society that can be of use or appropriated by the socialist state or proletarian class.

Marx said that that one cannot just spread the fruits of production in terms of the absolute equality of individual toilers. Whatever is the level of production, the fruit of production must be spread to all equally in several ways. He showed that

in a socialist system, there is no longer private profit or the full claim of the surplus value from the workers by the capitalists but instead, the new accumulation of capital is divided into different components. One part is for the expanded reproduction of the means of production, another part is for increasing wages, still another part is for the development of the of social services or welfare system and a further part is for the cost of administration and defense.

But in the actual building of socialism, even under Lenin during the time of the New Economic Policy, the NEP was undertaken out of necessity. As you can see. But in the actual building of socialism, even under Lenin during the time of the New Economic Policy, the NEP was undertaken out of necessity. In a transition period, the Soviet Union had to take in account the destruction of the economy due to the civil war and foreign intervention. That was why Lenin thought of undertaking several measures to immediately revive the economy, especially food and other necessities, whose lack or scarcity had caused the fall of the Kerensky government. The Kerensky government wanted to continue involving Russia in WWI, and inevitably continued the civil war and foreign intervention which of course caused destruction.

So, what Lenin did was to give concessions to the rich peasants and the small and middle-level entrepreneurs and traders. Instead of separating them to do what they wanted and embark on counterrevolution, he gave them concessions on enterprises in the middle level of industry and trade, and even granted concessions to rich peasants. He also raised the pay of the managers so that they would not flee. Lenin's logic was one he called buying-off policy. He used this policy, instead of compelling the non-proletarian elements running, moving away or continuing to fight. It was better to integrate them in the effort of economic recovery and rehabilitation. The NEP went on from 1922-1927 to enable the Bolsheviks to administer and revive the economy.

In 1927 Stalin launched the Socialist Campaign of Socialist Industrialization, collectivization and mechanization of agriculture. As in the Soviet Union, transition measures were undertaken in China to prepare for the Great Leap Forward in both in socialist industry and collective agriculture. From 1949 to 1952, this was the time of rehabilitation, consolidation and giving support to Korea which was the target of aggression by US imperialism. The Korean War was a big event. It was a great problem to which China gave attention. Socialism could not be immediately realized in China. But the political power was already socialist because it was already in the hands of the working class through the the

Chinese CP as the advance detachment of the working class.

Even during the first Five-Year Plan, in 1953-57, concessions were given to the capitalists. Previously, the state-private joint corporations were used to integrate the national bourgeoisie, and also the friendly elements of big compradors who were willing to function as national bourgeois and not just as agents of the foreign monopolies. The national bourgeoisie were allowed to exist because they followed the socialist policy of the state and agreed to play a secondary role. But they were given dividends and later during the new first five-year plan, they could receive a fixed interest on their capital. It was not as big as the dividend amounting to 25 percent of net incomes of joint state-private enterprises. Mao wanted to dissolve the private ownership of capital and the payment of dividends to the capitalists through the Great Leap Forward. But Liu Xiaogi and Deng Xiaoping were against the line of Mao and actually supported the openly revisionist line of Peng Dehuai, Chen Yun and others. And the fight between the proletarian revolutionaries and revisionist continued and escalated in the cultural revolution over the question of the share of the capitalist in the new material values created by the working class. The gains that went to the capitalists reached 25 percent. To give this much to them was like retaining the capitalist system for their benefit.

In the Critique of the Gotha Program, Marx stated that in the beginning wage differentials could not immediately be eradicated. There would be wage differentials that should be taken into consideration because you have to consider the difference in the ability and actual contribution of the workers. But there should be a deliberate policy to raise the general level of wages and improve the living conditions of the workers. That is the difference in the time of socialism from that of capitalism.

Eventually, when the buying-off policy ends and the private capital dissolves, the social profit will increase, this profit of the whole society from the annual production of the workers can be used to improve the wage and living conditions, among the major benefits from capital accumulation and economic growth. The dissolution of the characteristics of the old system will be by stages. Its dissolution cannot be implemented immediately. But under the leadership of the working class the dissolution of private profit for the capitalists is ensured and can be done as soon as possible.

What we are discussing are the transitional measures to full-scale socialist

revolution and construction. The direction of socialism is to dissolve the the privileges and private profit of the bourgeoisie in the socialist stage of the revolution and advance to the ultimate goal of communism. This direction is guaranteed by the party of the working class. Essential is its hold on state power and the issuance of policies and plans to firmly advance the socialist economy, politics and culture, and resolutely advance the eradication of class differences and move towards communism.

We can see that in the early part of socialism, there are necessary transition measures from capitalism to socialism because there are parts of the old society that could be appropriated. For a while, you can avail of joint state-private corporations and then dissolve them. You can also recruit experts and managers from the nationalized enterprises and do your best to educate them on socialism. It is wiser and more economical to do so because if they flee from the country or if they rebel you will spend more by hiring foreign experts. Even if they come from comradely socialist country, you have to give the foreign experts higher salaries, housing and other costly accommodations.

In the reactionary government, you can retire or remove those incorrigible officials at the top level of bureaucracy and they can be tried and punished if they have committed any serious crime like plunder and murder.

As regard the general run of bureaucrats at the lower levels, give them study courses on socialism and it is up to them to adopt socialism. It is more expensive to get foreign experts. The forces of the revolution cannot cover all the kinds of work in the revolutionary government. That is why long before the victory of the revolution, it is good that there are progressive unions of state employees. the Soviet Union was hit with destruction due to the civil war and foreign intervention; that was why Lenin thought of undertaking several measures to immediately revive the moribund economy which caused the fall of the Kerensky government. The Kerensky government wanted to continue involving Russia in WWI, and inevitably fought the civil war and foreign intervention which of course caused destruction.

So, what Lenin did was to give concessions to the capitalists. Instead of separating them to do what they wanted and embark on counterrevolution, he gave them concessions on enterprises in the middle industry and trade, and even granted concessions to rich peasants. Lenin's logic was one he called buying-off policy. That is instead of these non-proletarian elements running, moving away

or continuing to fight, it was better to integrate them to a recovery effort or a rehabilitation effort. The NEP operated from 1922-1927 when Stalin launched the Socialist Campaign of Socialist Industrialization, collectivization and mechanization of agriculture. It was just transitional. That was also done in China. During 1949 to 1952, this was the time of rehabilitation, consolidation and giving support to Korea when US imperialism was creating trouble. The Korean War was a big event. It was a great problem to which China gave attention. Socialism could not be immediately realized nor completed. But the political power was already socialist because it was already in the hands of the proletarian class through the advance detachment of the working class.

Even during the first Five-Year Plan, in 1953-57, concessions were given to the capitalists. Before, with the state-private integration to integrate the national bourgeoisie, and also the friendly elements of big comprador. The nationalist bourgeoisie were allowed to exist because they followed the socialist policy. But they were given dividends and later with the new first five-year plan, they could receive a fixed interest on their capital. It was not as big as the dividend could be in the development of production. Those were what they wanted to continue and to expand – the interest of the capitalists. Eventually private capital would be dissolved. But Liu Xiaogi and Deng Xiaoping blasted against it. And the fight continued until the cultural revolution, the fight on what is the share of the capitalist in the new material values created by the working class, so there is a surplus value that goes to the capitalists and the old system. The gains that went to enterprises reached 25 percent.

Therefore, among the ranks of the capitalists, there still existed the old system, the surplus value. When it came to to the likes of the Critique of the Gotha Program, Marx stated that in the beginning wage differentials could not immediately be eradicated. There would be wage differentials that should be taken into consideration because you have to consider the difference in the ability and actual contribution of the workers. But there should be a deliberate policy to raise the wages and improve the living conditions of the workers. That is the difference in the time of socialism.

Eventually, when the buying-off policy ends and the private capital dissolves, the social profit will increase, the profit of the whole society from annual production of the workers and raise in wage and living conditions, from increase of capital construction and accumulation. The dissolution of the characteristics of the old system will be by stages. Its dissolution cannot be implemented immediately.

But under the leadership of the working class the dissolution of profit of the capitalist will be ensured.

But what we are discussing here is the transitional method during the early part of socialism. The direction of socialism is to dissolve the divergence of classes until these disappear and reach communism. This direction is protected by the party of the working class. Essential is their hold on the political power and issuance of policies and plans to firmly advance the economy and society, and resolutely advance the eradication of the divergence of classes and reach communism.

We can see in the early part of socialism, there is for sure a transition from capitalism to socialism because there are parts of the old society that could be appropriated. Taken into account, for example, is the ousting of the cooperative capitalists and even those who acknowledge your political power. But if you oust them and remove even their managers, you will spend more if you pay foreign experts. Even if they come from comradely socialist country, you have to give them foreign experts level salary, housing. It will be more expensive.

With the reactionary government, you will only remove those in the top level of bureaucracy, the stubborn ones. Those in the high level and have not committed any crime or serious crimes, you can retire them.

But the enthusiastic bureaucrats, give them study courses on socialism and it is up to them to adopt socialism thoroughly. It is more expensive to get foreign experts. The forces of the revolution cannot cover all the kinds of work in the old system. Therefore, during transition use those who are no longer fighting and are not an obstructive element of society and are now being encouraged to work for the new system. The revolutionaries are doing work for the masses and government employees. Which is the same even in the level of supervisors and managers, although they are still inclined towards the orders of the owners of the factories, the unions know who follows the socialist system once the system has changed.

But the enthusiastic bureaucrats, give them study courses on socialism and it is up to them to adopt socialism thoroughly. It is more expensive to get foreign experts. The forces of the revolution cannot cover all the kinds of work in the old system. Therefore, during transition use those who are no longer fighting and are not an obstructive element of society and are now being encouraged to work for

the new system. The revolutionaries are doing work for the masses and government employees. Which is the same even in the level of supervisors and managers, although they are still inclined towards the orders of the owners of the factories, the unions know who follows the socialist system once the system has changed.

Nothing abrupt will be done that the revolutionary forces cannot take on. But ultimately, in the running of all the work in a socialist society, majority of these will be done by those already trained by the new system. The number of proletarian revolutionaries should have increased. To grab power upon victory of the Soviet Union, Bolshevik members were only around 80-100,000's. Watch out for the opportunists. Give the correct education to the people who were not totally with the revolution. They were also part of the revolution upon victory. Once the working class is in power, it finds out what is applicable from the former system.

There are benefits from the former system that are carried into the new system. The machineries, these came from the capitalists. The proletariat should take over these to produce more.

Elections will be held but the running of the elections will not follow the Philippine or US system of running elections where there are 2 or several competing parties who have the capacity for big spending for elections. The bourgeois election is a costly election. In the elections, there will be representatives from the different classes, sectors and parties. There would be the multiplicity of parties. In the Soviet Union, we saw that on the basic level, the elected leaders of the workers and peasants were revolutionaries.

But there is competition of several parties. I will give a short history on alliance. There is a wrong notion that the Bolshevik did not enter into an alliance. There was a time when the Bolsheviks entered into an alliance even with different bourgeois parties they were in contradiction with on policies. But on the issue of bringing down Czarism they were united. It was proven that the constitutional democrats and other bourgeois democrats dominated by Kerensky committed a policy error in Russia's continued participation in the war. This is what caused their destruction. They allowed the economy to fall. The Bolsheviks continued its alliance with the revolutionary socialist for it had a strong following among the peasantry and the peasants had a strong influence on the soviets.

But eventually, there was a split, the socialist revolutionaries took another path. Therefore, in the history of the Soviet Union, the Bolsheviks prevailed as seemingly the sole party. That is what the critics called the one-party system. But the matter of having several parties, this went into a historical process.

In the case of China, even when the Communist Party of China won, democratic parties remained. And these parties, including the communist party, were represented in the Consultative Assembly up to the National Congress. Until now, there are what are called democratic parties and there are alliances. But the leading party in the socialist state is the communist party as the advance detachment of the proletarian class. Because of their record in revolution and socialist construction they have good reputations and are elected into leading committees from the basic level up to the level of the party, state and different parts of the state.

So, there is the principle of election of representation but non-existent is the personality-centered politics of the bourgeoisie whether in a multiparty system, or two-party system, or in the case of a fascist state, a one-party system but still personality centered. In a socialist state, what is discussed is the policy to expand, practice and develop socialism.

2. What is the role of the mass movement?

JMS: The mass movement will continue to exist. It is a decisive political element of a socialist society. It is the base of the communist party. It is organized, mobilized and given education by the communist party. The laying down of all kinds of policies under socialism is based on the power and conformity of the mass movement. One thing that cannot be averted is the continuation and existence of the mass movement.

Did not the manifestation of revisionism reach the CCP when they launched the cultural revolution. This was considered as the widest and most intensive form of democracy in the whole history of the Chinese people and humankind. One could see the unprecedented and largest mobilization of the mass movement.

The power, energy and nuclear and whatever technological development, if they already exist, they already exist. What is important is how you will control and use these based on correct principles and policies. On having nuclear weapons, it is due to the US which first acquired nuclear weapons and used these in the form

of atomic bombs on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. It is a good thing that there were revolutionaries in the project, the Manhattan project, who helped and speed up the technological development of the Soviet Union. In a short time, by 1949, it also had nuclear weapons. Its purpose was to neutralize the nuclear weapons of the US. If these were not neutralized, these could have been used during the Korean war. In the case of the US, if it knows there is no counter-attack, it will use whatever kind of weapon and method of mass killing as long as it can continue to dominate as an imperial power.

But a nuclear balance was established when the Soviet Union acquired nuclear weapons. And as long as there are imperialist powers, socialist countries are forced to have weapons to counter or to neutralize. And if imperialist countries have the unlimited use of weaponry, socialist countries have the right to defend themselves. Because the imperialist countries can see that the socialist countries are able to fight, a nuclear stalemate has thus existed for a long time. Since 1949, the nuclear blackmail of the US has become inutile. If there was no defense to its nuclear weapons, it will not only use blackmail but would actually use these during times when it sees a chance to dominate. In Korea, there was a stalemate because it could not use the bomb on the Chinese volunteers and against the Koreans. In Vietnam, the US nuclear monopoly was disregarded because the Soviet Union had acquired nuclear weapons and China, too, in the 1960s. Thus, the US could not possibly use nuclear weapons in Vietnam. Currently, there are different kinds of conventional and modern weapons in the Middle East and other areas.

But no one has used a weapon that kills thousands or millions upon millions of people in an instant. An important point. While the imperialists are still existing, socialist countries must be vigilant and develop their defense so that the imperialists can be stopped from using aggression and weapons that kill a great number of people.

3. How is the judicial and court system in a socialist system?

JMS: Of course, there is a judiciary and juridical structure. There is a judicial system. It is also the state, the state of the proletariat, so like the bourgeois state, there is the executive branch, judicial and parliamentary or legislative. On the judicial and court system, there is the Supreme Court that handles the most important cases. Most important because of the weight of the law in question or the case being tried. But the most essential that we must understand, in a

socialist country, there are two types of contradiction. There is the contradiction among the masses, and the contradiction between the people and the enemy.

In general, the contradiction among the ranks of the people can be the lightest or the heaviest. The lightest is one which need not be brought before the court of the judicial system, but could be settled by arbitration on the administrative level. There is difference in the class interest among the people. Many cases are light which could be settled by arbitration, through the rank of local organs of political power by administrative measure. But there are also cases of abuse, grave violation of the rights of others. For example, the contradiction among the people, case of stealing from a neighbor or whose property has been snatched on the street. Worst than these is homicide or murder. These cases are being tried.

There is also the contradiction between a particular individual within the socialist country. There should be a court that would handle worst cases that involve contradictions between individuals. Cases emanating from cheating on transactions, robbery could also lead to life and death cases. There are also cases of crazy people violating the rights of other people but aside from investigating, one also tries to find out if the person needs psychiatric treatment or confinement to a mental asylum. But these are particular cases.

In the cases of contradiction between the people and the enemy, there is the case of being an agent of the bourgeois counter-revolutionary, who would like to topple the socialist state from within. These counter-revolutionaries are representatives of the exploitative class or sprouting new exploiters. It is possible for this to happen in a socialist country if one is not vigilant. There is also the contradiction due to subversion and aggression from outside launched by a foreign imperialist in power. The locals who become agents when caught, would be brought before a court and the appropriate charges for their counterrevolution will be filed against them.

The socialist state will need these but there would still be public authorities who will ensure there is order of the communist society. But while the society is still socialist, there are internal and external dangers and these can be brought before the court.

For example, the difference in nature of a bourgeois state is it is oppressive because the power and privilege of a few are upheld against the interest of the toiling masses and people. On the other hand, in a socialist state, the state

protects and uses itself as an organ of violent force to defend the rights and welfare of the majority and the Filipino people against those who would like the return of the old system of the bourgeoisie, the old system of their oppression and exploitation.

4. About the current political situation and the news on the statement of the CPP that it would allegedly create city partisan units and punish the incorrigible human rights violators and most corrupt and plunderers of the public funds of the people.

JMS: Just a few days ago, I gave an opinion as a guest in a zoom meeting here in Europe. I gave a statement as an observer of the Communist Party of the Philippines. There is a need to explain, that there should be a caveat because I might be accused of giving the order. I am just an observer and analyst.

I do not understand why the armed city partisan have disappeared. In my view, that is a manifestation of conservatism. That in the name of focusing on mass work and protecting mass work, especially in the cities, what have disappeared even with the modification in policy.

That the ACP shall come from the guerrilla fronts of nearby cities, and the team members have a knowledge and experience of the cities. Lessons have been learned during the period of dissolution of the ACP when the state ran after the KADENA. So there were caution and assurances. But these amounted to the dissolution. You know, to my knowledge since 2016 there has been questions from journalists interviewing me. The progressive journalists, who say “how come the ACP no longer exists? The Duterte administration is too brutal, killing thousands of people in the name of the bogus war on drugs, and it is obvious that he is waging an all-out war. And regarding his relations with the revolutionary forces, he did not fulfil his promises to grant amnesty and free political prisoners. And this Duterte, under the prodding of Trump when he visited and met in November 2017, this puppet Duterte.

5. Duterte, on December 2017, issued a declaration designating the CPP/NPA as terrorist organizations. Upon Duterte’s order, the military and police killed a number of suspected revolutionaries. That is how brutal this regime is, from its leader Duterte up to his paid killers. He deliberately corrupts and makes criminals out of those in the police force so they would serve as his menial servants and his private army.

So many are asking, “why does the ACP not just respond?”

JMS: You know, it is possible that the ACP has a strategic value. It could not replace the firm strategic line of protracted people’s war of encircling the cities from the countryside because this strategic line produces many weapons for the expansion of armed revolution.

But the ACP has a strategic value. Not only to render justice on human rights violators, criminals and thieving politicians like Duterte. The people want these. This is what will happen. Because if there are ACP, these violators are punished, the enemy will use many troops of police and military to serve as their bodyguards. Therefore, the number of their forces in the countryside will decrease. So, there is value. Not only justice has been served by the punishment but the enemy is forced to use more troops for defensive or bodyguard duty. Then the forces that attack the countryside will be lessened.

That is one of the strategic values. And the armed movement’s mastery of explosives is already well developed. Before we leave the topic of using the gun by revolutionaries to render punishment, only a few long arms are needed. Most would be short arms. Even homemade guns and knives are possible.

But the most damage, the strategic damage that could be inflicted upon the enemy would come from the skill reached by the revolutionaries in the use of mine explosives placed along the route of attacking soldiers. This means the NPA has the capacity to blow up installations of large economic interest owned by the biggest comprador landlords. The installations in plantations, mines and logging.

Their business will be crippled and they will spend a large amount of money and personnel for protection.

In other words, the number assigned by Duterte to the guerrilla fronts would decrease.

Even then, the ACP urban operations and operations against major installations in the mines, plantations and logging have not happened.

Based on what I read from reports, the military has 140 to 150 battalions. The operations for this number can already cause bankruptcy, a big expense, because of corruption in the procurement of foreign and local supplies, food and

whatever needs. And those fake surrenders or killings made to appear as real encounters, Duterte gives rewards to his military officers but through corruption.

The regime of Duterte seems like a monster which you can analyze or divide into two. In the view of a Marxist-Leninist, there is no object which could not be analyzed and divided into two. And there is no object you cannot strike piece by piece until it is completely destroyed, an object which you thought was an indestructible or unbeaten monster or giant. That is the principle of revolution. In a quick glance, you think your enemy is made of steel that is indivisible. Just like a poor person who admires a luxurious sports car. But that sports car has a weakness, just remove its piston and it will not run.

Likewise, in a guerrilla war, if you cannot withstand the enemy's attack, you retreat. But you plant explosives along its route and launch sniping operations.

Ambush the enemy in formations you are able to. And if it thinks it has kicked out the NPA from the area the reality is the NPA has only traded space for time or shifted location. It will watch which part of the enemy it will attack. Once the enemy thinks that the area is under its control, the NPA can harass. Because of its nightly carousing, or due to slight sound or few firings, the enemy troops lose sleep and will leave the area and then be hounded by the guerrilla fighters. That is the pattern.

Mao's 16-character formulation on military principles: 'Divide our forces to arouse the masses, concentrate our forces to deal with the enemy.' 'The enemy advances, we retreat; the enemy camps, we harass; the enemy tires, we attack; the enemy retreats, we pursue.' And usually, it leaves an area because other areas have better conditions for guerrilla actions, for offensives, they are pulled to these areas. The enemy will come to the rescue of its soldiers that are being attacked. Now, in the basics of people's war the enemy is defeated, and you give it a big headache. This is the threat of Duterte, he will finish off all the patriotic and democratic forces in the cities.

Does he not know that the revolutionaries can also do something when he is killing democracy or any manifestation of democracy. The revolutionary movement then is forced to use the armed city partisans extensively and intensively. The mines and logging and plantations of big compradors and landlords are open targets.

I am just giving an observation and view according to the flow of events. We analyze and this is our democratic right so that we can tell the crazy people in power that they are not the only ones who can make decisions and prevail so they can oppress and exploit the toiling masses without getting any response from the oppressed and exploited.

Now, on the issue of what is going to happen to Duterte, that is the essence I get.

Duterte is predictable. He is a coward, scared and thinks like a thug and a thief, scared that once out of power, he would be arrested by a new government of the Philippines which is not on his side. He can also be arrested by the revolutionary movement. And from other countries, because of human rights violations he has committed, the International Criminal Court can ask for his arrest. That is why this lunatic is doing everything to stay in power. He is a coward. His style of leadership is to rule through violence and killings. That is what he did in Davao, and is now turning the whole Philippines into Davao.

It is predictable that he still has ambition to be a fascist dictator. And if that cannot be, because I heard there are groups of soldiers against him as he said he would be shot in the head if he rules after 2022. But he is a liar.

It is easy to say “You can kill me if I continue after 2022.” Or he could not do it because he already stinks. He is a fool if he does not know that he already stinks.

He just pays those polls. Those surveys are stupid. What he wants is his daughter, Sarah, who is also a thug, an expert in stealing ghost payroll in Davao like her father. It is obvious how Duterte imposes his dynasty upon the whole Philippines. That cannot be. The whole Philippines is not Davao. The people of the whole Philippines are diverse and there is already a revolutionary movement in its length and breadth. Duterte is really stupid if he thinks he can remain in power. He is also sick in body and mind, he is crazy. Something is wrong with his head. Nothing will become of him but end up in the dustbin of the history of the Philippines.

On the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

Fourth Episode of Mao Serye of the Anakbayan-Europa ND Online School

Questions by Host Crisanto Kempendorff

January 3, 2021

1. What is the historical significance of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) to China and to the world?

JMS: Mao launched the GPCR in 1966 in line with his theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through cultural revolution in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism.

This theory was the result of his study of the class contradictions in Soviet socialist society and his critique of the Soviet political economy and the rise of the Soviet modern revisionism under Khrushchov as well as the circumstances of China from 1949 to 1966, especially from 1957 to 1966.

Mao had also observed that there were already revisionists or capitalist roaders within the Chinese Communist Party and the socialist state since the planning and preparation of the Second Five Year Plan in 1957; and that the Soviet revisionists headed by Khrushchov had influence on the Chinese revisionists since the rise of Khrushchov.

Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping sent study teams to the Soviet Union to learn from the revisionist reforms instituted by Khrushchov for application in China. They came into sharp conflict with the planning and preparation for the Second Five-Year Plan or the Great Leap Forward of China.

2. How did Mao take notice of the capitalist roaders in the Chinese Communist Party? And why did he launch the GPCR only in 1966 if he noticed them 10 years earlier?

JMS: Mao and the Central Committee had to observe first the pronouncements and behavior of the capitalist roaders, let them unfold themselves first and do only what was warranted at a given time. Peng Dehuai who was defense minister and was well-known as close to the Soviet Union was the most brazen in opposing The Great Leap Forward at the Lushan conference in 1959 and was promptly made to account for his position.

In criticizing certain points or features of the Great Leap Forward, Liu Shaoqi, Deng Zhao Ping, Chen Yun and Zhou Enlai were more prudent than Peng Dehuai. But Liu and Deng were systematic in taking advantage of contradictions and difficulties to undermine the entire Second Five Year Plan and not to solve them for the purpose of advancing socialist revolution and socialist construction.

They were for prolonging and enlarging concessions to the bourgeoisie in state-private corporations and to the rich peasants and private merchants. They were for the development of a “national democratic economy” instead of socialist construction. They exaggerated the need for private accumulation to run counter to the socialist drive for collective accumulation. In the name of using material incentives, they were for bigger wage differentials and for the piece-rate wage system.

Before and after the formation of the communes in the Great Leap Forward, Liu and Deng pushed the “Three Freedoms and One Contract” scheme to sabotage the advanced coops and the communes. The three freedoms were the freedoms: 1) to enlarge private lots, 2) to promote free-markets, and 3) for each individual household to be responsible for its own profit or loss. The one contract was to have each individual household sign a contract with the State for the production of a pre-set amount of crops. After the pre-set amount was met, the peasant would be free to sell everything on the free market.

3. What was the Great Leap Forward all about? According to the anti-communists as well as the Dengist capitalist-roaders, it was entirely or mostly a catastrophe like the GPCR.

JMS: After the basic socialist transformation of the Chinese economy in the First

Five Year Plan from 1952 to 1957, the Great Leap Forward was planned and implemented to develop rapidly heavy and basic socialist industries as the lead factor in building socialism, agricultural collectivization through the communes as the base of the socialist economy and light industry as bridge factor to provide for the immediate consumer and producer needs of households, especially among the peasants. This was supposed to learn from the overinvestment in heavy industry at the expense of agriculture in the Soviet experience under Stalin.

The Soviet revisionists and their Chinese followers were most vociferous in saying that agricultural collectivization was a certain failure if the agricultural machines were not yet provided everywhere. But the Great Leap Forward was successful in rapidly the economy self-reliantly through the wise and planned utilization of the available productive forces, through collective efforts, despite the continuing imperialist embargo, the Soviet abandonment of ongoing projects and the natural calamities which hit hardest in 1960 to 1961. The bumper crop came in 1962.

From then on, even the Chinese revisionists could not deny that the Great Leap Forward was greatly successful and that the Chinese people were enjoying stability and initial prosperity from year to year. Without the Great Leap Forward, China would not have developed its socialist economy self-reliantly on the two legs of industry and agriculture and would have succumbed to the imperialist embargo, the Soviet revisionist abandonment and the natural calamities.

Because of the Great Leap Forward, China scored major victories in developing socialist industry and the communes. Mao and the proletarian revolutionaries could not allow the Chinese capitalist roaders to get away with all the vitriolic attacks on his leadership when difficulties were misrepresented as insurmountable failures. Thus, he launched the Socialist Education Movement in 1963. But this was misdirected and sabotaged by Liu and Deng by promoting revisionism and they unwittingly laid the ground for the GPCR.

4. How did the GPCR begin and develop until the Ninth Congress of the CPC in 1969?

JMS: Liu and Deng themselves took part in the decision in January 1966 to explore the launching of the cultural revolution and to let Beijing Mayor Peng

Zhen investigate how so much revisionist propaganda had run under the very noses of the responsible organs Chinese Communist Party, especially the Propaganda Department.

Peng Zhen came out with the “February Outline” to dismiss as merely academic the issue over what his vice mayor Wu Han had written against the decision of the Party to dismiss Peng Dehuai from his position because of his opposition to the Great Leap Forward. He tried to suppress Yao Wen-yuan’s criticism of Wu’s satirical piece which compared Mao to a tyrannical emperor for dismissing Peng from office.

When faculty members and students in Beijing rose up against the “February Outline”, Liu and Deng dispatched “work teams” to quell them. The intervention from above merely outraged the university population. The chain of events led to the formation of the Central Cultural Revolution Group of the CPC, the drawing up of the August 18, 1966 16-point Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the spread of the Red Guards Movement among the youth and the workers and Mao praising the youth as the successors of the revolution and calling on the Red Guards to bombard the bourgeois headquarters within the CPC and on the People’s Liberation Army to support the Left.

The exemplary theatrical works began to roll out and be performed in theaters, on the streets, on various forms of transport, in offices, factories and farms. They celebrated as heroes of the Chinese revolution the workers, peasants and soldiers. They promoted the line of the proletarian-socialist revolution and socialist construction. They condemned the Chinese capitalist roaders and upheld the line of proletarian cultural revolution against the old ideas, old culture, old habits, and old customs.

The Red Guards Movement was described as the most extensive and intensive manifestation of democracy in the history of mankind, arousing, organizing and mobilizing hundreds of millions of people all over China and utilizing huge assemblies, big character posters, slogans on walls and other forms of propaganda that the people could easily make against officials taking the capitalist road. In accordance with the Constitution of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company, the right of the workers to strike was spelled out and exercised to assert the leading role of their class.

The January Storm broke out in Shanghai in 1967. The workers overthrew the Municipal Party Committee and took power in the name of the Shanghai Commune. This was renamed the Revolutionary Committee the following month and became the model for forming revolutionary committees to take power all over China. They consisted of representatives of the Party, the people's army and masses. They became the base for delegates to the Ninth Party Congress in 1969.

5. How did the Chinese revisionist or capitalist roaders fight back against the forces of the GPCR?

JMS: Of course, the highest of the revisionists or capitalist roaders within the CPC resisted the GPCR. I have already mentioned the work teams deployed by Liu and Deng and maneuvers of Peng Zhen. There were those who used their high positions at various levels to maneuver and spread intrigues in order to counter the mass movement before they lost their positions. There were also those who pretended to be remorseful and pretended to be for the GPCR.

The worst enemies of the GPCR were those who created their own factions of Red Guards and worker rebels and took an ultra-Left line and carried out actions to discredit the GPCR. They were then denounced as those who raised the Red flag to attack it. They engaged in fighting the real Red Guards and carrying out physical actions and acts of vandalism against China's cultural legacy.

The objective of the Rightists in whipping up ultra-Left slogans and actions was to discredit the GPCR and conjure the demand for stopping the mass movement and stabilizing the situation by the authorities. The Rightists spread the intrigue that even Mao had been repelled by the unruliness of the Red Guards and they also sought to split the Left.

6. After the Ninth Congress in 1969, what happened to the Left and to Lin Biao after being hailed as “closest comrade in arms” of Mao and “universally accepted successor”?

JMS: Soon after the Ninth Congress, reports circulated that there was a falling out between Lin Biao and Chen Boda on one side and the Shanghai Group of Four (Jiang Qing, Zhang Chunqiao Yao Wenyan and Wang Hongwen), that Lin Biao was in a hurry to become President and that he and his 24-year-old son were plotting to overthrow Mao or to assassinate him.

Many outsiders express disbelief that Lin Biao could be rumored as plotting a

coup for a long period of time before he was supposed to have botched his plot and taken a plane to fly to his Soviet foes with his top brass followers and with no sufficient fuel to reach the Soviet Union. After Lin Biao and his key followers were killed, the Group of Four would undertake a campaign to condemn Lin Biao and Confucius (a reference to Zhou Enlai).

It became apparent that the Left for which Mao called on Lin Biao and the PLA to support at the beginning of the GPCR was breaking up. It was reminiscent of how the top followers of Stalin (like Molotov, Malenkov and so on) had also split in the years before Krushchov took full power in 1956 in comparison to the re-ascent of Deng Xiaoping to power as Vice Premier and PLA Chief of Staff with the open support of Zhou Enlai.

7. But it looked like the Group of Four was still on the rise up to the Tenth Congress of 1973 and even thereafter. How much was the weight of this Left group in relation to the entire Left, Middle and Right section of the Chinese Communist Party?

JMS: Indeed, the Group was apparently on the rise as propagandists and icons of the cultural revolution up to the Tenth Party Congress in 1973 and even thereafter. Wang Hongwen became the Vice Chairman of the Central Committee, the third highest official after Mao and Zhou Enlai. He and other group members were raised to the Politburo.

Most of the time they enjoyed the support of Mao. Their strength was pushing the pen and doing propaganda pertaining to issues in culture, academia, education and similar matters. But by themselves they carried little or no weight within the Party, state and PLA. Without Mao to support them, they were ineffectual.

At any rate, they were able to launch the campaign to criticize Lin Biao and “Confucius” in late 1973 under the direction of Jiang Qing. The name of Confucius was used to refer to Zhou Enlai who was also pointedly alluded to as Zhou in the criticism of the novel, *Water Margin*.

The Group of Four were known to be on the same Left side with the Politburo member Kang Sheng in opposing the reascendancy of Deng and in targeting Zhou for criticism as the Centrist figure responsible for rehabilitating and promoting Deng Xiaoping. But subsequently, there would be falling out between

the Group of Four and Kang Sheng who died of illness in 1975.

8. What were the accomplishments of the GPCR before it dwindled in effect and was finally defeated?

JMS: The GPCR put into practice Mao's theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through cultural revolution in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. This theory is supposed to be Mao's greatest contribution to the development of Marxism-Leninism, thus making Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism the third stage of development in the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat.

Mao had the opportunity to study the continued existence of classes and class struggle and the emergence of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union and China. He confronted revisionism as a growing threat already embedded in the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese state. He hoped to succeed in preventing capitalist restoration and consolidating socialism through cultural revolution and in revolutionizing the political and cultural superstructure to promote the socialist mode of production against the one-sided revisionist and mechanical theory of "productive forces".

He succeeded in leading and generating the GPCR as the most extensive and intensive manifestation of democracy not only in the entire history of China but also of the entire mankind. The GPCR created the Red Guards movement among the youth, the three-in-one revolutionary committees as organs of political power, the three-in-one leading organs in factories, farms and institutions and the principle of mutual supervision between the cadres and masses.

The GPCR educated the cadres and masses in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the creation, created the exemplary literary and theatrical works and other artistic works, brought up the requirement for the youth to do mass work as part of their education and for the masses to evaluate their fitness for further education, systematically deployed teams of educated youth, scientists and technologists to raise the level of production in factories and farms, generated rural clinics and barefoot health workers, scientific experiment and technological innovations flourished archaeological works expanded, and so on.

Contrary to the claims of the Dengist capitalist roaders that the GPCR was an

economic catastrophe, the Chinese economy had an annual growth rate of 10 percent despite the attempts to bring down the figures for certain years. Socialist industry and the communes advanced at an accelerated rate, inspired by the examples Daqing and Dachai. The high growth rate was accomplished self-reliantly in the direction of socialism and communism and not with the influx of foreign direct investments and loans for the purpose of capitalist restoration and integration of China with the world capitalist system.

9. How did Deng Xiaoping and the like undermine and defeat the GPCR? How did they use the three worlds theory and call for modernization, reforms and opening up for the purpose?

JMS: Since the Xunyi Conference in the Long March, Zhou had always or in the main supported the leadership of Mao. And he was known to consult Mao on every major issue in his line of work. Especially because of his deteriorating health, Mao relied on Zhou to keep the ship of state stable amidst the twists and turns of the cultural revolution and agreed with him when he recommended the rehabilitation of Deng to stabilize the situation after the fall of Lin Biao.

It is an interesting subject for study whether and how Zhou became a Centrist collaborator of Deng Xiaoping in the ultimate defeat of the GPCR. Did Zhou have his own reasons and initiative in collaborating with Deng or the Group of Four pushed him to collaborate with Deng to prevent the Group of Four from running him down.

Ultimately, the Group of Four was impotent in the face of the Centrist-Rightist combination against the GPCR no less within the CPC, the state and the PLA. Within the month after the death of Mao on September 9, 1976, the Group of Four was easily arrested under orders by officials close to the late Zhou and Deng, like Hua Guofeng, Yeh Jianying, Li Xiannian and Wang Dongxing .

At the highest levels of policy-making by the Party and the state, the capitalist-roaders harped without cease on the line that GPCR had been chaotic and catastrophic and that therefore there was a need for stability and peace. Long before the arrest of Jiang Qing, Deng Xiaoping was also spreading the intriguing misogynistic joke that it would be a big tragedy if the Central Committee had come under the skirt of a woman.

But of course, in the most serious deliberations of the Central Committee, the

Political Bureau or its standing committee, the Centrists and Rightist made use of the threats of Soviet social imperialism, the Zhenbao island incident in the Wusuli River and deployment of one million Soviet troops along the Sino-Soviet border as the pretext for drawing closer to the US, make a rapprochement with it as early as during the Nixon visit in 1972 and justify friendly relations with the US as the way to “modernization”.

The struggle between the two superpowers, US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism, was utilized by the capitalist roaders to favor US imperialism instead of playing off one imperialist enemy against the other. The friendly relations of China with the US became ultimately the highway for capitalist-oriented reforms and China’s reintegration in the world capitalist system. The US welcomed such relations with China in order to support the advancement of capitalism in China and abandonment of socialism and proletarian internationalism by China.

10. In the decisive year of 1976 how did Deng get overthrown and bounce back?

JMS: Zhou Enlai was the main patron and protector of Deng in his rehabilitation and re-ascendancy to power after the death of Lin Biao. When Zhou died of cancer in January 1976, the Left in general and the Group of Four in particular, had Deng removed from power for proposing “modernization” as a big comprador scheme for integrating China into the world capitalist system.

But when Mao died in September 1976, the Rightists and Centrists combined to bring Deng back to power and once more and arrest the Group of Four and thousands of cadres who adhered to the GPCR. And they expelled Party members by the millions and replaced them with those opposed to the GPCR.

There was a total reorganization of the Chinese Communist Party, the Chinese state and the PLA in favor of the capitalist roaders. The proletariat was definitively overthrown. And the Dengist counterrevolutionaries succeeded in carrying out capitalist-oriented reforms and the integration of China in the world capitalist system.

11. What did the GPCR prove and what are the lasting lessons from it? Are you not dismayed that China has become capitalist and imperialist power contending for the No. 1 position?

JMS: The GPCR proved that there were capitalist roaders within the Chinese

Communist Party, the state and the people's army. They were in control of major portions of state power and grew in strength to overthrow the socialist state of the proletariat. After the 1976 coup, it became obvious that China was taking the capitalist road after the GPCR was condemned as a complete catastrophe, the commune system was dismantled, the bourgeoisie was given access to the state banks to finance capitalist enterprises, the privatization of rural industries and departments of the Party, state agencies and people's army were financed to go into business and make acceptable to Party cadres "going into business".

The GPCR successfully exposed the existence and growth of the bourgeoisie in China and combated modern revisionism at least for some three to five years but it failed ultimately to prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. After 1976, China proceeded to become an unabashed oppressor and exploiter of the Chinese proletariat and other working people. Still further, it became the main partner of the US imperialism in propagating neoliberal globalization, especially after the Dengists crushed the mass movement against corruption and inflation in 1989 and the US steered China towards its entry into the WTO in 2001. Now, they have become the biggest contending imperialist powers.

Of course, it is dismaying that the two biggest socialist countries of the 20th century have become capitalist. But by becoming capitalist, after building a socialist industrial base, they have made the world capitalist system far more fraught than ever with the crisis of overproduction and the dangers of fascism, wars of aggression and destruction of the environment by monopoly capitalism. All basic contradictions in the world are sharpening, between capital and labor in the industrial capitalist countries, between the imperialist countries and oppressed peoples and nations and among the imperialist powers themselves.

The current intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions, especially those between the US and China, are escalating the conditions of oppression and exploitation and driving the proletariat and the people to wage anti-imperialist and democratic struggles and aim for the resurgence of world proletarian-socialist revolution. The epochal struggle between capitalism and socialism, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, continues. Great revolutionary struggles are developing fast and great revolutionary victories of the proletariat and people are in the horizon.

On the Launch of Upsurge of People's Resistance in the Philippines and the World

Answers to Initial Question, February 7, 2021

1. Among the topics of your book is the capacity of the revolutionary forces and the masses for waging revolution. The people's war has been going on for more than 50 years. In your opinion what would it take to attain victory in the coming years. What else must the people do? Or what are we not doing or doing wrong.

JMS: The self-reliant nationwide building of the CPP, the NPA, the revolutionary mass organizations and the local organs of political power in more than 110 guerrilla fronts is a great historic achievement of the Filipino people in the last 50 years, despite the major setbacks suffered by the forces of national liberation and socialism during the same period outside of the Philippines. The revolutionary forces here can further grow in strength towards total victory as the crises of both the Philippine ruling system and the world capitalist system worsen.

The people's democratic government will keep on growing in the countryside until the revolutionary forces gain sufficient armed and political strength to overthrow the reactionary state in certain key regions and ultimately in Metro Manila. The basic alliance of the workers and peasants, further alliances with the middle forces and contradictions among the reactionary forces will facilitate the victory of the people's war against the enemy.

The intensification of the people's war in coming years will make the ruling

system bleed to death from thousands of wounds, with the most strategic battles to be won by the revolutionary forces in Mindanao, Cordillera, Samar and Panay in order to facilitate the final offensives from revolutionary bases in Central Luzon and Southern Luzon against the final holdouts of the enemy forces controlling Metro Manila.

The error of conservatism, which is the current target of rectification, is not as grave as the subjectivism, ultra-Leftism and militarism that were corrected by the Second Great Rectification Movement (SGRM). The correction of the error of conservatism this time is to use the mass base, created by the prolonged emphasis on mass work, as the basis for intensifying and expanding the people's war. There are no serious self-destructive problems like those that had to be solved by the SGRM.

2. Why do you say there is a resurgence of world proletarian revolution?

JMS: The worldwide upsurge of anti-imperialist and democratic struggles of the people against neoliberalism, fascism and other ultra-reactionary currents and the wars of aggression since 2019 have signaled the potential resurgence of the world proletarian-socialist revolution. The so-called Great Recession which started with the financial meltdown of 2006 to 2008 has become the Great Depression of 2019 onward, further aggravated by the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020 and thereafter.

All basic contradictions in the world are sharpening: those between labor and capital, among the imperialist powers, between the imperialist powers and oppressed peoples and nations; and between the imperialist powers and countries assertive of national independence and with socialist aspirations. The sharpest of contradictions are now between the erstwhile main partners in neoliberal globalization, the US and China. They are indeed the most bitter economic competitors and political rivals in the world today.

The rapidly worsening crisis of the world capitalist system is already driving the proletariat and people all over the world to form and strengthen revolutionary communist parties, mass organizations and mass movements and to wage struggles for national and social liberation in the direction of socialism. The situation is drastically different from the time that, because of the revisionist betrayals in the Soviet Union and then in China, the US emerged as the winner in the Cold War and the sole superpower in 1991. And the US imperialist camp

followers used to prate about the permanent death of socialism and the end of history with capitalism and liberal democracy.

Now, it is the turn of US imperialism and the world capitalist system to expose their fatal flaws. Both the neoliberal economic policy and the neoconservative security policy of the US have accelerated its strategic decline. US imperialism is desperately trying to wrest back the economic, trade and technological concessions to China and strengthen a bloc of imperialist allies against it. But China is taking advantage of its two-tiered economy and its huge size, continuing its economic and military rise, strengthening its own bloc, trying to disrupt the US-headed bloc and challenging US hegemony in various parts of the world. A new Cold War is now running between the two strongest imperialist powers.

Trotskyitis Is a Virulent Type of Psychopathic Anti-Communism

February 24, 2021

The Trotskyites are exposing themselves as big liars by calling Stalin, Mao and the Communist Party of the Philippines as instruments of the national bourgeoisie rather than of the working class. Now, they are claiming that the CPP has given up Marxism-Leninism and has embraced Catholicism, its entire history and all its doctrines.

Trotskyitis is truly a mental disease of boundless mendacity, a virulent type of psychopathic anti-communism, a verbose complement to the state terrorism of the butcher Duterte regime. Please read critically the Trotskyite article below against the facts and the further clarification made here.

The National Democratic Front of the Philippines has much to say in respectful and friendly terms towards Catholics and other Christians as well as Muslims who advocate a just peace and human rights. The Christians for National Liberation and the Moro Resistance and Liberation Organization are major allied organizations within the NDFP.

Only Trotskyite psychopaths can offend the scores of millions of Christians and other religious believers and drum up religious and anti-religious issues to obfuscate the urgent social, economic and political and moral issues. The Christians for National Liberation and the Moro Resistance and Liberation Organization have been outstanding in the just struggle of the Filipino people for national and social liberation.

It is not therefore surprising that the Interim Chair of the NDFP Negotiating

Panel speaks in friendly and ecumenical terms towards Christian leaders and followers who are assembled to promote the cause of just peace and human rights and the earliest possible resumption of GRP-NDFP peace negotiations.

But like their charlatan idol Trotsky, the Trotskyites have a penchant for misrepresentation and prevarication. They misrepresent alliances and common positions within and outside of the NDFP as the surrender or self-equation of the CPP to any of its allies under any circumstances. They cannot understand how the CPP maintains its independence and initiative even as it seriously cooperates with its broad range of allies.

The Trotskyites have become notorious for doing everything to isolate the working class and deprive it of the basic alliance of the peasantry, the secondary alliance of the middle social strata and the tertiary alliance with temporary and unstable allies within the reactionary classes.

Historically, the Trotskyites have discredited themselves by siding with the fascist powers against Stalin and the Soviet Union and with the US in the Cold War against the socialist countries and the national liberation movements. They have presented themselves as crazies by denying Stalin and Mao as proletarian revolutionary thinkers and leaders and misrepresenting them as instruments of the national bourgeoisie.

Being special agents of imperialism and the reactionaries, they deny the ideological, political and organizational integrity of the CPP as the advanced detachment of the working class and the need for alliances on the national democratic stage of the Philippine revolution.

In fact, they deny the need to get rid of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism and to basically complete the national democratic revolution before the socialist revolution can begin in the Philippines.

These Trotskyite counterrevolutionaries pretend to be for socialist revolution immediately in the Philippines but at the same time they say that it is impossible to have socialism in any single country despite the Soviet experience under Stalin, followed by the rise of several socialist countries in the aftermath of the anti-fascist war.

Significance and Relevance of the Paris Commune of 1871 to the World Proletarian Revolution

Address to the International League of Peoples' Struggle,

March 18, 2021

Dear comrades and friends, I thank the International League of Peoples' Struggle for inviting me to give the keynote speech at this webinar to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Paris Commune of 1871.

I am honored and delighted to discuss the significance of this great and glorious revolutionary event and its relevance to the world proletarian revolution up to the ongoing anti-imperialist and democratic struggles of the proletariat and the entire people of the world. I am proud that since its founding in 2001 the ILPS has been inspired by the Paris Commune and has contributed greatly to the worldwide anti-imperialist and democratic mass movement.

Again, in the revolutionary spirit of the Paris Commune of 1871, I daresay that these current mass struggles are in transition to the great resurgence of the world proletarian revolution from the major setbacks caused by revisionist betrayal of the socialist cause. The proletariat and people can never accept the escalation of their exploitation and oppression.

Imperialism has inflicted neoliberalism, state terrorism, wars of aggression, the threat of nuclear annihilation, global warming and pandemics on the proletariat and the people of the world and has incited them to fight back and advance the revolutionary cause of national liberation, democracy and socialism.

I. Significance of the Paris Commune of 1871

As Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippines, I discussed the significance of the Paris Commune of 1871 on the occasion of its 100th anniversary in 1971. I relied on the best possible summing up and analysis of the great event, *The Civil War in France* by Karl Marx who monitored the event through various public sources of information and best of all through members of the International Workingmen's Association (the First International) who were in the Central Committee leading the Paris Commune.

The Paris Commune proved for the first time in the history of mankind that the working class was capable of destroying the bourgeois state machinery as well as replacing it with the state of the working class, a dictatorship over the exploiting classes and a democracy for the erstwhile exploited classes. From March 18 to May 28, 1871, the workers of Paris (who numbered in the hundreds of thousands and who constituted the National Guards) rebelled, dismantled the reactionary army and demonstrated that they could seize political power and govern a new society.

They resisted the attempts of the French bourgeois reactionaries headed by Thiers to disarm them in compliance with the terms of surrender to the Prussians led by Bismarck who won in the Franco-Prussian War. Upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Communards issued as their first decree the suppression of the standing army of the bourgeoisie and its replacement by the armed people.

The Paris Commune was eventually defeated because it failed to launch promptly an offensive against the reactionary bourgeois government put up by Thiers in Versailles at a time that its army was still weak and disorganized and the Prussians had not yet released the many French army men that they had held as prisoners of war to favor the French bourgeois government.

To gain time on the Communards and make a deal with Bismarck, Thiers dispatched armed detachments against Paris and at the same time pretended to sue for peace negotiations upon the failure of every armed expedition. Thus, Thiers and Bismarck were eventually able to launch attacks that overpowered the Paris Commune and resulted in the mass murder of 20,000 to 30,000 worker-martyrs.

Marx honored the Paris Commune in the following terms: "Workingmen's Paris with its Commune will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new

society. Its exterminators' history has been already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them." The Paris Commune raised to a new and higher level the glorious struggle of the working class that burst all-out all-over Europe in 1848.

Consequent to the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels inscribed in the 1872 preface to the Communist Manifesto the following fundamental lesson of decisive importance: "One thing especially proved by the Commune, viz., that 'the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes'..." They saw fit to restate the words that are in single quotation marks from *The Civil War in France*.

To lead the October Revolution of 1917 to victory, Lenin learned well from the Paris Commune and repudiated the bourgeois parliamentarists, social chauvinists and social pacifists of the Second International. In his *State and Revolution*, he was emphatic on the lesson from the Paris Commune that the proletariat must smash the bureaucratic-military machinery of the bourgeoisie. Thus, the October Revolution of the Bolsheviks was essentially the destruction of the bourgeois state machine, establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and eventually its consolidation under Stalin.

In consonance with the Paris Commune, Chairman Mao taught us, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." This is the essence not only of the people's democratic revolution under the leadership of the proletariat in China but also of all revolutionary struggles waged by the proletariat in the 150 years after the Paris Commune. It is impossible for the proletariat to seize political power without following and realizing the principle of armed revolution.

One more fundamental lesson that the Paris Commune has taught us is that the proletariat must have its revolutionary party to lead the revolution and overthrow the bourgeoisie and for such party to build its strength ideologically, politically and organizationally for the purpose. The revolutionary practice of the Paris Commune showed the need for a central body of leadership to guide the vigorous movement of the revolutionary masses.

The National Guards, the body of armed workers, that seized power in Paris from the bourgeoisie looked up to a Central Committee for leadership. On March 26, the Paris Commune was elected by the workers as a representative body to lead them. Though the International Workingmen's Association was denounced

by the bourgeoisie as responsible for leading the revolt of the workers, it did not carry the preponderant influence among the workers.

Despite the fact that Marx was the leading organizer and spirit of the First International, Marxism had not yet been grasped by the majority of the workers. Blanquism and Proudhonism were acknowledged by the leaders of the Paris Commune as their guide. In practice, however, the Paris Commune debunked the Blanquist school of anarchy and the Proudhonist school of petty-bourgeois socialism and proved the correctness of Marxism.

Contrary to the anarchist tenets of Blanqui, the workers of Paris did not only destroy the bourgeois state machine but established the dictatorship of the proletariat and it was not a mere bunch of intellectuals that made revolutionary triumph possible but the great mass of workers in the course of class struggle. The economic decrees of the Paris Commune found no use for Proudhon's economic teachings about small cooperatives and had to deal with the facts of large-scale industry.

Learning from the experience of the Paris Commune, Lenin wrote *What Is To Be Done?* in answer to the need for building the revolutionary party of the proletariat. Tirelessly he built the Bolshevik Party as the advanced detachment of the working class, with Marxism as the guide to action. This party served as the political leader and general staff of the proletariat in the revolution for establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and building socialism.

In the Chinese revolution, Comrade Mao Zedong built a well-disciplined party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, using the method of criticism and self-criticism and closely linked with the broad masses of the people. This was the core of leadership of the entire Chinese proletariat and the people. It was the leader of the people's army and of the united front of all revolutionary classes and organizations.

Still one more fundamental lesson that can be learned from the Paris Commune is that the creators of history are the masses. Leaders can sum up and analyze experience and can formulate new tasks only on the basis of the revolutionary mass movement. Genuine leadership can arise, make decisions and act correctly only by relying on the masses and learning from them. "From the masses to the masses" is the correct line that must be followed by the revolutionary party of the proletariat and by its cadres.

At first, Marx warned the Paris workers that any attempt to overthrow the government would be the folly of despair. But when in March 1871, the revolutionary workers of Paris revolted against the bourgeoisie and created the Commune, Marx set the example of a true revolutionary thinker and leader by welcoming the Paris Commune and considering himself a participant. He paid tribute to the revolutionary enthusiasm and initiative of the workers and closely studied their movement for its great worth.

The Paris Commune showed the boundless capacity of the revolutionary masses for creating new things after destroying the bourgeois state machine with their own armed power. They created a new government based on a truly democratic exercise of universal suffrage among the workers. They put up a leadership from their own ranks, working conscientiously and receiving pay equal to that of the worker, with no representation allowances and discretionary funds.

Such a leadership shunned the separation of executive and legislative functions. It was the complete opposite of the parliament, a talking shop of the bourgeoisie and the landlord class and a complete obstacle to social revolution. Any leader was subject to recall by the people. The Paris Commune had the attributes of a true democracy for the proletariat and the people while being at the same time a class dictatorship over the exploiting classes.

The workers of Paris were capable of achieving so much despite the hardship and difficulties of political and economic life in a country defeated in war and in a city besieged not only by the ruffians of Thiers but also by the troops of Bismarck. How much more would the workers have accomplished had they had their own class-conscious party thoroughly instructed on Marxism!

How much more would they have been capable of had they not been prevented from a revolutionary coordination with the workers in other cities and with the peasant masses in the provinces of France. The Paris Commune envisioned a nationwide system of people's communes with a national delegation seated in Paris.

II. Relevance to the world proletarian revolution

Subsequent to the defeat of the Paris Commune of 1871, especially because of the mass murders inflicted on the workers during the bloody week of March 21 to 28, the international bourgeoisie and its articulators prognosticated that the

working class would not dare to rebel again against the bourgeois state. But the heroism and martyrdom of the workers of Paris inspired the workers of so many countries to build socialist and labor parties and movements. The Internationale became their common anthem.

In its better years within the period from 1898 to 1916, the Second International contributed to the building of Marxist parties of workers and making Marxism the main trend in the working-class movement in Europe in the last decade of the 19th century despite the revisionism of Bernstein and then Kautsky. In the meantime, as a consequence of repeated crises of overproduction and the relentless accumulation and concentration of private capital, several capitalist countries became monopoly capitalist and ushered in the world era of modern imperialism and the world proletarian revolution towards the end of the 19th century.

In this new era, the world capitalist system became more afflicted by the contradiction between the social character of the forces of production (the proletariat and the means of modern industry) and the private mode of appropriation by the capitalist class and became even more prone to the crisis of overproduction, intensified class struggle and inter-imperialist wars, such as those of World War I and World II in the first half of the 20th century.

World War I provided the conditions for the working class to seize political power in Russia and build Soviet socialism in one-sixth of the earth where Tsarism once reigned. World War II provided the conditions for communist parties to defeat the forces of fascism and take power and build socialism in China and other countries as well as to lead the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

By the early 1950s one-third of humankind was governed by communist and workers' parties. But the US emerged as the strongest imperialist power also as a result of World War II. It launched the Cold War since 1947 and unleashed propaganda campaigns of anti-communism, touting "free enterprise" as the guarantee to democracy. It violently opposed the people's movements for national liberation, democracy and socialism. It waged wars of aggression in Korea from 1950 to 1953 and in Vietnam and the rest of Indochina from 1955 onward.

The Korean people and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)

fought and stalemated US imperialism. And the Vietnamese and the rest of the Indochinese people inflicted on the US its first categorical defeat in 1975. All the while, China was engaged in socialist revolution and construction and stood as a bulwark against US imperialism. From its relative peak of economic and military strength from 1945 to 1975, the US started its strategic decline due to stagflation, military overspending and the economic recovery of capitalist countries devastated during World War II.

But in the Soviet Union, where Stalin had directed the postwar reconstruction of the socialist economy and had broken the nuclear monopoly of the US, modern revisionism had risen to power and totally negated Stalin in 1956 in order to overthrow the state of the working class and allow the bourgeoisie and the factors of capitalism to grow within socialist society. It pushed bourgeois reformism and pacifism under Khrushchov and then social-imperialism under Brezhnev.

The Communist Party of China (CPC) opposed the modern revisionist line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in the international communist and workers' movement. It also opposed within China the blatant Rightists as well as the home-grown and Soviet-influenced revisionists. It prevailed over a number of anti-socialist elements before, during and after the Great Leap Forward but some persisted in power.

Recognizing the crucial importance of upholding Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, Mao carried out the socialist education movement from 1962 to 1966 to cleanse the Party and the socialist state of Rightism and revisionism ideologically, politically, economically and organizationally. But this did not suffice. And thus the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) was carried out from 1966 to 1976 on the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution in order to combat revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

At the 100th anniversary of the Paris Commune on 1971, the GPCR shone brilliantly as the peak of the world proletarian revolution. But it would go through twists and turns and ups and down. The Rightists or revisionists increasingly succeeded to combine with the Centrists against the Left behind the apparent victory of the GPCR while Mao was alive. But soon after his death in 1976, the capitalist roaders led by Deng Xiaoping successfully carried out a counterrevolutionary coup against the proletarian revolutionaries and the

socialist state of the working class.

The Dengist counterrevolution declared the GPCR as a complete catastrophe and carried out the restoration of capitalism in China through capitalist reforms and opening up to the US and world capitalist system. After suppressing the mass protests against inflation and corruption at Tien An Men in Beijing and in scores of other cities in China in 1989, Deng and his political stooges pleaded for more economic concessions from the US and became even more determined to strengthen capitalism in China as an integral part of the world capitalist system.

By 1991 the Soviet Union collapsed and its satellite revisionist-ruled states in Eastern Europe disintegrated. The bourgeoisie took full control of all the countries in the Soviet bloc. The communist parties influenced by Soviet modern revisionism all disintegrated. So did those communist parties which became confused by the anti-GPCR position of the Chinese party and state. US imperialism emerged as winner of the Cold War and became the sole superpower. And its ideologues and publicists proclaimed the death of socialism and the end of history with the supposed permanence of capitalism and liberal democracy.

US imperialism gloated over the full restoration of capitalism in China, Russia and the entire former Soviet bloc. It was unmindful of the fact that China and Russia were two large capitalist countries that could exacerbate inter-imperialist contradictions and worsen the crisis of the world capitalist system. It became preoccupied with the objective of subordinating China to US economic expansion under the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization and subjecting Russia to the neoconservative policy of using the full spectrum of US power to expand NATO and undo the vestiges of Soviet power and influence in Eastern Europe, Central Asia and the Middle East.

Thus, the US itself aggravated the conditions for accelerating its own strategic decline through its economic, trade and technological concessions that enabled China to grow economically and militarily and undermine US economic hegemony and through the “endless wars” to counter Russia that cost \$ 6 trillion in so short a period of time. The US has conspicuously lost its sole superpower status since the financial meltdown of 2008 and the ceaseless worsening of the economic and political crisis of the world capitalist system until now.

US imperialism adopted neoliberalism to overcome the problem of stagflation.

But it never solved the crisis of overproduction which had been the root cause of stagflation. The increased production by the military-industrial complex was profitable within the US economy and from sales of war materiel to the oil-producing countries. But it was counterproductive and unprofitable as the US wars of aggression failed to expand a stable economic territory for US imperialism abroad.

We see today the growing turbulence in the world capitalist system. All major contradictions in the world capitalist system are intensifying, such as those between labor and capital; those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations; those between the imperialist powers and states that assert national independence and the socialist cause; and those among the imperialist powers themselves.

The intensification of contradictions between labor and capital within the traditional and relatively new imperialist countries is due to the worsening crisis of overproduction relative to the drastically reduced income of the working people in the entire world capitalist system. The workers have become restless and rebellious due to unemployment, low income, rising prices of basic commodities, austerity measures, the curtailment of their democratic rights and the rise of chauvinism, racism and fascism.

Among the imperialist powers, the US and China have emerged as the two main contenders in the struggle for a redivision of the world. Each tries to have its own alliance with other imperialist powers. The traditional alliance of the US, Europe and Japan is still operative in such multilateral agencies as the IMF, World Bank and WTO and in NATO and other military alliances. Ranged against the traditional imperialist powers are China and Russia which have broadened their alliance in BRICS, Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), BRICS Development Bank, the Belt and Road Initiative and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Fund.

The imperialist powers engage in a struggle for a redivision of the world but so far they have not directly warred on each other to acquire or expand their sources of cheap labor and raw materials, markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence. They have developed the neocolonial ways and means of shifting the burden of crisis to the underdeveloped countries. They are afraid of any direct war between imperialist powers because they are afraid of mutual destruction with their own nuclear weapons of mass destruction. They give vent to their

aggressiveness by waging wars against underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

They make the oppressed peoples and nations of the underdeveloped countries the main source of super profits through a higher rate of exploitation. They make them suffer the main brunt of the recurrent and worsening economic and financial crisis of the world capitalist system. Even as they are now increasingly protectionist, they continue the policy of neoliberal globalization at the expense of others. To suppress the people's resistance to oppression and exploitation, they provide their client-states with the means of state terrorism and fascist rule by the bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie. They also use their respective client-states for proxy wars and counterrevolutionary wars for maintaining their economic territory or for redividing the world.

Despite their attempts to shift the burden of crisis to the oppressed peoples and nations, the imperialist powers are driven to extract higher profits from their own working class under the neoliberal policy regime. To suppress the resistance of the proletariat and people to oppression and exploitation in both the developed and underdeveloped countries, they have enacted so-called anti-terrorist laws and are increasingly prone to the use of state terrorism and to sponsor fascist organizations and movements for countering the growing revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

There are anti-imperialist governments like the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Cuba, Vietnam, Venezuela and Syria that effectively assert national independence and the socialist cause. They enjoy the support of the people, stand up against US imperialism and take advantage of the contradictions among the imperialist powers in order to counter sanctions, military blockade and aggression. The people and revolutionary forces led by the proletariat can strengthen themselves in the course of their just struggles.

III. Transition to the resurgence of world proletarian revolution

Since 2019, we have seen the unprecedented rise and spread of gigantic anti-imperialist and democratic mass protests, joined by millions of people and occurring in all the six continents and in both the developed and underdeveloped countries. These are the resistance of the broad masses of the people to the extreme exploitativeness and bankruptcy of the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization and to the escalation of state terrorism and wars of aggression.

I am deeply gratified that the International League of Peoples' Struggle has contributed greatly to the development of the anti-imperialist and democratic mass movement since 2001. The mass protests of 2019 flowed from earlier ones as a result of the persistent stagnation and depression of the world capitalist economy and outrageous failure of the leaders and experts of the imperialist powers and the taskmasters of the client states to solve the economic crisis and avert political crisis.

The Covid-19 pandemic and the lockdowns and other efforts of the authorities to discourage the mass protests failed to diminish and dampen these in 2020. Instead, the pandemic has served to expose the extreme anti-social character and consequences of neoliberalism and rouse the broad masses of the people to rise up against their loss of jobs and incomes, deprivation of social services, the bailouts and stimulus packages for the big bourgeoisie, the escalation of repressive measures and the promotion of fascism in the name of anti-terrorism. It is expected that the mass protests will intensify and spread further in 2021 and thereafter.

Clearly, the world capitalist system and the domestic ruling systems are in a grave and deep going crisis. The imperialist powers and their puppet states fail more than ever in the old way. The worldwide anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles signify the transition to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution. The revolutionary spirit of the Paris Commune of 1871 is once more calling for the further rise of the oppressed and exploited masses and the revolutionary parties of the proletariat against imperialism and all reactionary classes

The massive and sustained mass protests in various countries of Europe, North America, Oceania, Latin America, Asia and Africa bring to the surface the deep-seated detestation of the people for the extreme oppression and exploitation that they are suffering. The proletariat and people of the world are fighting back.

The starting points or inciting moments for the mass protests have been concrete issues of wide variability but they always rise up to the level of condemning imperialism and all reaction and demanding revolutionary change of system. The upsurge of anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles shows that we are definitely in transition to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

The broad masses of the people are rising up against the worst forms of

imperialist oppression and exploitation, such as neoliberalism, austerity measures, gender discrimination, racism, oppression of indigenous peoples, fascism, wars of aggression and environmental destruction. The wanton plunder of the natural resources by monopoly capitalism threatens the very life of humankind with global warming and pandemics even as the danger of nuclear annihilation persists, especially because the imperialist powers are whipping up fascism.

In the last 50 years, we have seen how imperialism, neocolonialism, modern revisionism, neoliberalism, fascism and neoconservatism attack and put down the proletariat and people of the world. Now, the people are resisting as never before and generating new revolutionary forces, including parties of the proletariat and mass organizations that are guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. These will ultimately result in the spread of armed revolutionary movements and the rise of socialist states and people's democracies with a socialist perspective.

While the imperialist powers and their reactionary stooges all over the world are using all kinds of counterrevolutionary violence to suppress the mass protests, there are the reformists and opportunists who claim that these are leaderless and spontaneous and would soon subside upon the peaceful democratization of the rotten ruling systems of the exploiting classes. But already there are Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties and groups striving to develop themselves as revolutionary parties of the proletariat and to build the armed revolutionary organization for seizing political power under the inspiration of the Paris Commune of 1871 and succeeding armed revolutions.

The Filipino people and their revolutionary forces have persevered in the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war and with a socialist perspective in the last more than 50 years. Thus, they are now in the front line of the ongoing anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles and they are making major contributions in the transition to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

Ever loyal to the just revolutionary cause of the proletariat and people, they have waged revolutionary struggle resolutely and militantly and have fought fiercely against the counterrevolutionary campaigns of suppression by the enemy. They have been inspired by the revolutionary spirit of the Paris Commune of 1871 and by all succeeding struggles for national liberation and socialism in the world and

are more than ever determined to contribute to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

They take pride in being referred to as one of the torch bearers of the anti-imperialist struggles of the peoples of the world and the world proletarian revolution. Their revolutionary will and fighting spirit are more than ever higher as their revolutionary struggles are now in concert with the resurgent mass struggles of the proletariat and people on a global scale. We foresee that in the next fifty years the crisis-stricken world capitalist system will continue to break down and give way to the rise of anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist states and societies.

About the Communist Party of China

This interview was the main feature of the webinar in anticipation of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China on the official date of July 1, 1921

Questions from Paaralang Jose Maria Sison, April 25, 2021

Questions: 1. What was the social and international situation that led to the establishment of the CCP? What is the similarity or difference in building their Party (and Army) with the Russians?

JMS: Through the Revolution of 1911 in China, the Ching dynasty was overthrown and the bourgeois Republic of China was established in 1912 under the leadership of Sun Yatsen. But it was betrayed by Yuan Shikai who declared himself emperor of China. China is in turmoil. Warlords dominated the provinces and the imperialist powers soon took advantage of China's situation.

The October Revolution took place in Russia in 1917 and in the following years the Chinese took interest in this revolution hoping to break free from the dark condition of China enveloped by feudalism, comprador capitalism and the domination of imperialist powers. Lenin and the Bolsheviks immediately took an interest in China. Since the establishment of the Comintern in March 1919, it intends to extend the proletarian revolution to China.

In May 1919, the May 4 Movement also erupted among the Chinese youth to oppose Japan's claim to German concessions in accordance with the re-division of the world as a result of World War I. By July 23, 1921, there were an advanced element in China that came from the petty -bourgeois intelligence that sought to become communist and build the Communist Party of China (CPT).

Twelve Chinese, representing about 57 members, gathered in Shanghai to form the CCP.

With the formation of the Social Democratic Labor Party in Russia in 1893 by the Bolsheviks led by Lenin and the Mensheviks led by Martov, most of the founders also came from petty -bourgeois intelligence but immediately recruited workers in accordance with proletarian characteristics. of the Party.

The Bolsheviks deliberately recruited cadres within the Tsarist army to form Soviet (councils) of soldiers to turn the imperialist war into a civil war against Tsarism. At the same time, the Bolsheviks also formed soviet workers and peasants and Red Vanguard who later became part of the Red Army. Thus, the October Revolution was prepared.

When the National Revolutionary Army was formed with the help of the Soviet Union under the First United Front of Guomindang (GMD) and the CPT in the years 1924 to 1927, regiments were formed under the leadership or influence of CCP cadres and members. When Jiang Kaishek betrayed in 1927, these regiments moved to the side of the CCP and reached Jinggangshan where Mao had earlier built guerrilla bases among the peasantry.

2. Can you describe how the CCP promoted the United Front on various issues (Land issues, CPC-KMT relations, Peace Talks, National Minority issues, middle forces issues, etc.), Location (Urban Countryside) and Period (various stages of the civil war, the war against Japan and the establishment of the new republic)

JMS: The GMD and CCP had a First United Front against the northern warlords and they launched the Northern Expedition in 1926-27. During this time, Mao worked among the peasantry to carry out agrarian revolution, guerrilla warfare by the Army and carry out the antifeudal united front in Jinggangshan. Mao led the 1927 Autumn Harvest Uprising.

He built in Jiangxi the Soviet Workers and Peasants and Labor Army that the GMD attempted to destroy through siege campaigns. The CCP defeated these first three campaigns and the CCP grew stronger. But the revolutionary bases were alarmed by the interference and mistakes of the Comintern envoys. And the CCP was forced to make the Long March to Yen'an in 1935.

The GMD and the CCP had a Second United Front Against Japan from 1936 to 1945. In enlarging and strengthening the Red Army, the strategic line of

encircling the cities from the countryside was used. The process of people's war went through three strategic levels of defense, leveling and offense. Respect the independence and rights of national minorities. Thus, they were motivated to take part in the people's war. When the Japanese were defeated and surrendered and World War II ended, the CCP agreed to talk to the GMP about peace in Chongqing in 1945. But what Jiang Kaishek wanted was civil war. The GMD was defeated in the civil war in 1946 to 1949. Thus, the People's Republic of China was established on October 1, 1949.

3. What did the people's government, economic operation, cultural work and international work look like when they were not yet the state in power?

JMS, At the time before the Republic of the People's Republic of China was established in 1949, there was a system of people's government on revolutionary bases. There are organs of political power under the leadership of the CCP at all levels. Based on the basic alliance of the working class and the peasantry. It drives economic, cultural and international affairs.

4. Arousing, organizing and mobilizing the peasantry is vivid in the history of the CCP. On the other hand, can you share the high points in arousing, organizing and mobilizing the youth and workers in the cities and in the countryside (such as Yanan etc.). How did it overcome the White horror of the cities, Japanese aggression and prepare the people of the city to victory?

JMS: Ever since the May 4 Movement in 1919, the young leaders who became communists in 1921 have continued to arouse, organize and mobilize the youth. They have also begun to take action among workers and unions before yet build the CCP. It acted more widely among the workers when the CCP was formed.

Mao was the most zealous in action among the peasants because the majority of the Chinese were landless peasants and therefore agrarian revolution was the main content of the democratic revolution. The Chinese revolution can be advanced and won with the integration of armed struggle, agrarian revolution and the building of revolutionary bases in the countryside.

Due to the action and strengthening of the revolutionary movement among the peasants in the countryside, the CCP and the people's army were able to overcome the White horrors in the cities, the Japanese aggression and the GMD attacks. The participation of the peasants was favorable to the revolution and in

the countryside, there was widespread maneuvering for the people's war. In the countryside, the small and weak people's army can grow and become stronger through the strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare and regular mobilization.

5. During Chinese Socialism, what was the situation of the following: PMLs/ MBKs, officers and staff of the old KMT government, military officers and ordinary soldiers of the KMT, peasants, industrial workers, intellectuals, national bourgeoisie, youth, women, national minorities etc.) How did Mao's time ensure the delivery of basic needs to the people (food, clothing, housing and education) and increase the quality of life (Job security and wage issues, child and old care, health, rest & recreation etc.)

JMS: In the early years of the People's Republic of China land nationalization was proclaimed and carried out and land confiscation from landlords and free distribution of land to landless farmers were made complete. and there is not enough land. The phased advancement of cooperativization was carried out. PMLs who have not committed any serious crimes in the country have been given the opportunity to live decently but have been deprived of the right to vote and be elected to any position in government.

The big bourgeois compradors closest to the enemy were dispossessed, tried on corruption charges and deprived of the right to elect and be elected to government positions. The MBKs who provided assistance and collaborated with the revolutionary movement were given the opportunity to become the national bourgeoisie in accordance with the policies of the socialist state and were allowed to enter their capital into state corporations and private capitalists. This is a transitional initiative.

Government officials who were corrupt, brutal and addicted agents of the enemy class were arrested, tried and punished. But the masses of lower-ranking officers and staff continued to work on managing the CCP cadres and gave them a course of study on socialism. It is likely that before the revolution won, many of the officers and staff were already biased against the revolution.

Officers and ordinary soldiers of the KMT army who surrendered were granted amnesty and made more officers and soldiers of the people's army under the leadership of Party cadres and former commanders of the people's army. There is also the option that KMT officers or soldiers can go home if they do not want to join the people's army or they can be sent home if they are hesitant to enter the

people's army. Officers and soldiers, especially notorious assassins and those under espionage, caught by the people's army were tried and given appropriate punishment in accordance with the evidence-based decision.

The peasants benefited from land reform and cooperation, the industrial workers, from the expansion of production and increase in wages and social services, intellectuals from their freedom and good condition to serve the people, the national bourgeoisie in the opportunity to help socialist industrialization, youth on the opportunity to help build socialism, women in their liberation from patriarchalism and discrimination, and national minorities in respect for their independence and further opportunity to thrive.

In Mao's time the delivery of basic needs to the people (food, clothing, housing and education) and raising the quality of life (job security and higher wages, child and old care, health, rest and recreation etc.) were ensured. With the disappearance of foreign corporations and big bourgeois compradors exporting super-profits from the country, landlords collecting land rent for their luxurious living and banning corruption of officials and punishing the corrupt that officer.

6. How did Socialist China deal with various complex issues in running the new state: Solving the disease brought on by the old society (opium addiction, prostitution, begging, prisoners of common crime, bureaucratic corruption), epidemics), economic and political sabotage by the KMT, harassment both by the US and the revised Soviet Union, natural calamities, environmental protection, border disputes in neighboring countries and dealing with international affairs (party to party, people to people and diplomatic relations) in drafting the front against Imperialism (national liberation movements and decolonization of Africa).

JMS: Socialist China solved the problem of opium addiction and prostitution by dismantling criminal syndicates and arresting its leaders, providing social services, employment and assistance to communities. Regarding begging, those who could afford to work were provided with employment, assistance and treatment for the sick. In the case of prisoners of common crime, they are given the opportunity to change and work, unless maximum security detention due to a felony is required.

Bureaucratic corruption and the economic and political sabotage of the KMT were severely punished. Suppressing epidemics through the cooperation of

health care personnel and communities, the Party mobilizes the masses to resist pressure from both the US and the revisionist Soviet Union, to address natural disasters, carry out environmental protection and guard borders and resolve disputes in neighboring countries.

Addressed international work (party to party, people to people and diplomatic relations). The principles of proletarian internationalism and anti-imperialist solidarity were upheld by the peoples of the world against imperialism and reaction. Formed and formed the ranks of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to fight and win their struggle for national and social freedom. Established and implemented peaceful and friendly line and diplomatic relations based on mutual respect for independence, cooperation and mutual benefit.

7. It is often ridiculed in the bourgeois media and academia that during the 'Great Leap Forward' many died, famine spread and the GPCR as a great tragedy. On the contrary, what can we say about significant achievements and breakthroughs in various fields today?

JMS: The ridicule of the bourgeois and anti-communist media and academics that many died of starvation due to the 'Great Leap Forward' is untrue and mania. Through the Great Leap Forward, China's industrial foundation was expanded and strengthened, the commune system was established as the highest level of agricultural cooperation and China's production and economy grew. The imperialist blockade, the betrayal of the Soviet Union and natural disasters were overcome. China became a strong socialist country because of the Great Leap Forward.

8. Like Marx's summary of the Paris Commune and Mao's summary of the Soviet Economy, what is your summary of socialist construction and GPCR in China? What can be done to hold on to the positive lessons and the negative lessons will not be repeated in the future in the countries that will succeed again in Socialism?

JMS: We must understand that the proletarian and socialist line taken by China in the period of rehabilitation and reconstruction, basic socialization of China's economy, Great Leap Forward and socialist education movement and GPCR is correct. During these stages, the correct policies and implementations of socialist revolution and construction emerged and also the revisionist traitors who restored capitalism in China emerged.

The GPCR was necessary for vigorous resistance to revisionism because of the influence of the Soviet Union and because of the internal bourgeois elements and tendencies in China. The GPCR exposed the proponents of revisionism and the path of the restoration of capitalism. The GPCR was clearly successful in the years 1966 to 1971. The right line was drawn against the revisionists in power and Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping were overthrown by the Red Vanguard youth. As a result of the Shanghai Commune, the three-in-one system of revolutionary committees was established as the organ of political power. The Anshan Constitution was also modelled as a guide to the working classes and the labor movement.

After the Left split on accusing Lin Biao of wanting to be President of China and plotting to assassinate Mao and Lin Biao and the entire staff were killed or killed, Deng Zhao Ping was returned to senior positions, as chief of PLA staff and others. In 1972 Nixon visited China. In the years 1972 to 1976 revisionists and anti-socialists used the rivalry between China and the Soviet Union to link China to the US in the name of modernization, pro-capitalist reform and opening up and integration with the US and the global capitalist system.

As with the defeat of the Paris Commune, it has been proven that the international bourgeoisie can conspire to destroy the proletarian revolutionaries. Ding Xiaoping's successful capitalist counter-revolution proved the fact that there were revisionist traitors within the CPT and state who were confronted by the GPCR under the theory and practice of continuous revolution under the class dictatorship of the proletariat through cultural revolution to fight revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism.

9. How was the process of revisionist betrayal of the principle of Socialism, capitalist restoration until China turned to Imperialism? Can we stage it from Deng Xiaoping, Jiang Zemin, Hu Jintao and Xi Jinping?

JMS: Due to the collusion of the opportunists Right and Centrists, Deng Xiaoping and his accomplices succeeded in carrying out the coup. Against the Left and GPCR, former opponents united in the Great Leap Forward. Cadres loyal to the GPCR were arrested and imprisoned, all those deemed pro-GPCR were removed from the Party, the GPCR was declared a total catastrophe, the communal system was dismantled, many rural and urban industries were privatized, banks were opened of the state to China's former big capitalists, repaid war bonds previously bought by capitalists, enacted laws to allow US and

other imperialist investment to enter and US and China conspired to exploit cheap Chinese labor proletariat.

Since late 1976, especially since 1978, Deng Xiaoping and his accomplices have carried out the restoration of capitalism in China. Liu Shaochi was acquitted in 1980. The big bourgeoisie conspired in the state and private sectors. And its billionaires had control over the Party, the state and the economy. They have been the main partners of the US and China in the implementation of neoliberal globalization since the 1980s.

10. What can we say is the distinctive character of Chinese Imperialism different from the traditional Imperialist countries in the West? Who are the big Chinese companies (State-Private) today in terms of Industry, Commerce, Banking and Investment? (Digitized payments [from QR codes to facial recognition], e-commerce and new ventures in digital currency are prevalent in China. What role will these new innovations play in the ongoing capitalist accumulation and crisis of capitalism?)

JMS: The distinctive character of Chinese imperialism that is different from traditional imperialist countries in the Development is that China has used its large population, the industrial foundation of the former socialist economy, the combination of state and private monopoly capitalism, state planning and the use of state resources and the rapid transfer and development of high technology to accelerate the rapid growth of the economy and military forces. State and private monopoly corporations in industry, commerce, finance and investment work together and coordinate. There are state monopoly corporations in all major parts of China's economy. State monopoly corporations have always had a related monopoly corporation that is private and even sells shares to big capitalists. Take a look at the list of the 500 largest Chinese private corporations.

Let me just mention the 10 with the largest capital: Huawei (in electronics), Pacific Construction Group, Amer International Group (metals), Hengli Group (chemistry), Country Garden Holdings (real estate), Evergrande Group (real estate), Legend Holdings Ltd (electronics), Gome Holdings Group (retail), China Vanke Co Ltd (real estate) and Geely Holding Group (motoring). Huawei's largest capital is 858 yuan or 126 billion and Geerly's is 330 yuan. The 10 largest private banks of China are: China Merchants Bank, Industrial and Commercial Bank of China, Bank of China, Agricultural Bank of China, China Construction Bank, China International Capital Corporation, Bank of Communications,

Shanghai Pudong Development Bank, China CITIC Bank and China Minsheng Bank. The following are the 5 largest private insurance companies: China Life Insurance Company, Ping An Insurance Group, China Pacific Insurance Group, People's Insurance Company of China and New China Life Insurance.

11. Online sources say that the concept of the 9 dash line was still in the Mao era (or earlier in the Kuomintang era) but it did not lead to aggressive claims to the WPS. What is the basis and view of this? Now that the Chinese Imperialist presence in the WPS is growing stronger, what should the Filipino people and the world do in this regard?

JMS: The GMD government first made 9 dash lines and claimed 90 percent of South China in 1947. There was no such claim in the no Mao era. It was only in 2009 that the People's Republic of China began using the 9-dash line to claim the South China Sea in connection with its dispute with Vietnam over Paracels. And then China made aggression in the Philippines by seizing maritime features in the exclusive economic zone to the territorial sea in the West Philippine Sea to create artificial islands that also have the characteristics of military bases. It even destroyed the marine environment and claimed the marine and mineral resources around it.

On Revisionism

Anakbayan Europe ND Line Online

May 2, 2021

Revisionism is the systematic revision of and deviation from Marxism, the basic revolutionary principles of the proletariat laid down by Marx and Engels and further developed by the series of thinkers and leaders in socialist revolution and construction. The revisionists call themselves Marxists, even claim to make an updated and creative application of it but they do so essentially to sugarcoat the bourgeois anti-proletarian and anti-Marxist ideas that they propagate.

The classical revisionists who dominated the Second International in 1912 were in social-democratic parties that acted as tails to bourgeois regimes and supported the war budgets of the capitalist countries in Europe. They denied the revolutionary essence of Marxism and the necessity of proletarian dictatorship, engaged in bourgeois reformism and social pacifism and supported colonialism and modern imperialism. Lenin stood firmly against the classical revisionists, defended Marxism and led the Bolsheviks in establishing the first socialist state in 1917.

The modern revisionists were in the ruling communist parties in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. They systematically revised the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism by denying the continuing existence of exploiting classes and class struggle and the proletarian character of the party and the state in socialist society. And they proceeded to destroy the proletarian party and the socialist state from within. They masqueraded as communists even as they gave up Marxist-Leninist principles. They attacked Stalin in order to replace the principles of Lenin with the discredited fallacies of his social democratic

opponents and claimed to make a “creative application” of Marxism-Leninism.

The total collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, has made it so much easier than before for Marxist-Leninists to sum up the emergence and development of socialism and the peaceful evolution of socialism into capitalism through modern revisionism. It is necessary to trace the entire historical trajectory and draw the correct lessons in the face of the ceaseless efforts of the detractors of Marxism-Leninism to sow ideological and political confusion within the ranks of the revolutionary movement.

In the Philippines, the political group that is most embarrassed, discredited and orphaned by the collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes is that of the Lavas and their successors. It is certainly not the Communist Party of the Philippines, re-established in 1968. But the imperialists, the bourgeois mass media and certain other quarters wish to confuse the situation and try to mock at and shame the Party for the disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes. They are barking at the wrong tree.

1a. A lot will argue that Marxism or any theory for that matter must be progressive -open to changes and interpretation otherwise it is passé. Thus, can you discuss to what extent the interpretation and practice of Marxism borders revisionism? What is modern revisionism and how is it different from the classical revisionism?

JMS: An individual, group or entire party ceases to be communist and becomes revisionist the moment it starts to deviate from and violate the fundamental principles of the universal revolutionary theory of the proletariat and systematically passes off bourgeois ideas as proletarian.

Bernstein of the Second International violated Marxism and became revisionist by claiming that socialism is achieved through peaceful evolution. And Kautsky and others became revisionist by espousing social chauvinism, social pacifism and social imperialism by supporting and tailing after the ruling bourgeoisie in going to war and in engaging in colonialism and imperialism.

The difference between the classical revisionists of the Second International from the modern revisionists is that the latter were in power in socialist society and in the leadership of the communist party, like Khrushchov who espoused

bourgeois populism (party and state of the “whole people”); and bourgeois pacifism (peaceful road, peaceful competition and peaceful coexistence as strategic line of the international communist movement).

1b-Do we then restrict the flow of different theories and ideas for the people to explore? How can we then distinguish then theories and ideas that are genuinely for the people from the one's that can be damaging?

JMS: Communists do not restrict the flow of ideas but know how to distinguish bourgeois ideology from the proletarian. They critique the ideology of the enemy and they are for the development of the proletarian revolutionary theory in accordance with the situation and concrete revolutionary practice. They always welcome new ideas that advance the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat. And they criticize and rectify their own errors and shortcomings within the framework of Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian revolution.

Revisionists are not welcome in a genuine communist party just as communists are not welcome as members among the ranks of the bourgeoisie and atheists are not welcome as members in a religious organization. It is not progressive but retrogressive for a communist party to welcome as members those who take the bourgeois stand, viewpoint and method; and oppose its fundamental principles as a proletarian revolutionary party.

2. How did modern revisionism arise in the Soviet Union and how has it been used to undermine and cause the collapse of the Soviet Union?

JMS: Khrushchov and his ruling clique took advantage of the false notion that classes and class struggle had ceased to exist in the Soviet Union since the promulgation of the 1936 Soviet Constitution and that the point was to build the material and cultural foundation of communism, with his “creative” capitalist-oriented economic reforms and his bourgeois populism and bourgeois pacifism. In fact, in Soviet socialist society, there were still the vestiges of the bourgeoisie, the emergence of a new bourgeoisie in the party and state bureaucracy and the influence and active intrusions of the international bourgeoisie, especially imperialism.

Khrushchov’s complete negation of Stalin, the propagation of modern revisionism, the abandonment of the proletarian line, the further spread of bourgeois ideas and imperialist influence, the recentralization and wastage of

resources in the arms race and in the practice of social-imperialism by Brezhnev and the swing back to Khrushchovite policies under Gorbachov undermined and caused the collapse of the Soviet Union.

3a. Did revisionism from Soviet and Eastern Europe affect the line of the Old Communist Party in the Philippines? In what way? Where did it go wrong?

JMS: The Lavaite revisionists in the old Communist Party established relations with the revisionist Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in the 1960s and followed the Soviet revisionist line by espousing the line of indefinite legal struggle and endless avoidance of armed revolution in the Philippines. This was in contradiction with the Marxist-Leninist line of the re-established CPP that it was possible and necessary to start people's war along the line of the national democratic revolution because of the chronic crisis of the semifeudal and semicolonial Philippine society.

3b. Why is it so important to uphold the Marxist-Leninist line? How can we distinguish the systematic changes in line from revisionism? How can we even uphold the Marxist-Leninist line?

JMS: It is important to follow the Marxist-Leninist line because it spells the advance of the proletarian revolution. Look at how the CPP advanced since its reestablishment by upholding and being guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. And look at how the old CPP has degenerated and has become inconsequential in the Philippines as a result of adhering to revisionism and capitulating to the Marcos fascist regime.

4. What was the basis of the old Communist Party to release and popularize the policy paper, "The Present World Situation and the CPP's General International line and Policies"? What was the effect of this error on the international work of the CPP? Are these errors still visible or felt up to today?

I presume that you are referring to the active role of the old CP in blocking the attempt of some of the leaders of the CPP to establish relations with the CPSU and the Soviet-bloc parties supposedly to seek military assistance from them in the 1980s. Indeed, the old CP stood guard against the effort of the aforesaid CPP leaders to establish relations with the CPSU in the 1980s.

Before and during the Second Great Rectification Movement (SGRM) , which was launched in 1992, the CPP vigorously criticized the error and failed attempt

to establish relations with the CPSU, reconsider its revisionist character and seek Soviet military assistance. The error did not cause grave damage to the CPP international work. The international relations of the CPP have flourished.

The error could not go far because the old CP prevented CPP relations with the CPSU. Both the CPSU as ruling party in power and the Soviet Union started to disintegrate in the late 1980s and they collapsed in 1991. And the CPP and its SGRM thoroughly criticized and repudiated the error.

5. The NDF as the political arm of the CPP can seek relations with other anti-imperialist and national liberation formations. Why is it then wrong for the CPP itself to establish fraternal relations with these formations? Why not also with the CPSU? Is there a difference?

JMS: One should not speak of the NDFP as the political arm of the CPP as if the CPP is not itself a political party. The CPP can have fraternal or comradely relations with genuine communist and workers' parties as well as friendly relations with anti-imperialist and national liberation movements.

At the time that some CPP leaders in the early 1980s wished to have relations with the CPSU, the latter wanted the CPP to change its previous position that the CPSU was revisionist and that the Soviet Union was social imperialist. Friendly or comradely relations were impossible. The CPSU also wanted the CPP to collaborate with the the revisionist old CP and its line of supporting the Marcos fascist regime. It was futile to expect military assistance for revolution from the Soviet Union which was deeply into collaboration with the Marcos regime.

6a. Why do we say that building proletarian dictatorship is a prerequisite to building socialism?

JMS: Proletarian class dictatorship simply means the socialist state, like the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie means the capitalist or bourgeois state. The socialist state of the proletariat is a prerequisite to building socialism. Socialism is impossible without the socialist state being established first.

6b. Stalin is perhaps one of the most vilified historical personalities, in some cases he even exceeds Mao's vilification. In Europe, he is known as a great commander who defeated the fascism of Hitler. But he is also known to be a 'dictator' whose evil is equal to Hitler. Before we jump to the next question, can you quickly introduce Stalin to our viewers and listeners.

JMS: Any proletarian revolutionary thinker and leader with great achievements, like Stalin or Mao, is treated as personification of socialism by anti-communist powers and propagandists and is vilified as a shortcut to vilify the entire socialist system. The achievements of Stalin in socialist revolution and socialist construction and defeating fascism are undeniable and should be put forward. The lies of the anti-communists against Stalin and Mao try to deny the great advance of democracy through the liberation and empowerment of the toiling masses and the great advances in economic construction.

7. Upon the death of Vladimir Lenin, Stalin took the leadership and managed to continue policies and the line that Lenin started. However, in the new constitution he declared in 1936, he states that there were no more class struggle and exploiting classes in the Soviet Union. Why is this claim wrong in the first place and how significant was his error?

JMS: Stalin and the CPSU were so happy with the victories of the socialist revolution and construction in 1936 that they thought that classes and struggle had disappeared in the Soviet Union. As I have earlier pointed out, the wrong presumption that there were no longer classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union would open the way for the revisionists to further cover up the persistence and influence of the bourgeoisie and misrepresent bourgeois ideas and policies as socialist. Proletarian revolutionary education would be undermined and derailed.

8. It took Stalin 20 years to build a Socialist country but it took longer for the revisionists to restore the capitalist society. What does it say about socialism?

The socialism that Stalin built was durable despite the Nazi invasion and occupation of the Soviet Union and the devastation wrought on the Soviet economy during World War II. Stalin practically industrialized the Soviet Union twice, from 1927 onward; and again from 1945 onward. Indeed, the revisionists took a long time to undermine and destroy the Soviet Union.

9. How did then this modern revisionism overthrow the proletarian dictatorship and convert it to monopoly bureaucrat capitalism? For the benefit of our audience can you also please give context to what monopoly bureaucrat capitalism is?

JMS: As early as 1956, the revisionist ruling clique of Khrushchov overthrew

the proletariat by completely negating Stalin and implementing anti-socialist policies. At every level of the Soviet state and economy, the bureaucrats became bourgeois and corrupt, seeking not only perks and privileges within the confines of their offices but stretching their hands to take cuts from private enterprises and transactions. The highest of these bureaucrats became the monopoly bureaucrat capitalists.

10a. In what way did Khrushchov undo the works of Lenin and Stalin in building socialism?

Khrushchov put forward and spread his ideas of bourgeois populism and bourgeois fascism and dismantled the socialist economy by decentralizing and autonomizing state enterprises and collectives and making them responsible for their cost and profit accounting. Managers were given hire and fire power over the workers. Kulaks reemerged in the collectives and the bureaucrat capitalists enriched themselves at every level of the Soviet state and economy.

You can review the article “Stand for Socialism against Modern Revisionism” to know more about how Khrushchov dismantled socialism in the Soviet Union.

10b. Can we then assume that bureaucratism and intelligentsia in the Party can lead to revisionism as seen by the likes of Khrushchov?

JMS: Of course, bureaucratism and the intelligentsia within the Party can lead to bourgeoisification if not checked by Marxist-Leninist education and practice. Bureaucrats and the intelligentsia can become divorced from the masses and revolution, preoccupy themselves with perks and privileges and resurrect the bourgeoisie among themselves.

11. How did Khrushchov ‘s successor Brezhnev, maximise revisionism in restoring capitalism? How did they entice the people to join the capitalist restoration?

JMS: By decentralizing the Soviet economy, Khrushchov put it into shambles the Soviet economy and was subsequently ousted by Brezhnev in 1964. Brezhnev recentralized the economy in order to have more funds for the center of the empire to engage in the arms race with the US, to carry out social-imperialist adventures from Czechoslovakia to Afghanistan and to feed the corruption of the central bureaucrats and their collaboration with a Mafia-type criminal bourgeoisie which was expert at stealing from the Soviet factories,

collectives and state banks.

11b.-can you talk more about Brezhnev?

It was during the time of Brezhnev from 1964 onward that the Soviet Union wasted tremendous amounts of public resources in bureaucratic corruption and military overspending in the arms race and in a war of aggression as in Afghanistan. His revisionist clique made the Soviet economy bleed and decline. This set the ground for Gorbachov to put forward his brazen anti-socialist bourgeois “new thinking” and perestroika from 1985 onward.

12a. Gorbachev completed the fall of Soviet Union and his regime has been more influenced by the Western ideas. In what way did his regime push the full restoration of the capitalist society in now Russia?

JMS: Gorbachov made use of Brezhnev’s bungling of the Soviet economy and the costliness of social-imperialism to swing back to the Khrushchov line. He was able to make the Soviet Union deteriorate further and formally go into a collapse by tolerating the corrupt bureaucrats and the criminal syndicates that had grown large during the Brezhnev regime, and secretly promoted separatist currents among the Soviet republics in collaboration with Yeltsin showing the way how Russia no less could break away from the Soviet Union.

12b. Did the restorations to capitalism start the Russian oligarchs?

JMS: Of course, modern revisionism and capitalist restoration brought about the rise of the Russian oligarchs who are monopoly bureaucrat capitalists and the mafia lords of private business who stole their assets from the state. From Khrushchov through Brezhnev to Gorbachov, the state and private monopoly capitalists as well as the criminal syndicates grew. The growth of private enterprises provided cover for criminal appropriation of the social wealth created by the working people and for systematic theft of the flow of products from the factories and farms.

13. What lessons does the CPP get from this historical event of the rise and fall of the Soviet? By the looks of it, lack of ideological struggle and consolidation gave rise to modern revisionism, what can you say about this?

JMS: There is a wide range of lessons for the CPP to learn from the rise, degeneration and collapse of the Soviet Union. The most important lesson is to

adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, to always promote the proletarian revolutionary education and to apply the proletarian revolutionary stand, viewpoint and method in the class struggle against the bourgeoisie.

14. How can the revolutionaries deliver the people from the evil that is revisionism?

JMS: We have observed how modern revisionism went on in the Soviet Union until its collapse and how it was confronted by Mao and the Communist Party of China through ideological debate with the CPSU from 1956 onward and through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) from 1966 onward.

We have learned a lot of principles and methods in combating revisionism in the GPCR but because this was defeated eventually in 1976, we have to study further and learn further in dealing with this problem. We deal with this problem in connection with new conditions.

15. How can the socialist construction and wealth distribution assure that it will not give rise to modern revisionism, should another socialist state be established again?

JMS: The problem of modern revisionism will always have the potential of reemerging to counter socialism. There is no alternative but to fight and defeat it. Otherwise, capitalism cannot be defeated. It is a problem that arises within socialism and it must be solved so as to consolidate and advance socialism toward communism.

16. Before we proceed to the second part of our program, anything to add on this topic?

JMS: I prefer to give more time to our listeners to raise their questions.

On Socialism and Related Issues

Interview by Alf Beckinsale, Libya Jamahiriyah May 15, 2021

The following is an interview which I conducted with Comrade Jose Maria Sison, the Founding Chairman of the Communist Party of the Philippines and Chairman Emeritus of the International League of People's Struggle. Comrade Joma is a proletarian internationalist, a Filipino patriot, and a revolutionary. Joma has written many books, including Basic Principles of Marxism-Leninism: A Primer, and Selected Readings from the Works of Jose Maria Sison. Joma can be found on twitter at @JoseMariaSison or his website (<https://josemariasison.org/>).

1. Q: One topic of contention amongst Marxists is the question of whether or not there are currently, any states that have either built or are in the process of building socialism, what is your view on this issue.

JMS: There are still significant remnants of the series of socialist countries that arose in the 20th century. On the whole, the DPRK is a socialist country. Cuba has certain significant socialist features. These so-called remnants can be appreciated for having outlived the former socialist countries that have taken the capitalist road for many decades already.

2. Q: On a similar note, which countries would you say historically developed socialism?

JMS: They include the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of Mongolia, China, Vietnam, DPRK, German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea and Laos. You can supply any country that I have overlooked.

3. Q: Which countries today would you define as having reached imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism?

JMS: You have the traditional ones (the UK, US, Canada, Germany, Japan, France, Netherlands, Belgium and the like) and the new ones (Russia and China).

4. Q: A trend I have observed emerging on the left lately, a trend which I observe to be a harmful and revisionist one, and one which often leads to electoralism, is so-called “lesser-evilism”, for instance, last year, many self-proclaimed “leftists” advocated for voting for Joe Biden, due to the fact that in their view this would be better than Donald Trump, ignoring Biden’s own heinous imperialist record. Inevitably, this has led many to proclaim that socialism can be won by voting. What would your advice be to combat this, and the modern revisionism of today more broadly?

JMS: You are correct in describing Biden and criticizing those who have obscured his rabid imperialist track record. It remains important and necessary to keep an ideological Marxist-Leninist-Maoist stand against bourgeois reformism and electoralism as well as against modern revisionism. However, there may be political flexibility in allowing anti-imperialist solidarity with certain countries which assert national independence and have socialist aspirations even if they were previously associated with Soviet modern revisionism. The correctness of the Marxist-Leninist critique of modern revisionism is well proven by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Dengist counterrevolution and capitalist restoration in China.

We must recognize that the world proletarian revolution or socialist cause has suffered a big setback since its peak before 1956 and the US became the sole superpower from 1991 onward and rode high on the policies of anti-communism, neocolonialism, neoliberalism, state terrorism, neoconservatism (endless wars of aggression). Most importantly, we must recognize that all these policies have gone bankrupt and have in fact accelerated the strategic decline of the US in the 21st century and the current rise of anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles on a global scale which are generating conditions for the rise of proletarian revolutionary parties and the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

5. Q: Of course, many communist parties have succumbed to modern

revisionism, in your opinion, how can we rebuild the communist parties that were taken by revisionism?

JMS: Communist parties that succumbed to modern revisionism underwent various ways of completely ending the pretense of being communist. Outside of the revisionist-ruled countries, some communist parties completely disintegrated after the collapse of the Soviet Union and others split with one part trying to be social democratic and the other part becoming a dwindling club of old folks. Within the former revisionist-ruled countries, the previous ruling communist parties were generally put out of existence or put aside by the bourgeois parties. Some of the assets of the CPSU were conceded to its Russian replacement and the latter persisted as a declining castrated revisionist party. In China, the communist party has been taken over by the bourgeoisie since the Dengist counterrevolution which expelled all genuine communists and enrolled the supporters of capitalist restoration. It continues as the center of political authority and legitimator of the state and economy dominated by the partnership of the monopoly bureaucrat capitalists and the private monopoly capitalists.

It is impossible to rebuild the old revisionist parties and convert them to genuine communist parties after so many decades of disintegration or decline. Many of the old revisionist folks are either dead or too old. It is more effective to build communist parties by bringing together those groups and individuals who have been guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and recruit and develop party members from the ranks of advanced activists in the current anti-imperialist and democratic mass organizations and movements. It is fine if there is already a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party that one can join in a certain country. If none, such a party should be built. The founders can start with the advanced elements of the current mass movement who wish to build a new Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party.

6. Q: One question I would like to ask you, considering the work I am currently doing on the topic, is what is your opinion on Muammar Gaddafi, and the present-day Green Resistance movement, a movement of those who were loyal to Gaddafi, who fought against NATO imperialism and colonialism?

JMS: Muammar Gaddafi was a great anti-imperialist leader. For decades he fought hard against NATO imperialism and colonialism. Thus, the US, UK, France and NATO imperialism did everything to attack and overthrow his government. Gaddafi enabled democratic reforms and provided substantial

social benefits to the people from the oil income of Libya. It is important for the Green Resistance movement to cherish, perpetuate and develop the legacy of Gaddafi.

7. Q: The previous question could also be linked to the broader question of should communists support non-communist, but still progressive, anti-imperialist movements and governments, such as for instance the Polisario Front in the Sahara, and the anti-imperialist resistance in Yemen, what is your stance on this?

JMS: Of course, communists should engage in anti-imperialist solidarity, alliance, mutual support and cooperation with non-communist, progressive and anti-imperialist movements and governments, like the Polisario Front and the anti-imperialist resistance in Yemen. It would be dogmatism for communists to impose ideological principles on all types of relations and policies in the political field.

8. Q: Of course there are many revolutionary struggles, including people's wars and wars of national liberation, ongoing all around the world. Which countries would you identify as currently having strong revolutionary potential and do you envisage any ongoing people's wars being victorious in the near future?

JMS: The most outstanding people's wars and wars of national liberation include those in India, Philippines, Nepal, West Papua, Myanmar, Turkey, Kurdistan, Donbas region, Palestine, Colombia and Peru. All of them have a strong revolutionary potential. We must grasp the point that the world capitalist system is in the throes of an unprecedented crisis due to the aggravation of the crisis of overproduction by imperialist policies against the working class and against the oppressed peoples and nations. The various forms of anti-imperialist and democratic struggles have burst out all over the world and are favorable to all forms of revolutionary struggle and the resurgence of the world proletarian-socialist revolution.

9. Q: Another trend that has been emerging amongst some, particularly amongst some Maoists, is a trend known as "Third Worldism", this is essentially the view that the First World has no revolutionary potential, some Third Worldists go as far as to say that there is no proletariat in the First World, and that the entire population of the First World constitutes a labour aristocracy. What is your view on this school of thought?

JMS: I do not agree with the trend known as “Third Worldism” which is dismissive of the revolutionary potential of the proletariat in the industrial capitalist countries. I do not agree with such notions as that the First World has no revolutionary potential, that there is no proletariat in the First World, and that the entire population of the First World constitutes a labour aristocracy. These notions are nonsense. The crisis of capitalist countries, aggravated by the neoliberal policy of unbridled greed, is now characterized by the extreme exploitation and oppression of the working class, the

dwindling of the so-called middle class and the precarity and economic proletarianization of the petty bourgeoisie. What is needed now in the industrial capitalist countries is the building of proletarian revolutionary parties that can generate and intensify the campaigns to arouse, organize and mobilize the proletariat and people against monopoly capitalism and for democracy and socialism.

10. Q: In your view, for revolutionaries in Europe and the First World more broadly, what revolutionary strategy do you think we should pursue?

JMS: In Europe and the entire First World, you cannot avoid engaging first in building the genuine communist party and the mass movement and striving to win the battle for democracy against everything that the monopoly bourgeoisie can throw at the proletariat, including the coercive apparatuses of the state and the ideas of anti-communism, conservatism, liberalism, social democracy, neoliberalism and fascism. It is only through the process of mass struggles that you can strengthen the communist party, the mass organizations and the organizations of self-defense in mass organizations and communities. There must be such organizations for self-defense and Bolshevik style efforts to send cadres into the reactionary army.

A communist party that tries to start any kind of armed revolution without any strong and wide mass base, without self-defense organizations and without the ruling system being sufficiently weakened by systematic crisis and imperialist war will be smashed in a matter of days or even hours. Only the infantile type of Maoists and agents provocateurs can suggest waging a protracted people’s war in industrial capitalist countries in which the rural population is less than 5 percent of the national population and consists of rich peasants and farm workers employed mainly by farm capitalists. So far no group of infantile Maoists has launched an armed revolution in either cities or countryside of any imperialist

countries for more than 20 years.

In the past, inter-imperialist wars like World War I and II provided favorable conditions for partisan warfare in both urban and rural areas in Europe. But the imperialist powers themselves have avoided direct inter-imperialist wars because of their fear of mutually assured destruction with the use of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. The inter-imperialist policy in the last more than 70 years has been to shift the burden of capitalist crisis to the third world countries and to unleash aggressive wars against recalcitrant countries in the third world. It is therefore of great importance to correlate and encourage the interactive development of revolutionary mass struggles of various forms in both developed and underdeveloped countries of the world.

11. Q: One particularly disturbing trend that has been emerging is the rise of right-wing anti-communist propaganda, as well as fascism. What is your advice on how to combat this?

JMS: The emergence of right-wing anti-communist propaganda and fascist groups is a clear sign that the monopoly capitalism is in a grave crisis and that the monopoly bourgeoisie is promoting and funding the rise of the ultra-reactionary trend and groups in order to preempt and block the rise of the anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist movements. The way to combat the anti-communist and fascist trend and groups is to build the revolutionary party of the proletariat, raise the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat and entire people about the crisis of capitalism and the need for immediate reforms as well as the need for socialist revolution, organize various types of mass organizations as well as organizations of community self-defense and self-defense groups within mass organizations and keep on mobilizing more people in campaigns against capitalism and imperialism and for democracy and socialism.

12. Q: As you know, there are many different tendencies amongst the left, anti-capitalist movement, including, for instance, anarchism. Many on the left have of recent been proposing an idea called "left unity", that is the unity of all sections of the left, from Marxist-Leninist-Maoists to anarchists, what is your opinion on this idea?

JMS: Any alliance that may be called Left Unity can be firm in principle against the common enemy that is imperialism together with all its monstrosities like neoliberalism, fascism, state terrorism and wars of aggression. But there must be

political flexibility to allow the unity of communists and non-communists. Their parties and organizations have independence and initiative and agree on the basis of consensus and broad political principles and policies. The alliance may have a consultative and consensual committee or secretariat to coordinate meetings and mass actions. The alliance should not include any entity whose sole or main objective is to disrupt or prevent the alliance.

On The Theory Of Continuing Revolution under Proletarian Dictatorship

Guide Questions from ND Online School of Anakbayan-Europe

Answers by Prof. Jose Maria Sison

Founding Chairman, Communist Party of the Philippines

June 13, 2021

1. The theory of continuing revolution comes as a major Maoist political thought. Could you expound on this in the context Chairman Mao's time when this political theory developed. How would you consider this theory significant to the continuing institutionalization of the Communist Party of the Philippines?

JMS: I presume that you are referring to Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship or socialism through repeated cultural revolution in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism.

In the time of Mao, the Communist Party of China considered the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship and its application in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution as his greatest contribution to the entire theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism because it confronted the phenomenon of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) having become revisionist and having put the Soviet Union on the road to capitalist restoration.

Since then, the Communist Party of the Philippines and many other parties agreed with the CPC under the leadership of Mao. The said theory presumes that in socialist society classes and class struggle continue to exist and that if the Marxist-Leninist party and the proletariat do not watch out either this fact can be overlooked, mishandled or allowed to run with the bourgeoisie growing peacefully until it overthrows the proletariat.

Mao learned from the teaching of Lenin that after its defeat in a certain country

like the Soviet Union the bourgeoisie would multiply its resistance 10,000-fold, taking advantage of old ideas, customs and habits based on self-interest and private property and getting the support and assistance of the international bourgeoisie. In arriving at his theory of continuing revolution, Mao studied the history of the Soviet Union and its circumstances under modern revisionism.

In 1936, Stalin was so happy with the success of the first two five-year economic plans that he had it enshrined in the Soviet constitution that there were no more classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union. He thought that there could only be the imperialists and their agents that would subvert socialism. He overlooked the remnants old bourgeoisie and the new sprouts of the bourgeoisie in the intelligentsia and the bureaucracy.

After the modern revisionists headed by Khrushchov took over the CPSU and the Soviet state and completely negated Stalin in 1956, they kept on harping that the proletariat had accomplished its historic role of building socialism and that the revisionists could simply build the material and cultural foundation of communism in years or so through economic construction. The implication was that the proletariat had done its job and that it was no longer needed to keep socialism going because the well-educated and the experts could very well do their job.

The revisionists in China were brusquer when Mao pointed out that classes and class struggle continued to exist and that the class struggle by the proletariat was the key link to consolidating and expanding socialism until communism is attained. The modern revisionists, like Liu Shaochi, Deng Xiaoping and others said that class struggle was dying out and that the most intense of it was already over.

They believed that building socialism and advancing towards communism was merely a matter of developing the forces of production. They considered as unnecessary to revolutionize the superstructure in order to enhance the revolutionization of the mode of production.

Mao stood firm on his theory and practice of continuing revolution through cultural revolution under proletarian dictatorship and he was successful, especially in the first five years of the GPCR, but eventually he was outmaneuvered by the Rightists and Centrists who discredited the GPCR as all disorder and catastrophe and pushed “modernization” to make capitalist-oriented

reforms, open up to the West and reintegrate China to the world capitalist system.

The restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and China proves beyond doubt the correctness of Mao in posing the problem of modern revisionism or precisely the problem of continuing classes and class struggle in socialist society. Mao was well guided by the teaching of Lenin that after defeat the bourgeoisie multiplies its resistance to socialism and that it would take a whole historical epoch to build socialism before communism is achieved.

2. Is the theory originally a Maoist contribution to political theory or it resonates from Marxist and Leninist political school of thought? How did this Maoist theory resonate from the Marxist and Leninist Philosophy? From what basic Marxist and/or Leninist works did this resonate?

JMS: Mao's theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism was an original and immense contribution to the development of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. His great predecessors from Marx to Lenin did not have the opportunity to confront, analyze and combat modern revisionism, the phenomenon of nominal communists in power propagating and applying bourgeois ideology within the communist party and the socialist state.

The most that Marx and Engels knew and studied as proletarian dictatorship was the Paris Commune. Lenin had the opportunity to debate and struggle with the classical revisionists, the social democrats who were mere tails of the bourgeoisie in the bourgeois parliament but not with the modern revisionists like Khrushchov and Brezhnev who were leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet Union. It became the responsibility of Mao to confront them and to develop the theory and practice against modern revisionism.

But Mao was keenly aware of Lenin's writings and teachings that after the defeat the bourgeoisie in a certain country it multiplies its resistance and is assisted by the international bourgeoisie, that classes and class struggle continue to exist in socialist society and that it takes a whole historical epoch to build socialism. During the GPCR, Mao pointed out that classless communism is not possible until imperialism is defeated. Socialism is still necessarily a class society ruled by the proletariat, using its state power to prevail over and defeat the bourgeoisie

and ensure democracy for the people.

3. Prior to the Maoist theory on contradiction, Marx posits on the prerequisites of a sound relationship between revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice or a revolution as rendered to be a great failure should revolutionary theory be inconsistent with revolutionary practice. But Maoist theory puts the law on contradiction at the heart of the “theory on continuing revolution”. Will this not run counter or redundant to what Marx posits as the prerequisites of a successful revolution? Why and why not?

JMS: From Marx to Mao, the great communist thinkers studied and made formulations about dialectical materialism on the basis of material facts and developments in the natural and social sciences, in history, political economy, in social investigation, mass work and waging revolution on the basis of the history and concrete circumstances of particular countries. They do not speculate with sheer imagination and abstract terms.

Mao was an excellent student of his great predecessors on the subject of dialectical materialism and the laws of contradiction. In his writings *On Contradiction* and *On Practice*, he elaborated on Lenin’s identification of the unity of opposites as the most fundamental of the three laws of contradiction that Engels laid out. You cannot say that Mao flies away from material reality and revolutionary practice if you read his philosophical writings.

Mao did not invent the problem of modern revisionism as an abstract problem. He studied the reality of modern revisionism and capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and other Soviet-led countries as well as the Rightist and revisionist currents in the Communist Party of China itself.

Only by studying and criticizing modern revisionism as a concrete problem did he put forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship. Through the GPCR, he had to learn further what to do in the class struggle within Chinese socialist society. He was successful mainly in the first five years. But he would be outmaneuvered by the capitalist-roaders who were blatant Rightists and who disguised themselves as centrists in the ten-year course of the GPCR.

The materiality of the practical problem of modern revisionism is well-proven by the restoration of capitalism in China after the defeat of the GPCR. But the

GPCR bequeathed to us the principles and methods for combating modern revisionism in future socialist revolutions. Without Mao's theory and practice of the GPCR, we would be at a loss now on how to explain the restoration of capitalism, in the Soviet Union, Soviet bloc countries, Yugoslavia and China.

4. There were ramifications of contradictions that Marx's political thought had pointed out. Which part of these ramifications of contradictions should be considered salient to the manifestation of the theory on continuing revolution, the one that points to principal contradictions as opposed to secondary contradictions or those of the universal as opposed to particular contradictions? Why?

JMS: It was beyond Marx to anticipate and speculate about modern revisionism. Marx was great enough to lay down the basic principles of Marxism in the era of free competition capitalism by critiquing the capitalist political economy in *Das Capital*, giving an outline of the socialist revolution of the proletariat in *The Communist Manifesto* and by analyzing the success and defeat of Paris Commune of 1871 in the Civil War in France.

As thinker and leader of the Chinese revolution, Mao consistently used dialectical materialism to analyze the Chinese revolution from the stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution to the stage of socialist revolution and onward when he confronted modern revisionism not only in the Soviet Union but also in China. It became the task of Mao to analyze and act on the classes and class struggle in Chinese society in his time.

In accordance with his own learning from his predecessors, Marx and Lenin, his own writings on contradiction and on practice, he summed up and analyzed Chinese society, distinguishing principal and secondary contradictions and solving complex problems; and penetrating the principal and secondary aspects of every contradiction in order to move the Chinese revolution from one stage to another.

5. Is the Cultural Revolution waged in China considered as the evident praxis on the Maoist political theory on the "continuing revolution"? How is the theory on "continuing revolution" reflective as part or, as forerunner of the Chinese Cultural Revolution at that time?

JMS: The theory and practice or the praxis of continuing revolution under

proletarian dictatorship through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was carried out from 1966 to 1976, ending in defeat with the Dengist counterrevolutionary coup. There has been only one proletarian cultural revolution in China in accordance with Mao's theory and practice

This theory asserts that not only one cultural revolution but repeated cultural revolutions were needed in the entire epoch of socialism in China. But the problem now is that China has become capitalist and it would take more than cultural revolutions to go back to socialism. It has been proven by modern revisionism that socialism can retrogress peacefully to capitalism. But so far in history there is yet no proof that socialism can arise or re-arise from capitalism peacefully.

6. Common to states struggling against the capitalist world order is a two-stage revolution that is said to be engaged in order to proceed to a clear-cut socialist reconstruction proper. The first stage is said to be categorized as a "bourgeois revolution" such as an agrarian revolution to pave the way for massive land redistribution (also termed as genuine assets reforms and genuine assets redistribution), and then second, a "socialist revolution" that which pushes to socialize the means of production into the hands of the toiling proletariat. Would you consider the Cultural Revolution as distinct from the two-stage revolution? How and why?

JMS: The two-stage revolution is necessary as in the past semicolonial and semifeudal China and as in the current semifeudal Philippines. In China the GPCR was carried out as a distinct revolutionary movement after the victory of the two-stage revolution. It was carried out to combat modern revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

The socialist revolution and construction that followed the bourgeois democratic revolution, of undoing the semicolonial and semifeudal conditions confronted problems such as the imperialist blockade, Soviet revisionist abandonment and the emergence of Rightist and revisionist currents among the educated and bureaucrats in China.

Mao put forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through repeated cultural revolutions in order to fight and defeat the emergence and development of modern revisionism. The theory acknowledges that the modern revisionists at first use the cultural field to promote bourgeois

ideology before this becomes effective in the economic and political fields.

7. How does this theory on “continuing revolution” apply to the current set up of the Communist Party of the Philippines? Do you consider this significant and effective in the advancement of the Filipino people’s struggle for national freedom and democracy? Why, and how?

JMS: In the current stage of the Philippine revolution, we are continuing the unfinished bourgeois-democratic revolution started by Andres Bonifacio but was interrupted by US imperialism and its subsequent development of the semicolonial and semifeudal conditions.

But this time the proletariat is the leading class in the revolution and no longer the liberal bourgeoisie. And the theoretical guide to revolutionary action is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and no longer bourgeois-liberalism in the current world era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution.

We have to win first the people’s democratic revolution against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic and proceed to the socialist revolution and construction before we are possibly confronted by the problem of modern revisionists in power and need to avail of the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through the cultural revolution, like the GPCR on China.

We consider Mao’s theory and practice of proletarian cultural revolution as significant and useful and effective in the advancement of the Filipino people’s struggle for national freedom and democracy because it reminds us to take seriously the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist education of the CPP and the advanced elements of the mass movement and the leading role of the proletariat in carrying out the Philippine revolution now and in the future in the cultural, political, economic and social fields.

In addition, we need to grasp the aforesaid theory and practice in order to understand how grave a problem it is in socialist society and how it has resulted in capitalist restoration. At the same time, we learn the principles and methods of carrying out the cultural revolution and have the confidence that in the future we shall be able to combat modern revisionism more effectively, consolidate socialism and prevent the restoration of capitalism.

On the Philippines, US, China and other Matters

Interview by Carlo Francisco of Red Sails

July 26, 2021

Good day Professor Sison. I writing on behalf of Red Sails (<https://redsails.org>) - we are a small Marxist-Leninist publication and are interested in your thoughts on a number of matters related to the Philippines, China, and Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. We heard from the PRWC Twitter account that you would be interested in sharing your perspective.

Without further ado, here are the questions.

1. Let's start with recent developments in the Philippines. Under President Duterte, the Philippine government has had one of the most ineffective COVID-19 responses in Asia -from slowing the spread, to minimizing economic fallout from lockdowns, to vaccine deployment. In the meantime, this administration has also ramped up its state-sponsored red-tagging effort with the Anti-Terrorism Law of 2020, which gave legal backing to the already ongoing practice of cracking down on various social justice and human rights organizations. Previously, you have pointed out the similarities between the Duterte and Marcos regimes, in particular their open embrace of state terror. How is the situation different today? In particular, what is your analysis as to the material and social conditions that have prevented a mass anti-fascist uprising like what we saw with the People Power Revolution?

JMS: I agree with you that Duterte has failed to adopt and implement the necessary measures to slow down the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic, to minimize the economic fallout from the lockdowns and to promptly acquire and

deploy the vaccines. In the first place, he ignored the advice of health experts to restrict travel from China and allowed the pandemic to spread from December 2019 to March 2020 by letting in more than 500,000 Chinese tourists and casino players.

The main concern of Duterte during the pandemic has been to steal public money and push forward his scheme of fascist dictatorship. He caused the congressional appropriation of hundreds of millions of pesos and has increased the public debt by two trillion pesos supposedly for mass testing, acquisition of vaccines and medical equipment and economic assistance for those who lost their jobs and other means of livelihood. But most of the money has been wasted on bureaucratic and military corruption, with Duterte taking the lion's share.

He has put generals, instead of health experts in the national task force in charge of fighting the pandemic. He has militarized the lockdowns in order to intimidate the people; railroaded the legislation of the so-called Anti-Terror Law of 2020; increased the budget for the military and police in the name of anti-communism and antiterrorism; and has escalated both the bogus war on drugs and counterrevolutionary campaigns of state terrorism in both urban and rural areas.

The Marcos and Duterte regimes are quite similar in unleashing state terrorism against the people. But the difference is that Duterte within the span of 5 years has done far worse in extrajudicial killings than Marcos. Marcos was held accountable for 3500 extrajudicial killings. Duterte has scored 33,000 extrajudicial killings. And the economic, social and political crisis of the ruling system is now far worse than during the time of Marcos. The armed revolutionary movement has therefore become much stronger. Also, we should not underestimate the consequences of the health crisis and Duterte's accountability for this.

The people are outraged and are desirous of revolutionary change. So many people are joining the people's army and the urban underground, according to reliable reports. Despite the restrictions set by the military and police on mass gatherings, mass protest actions are intensifying and spreading. The volcano is already rumbling and is bound to explode soon, especially if Duterte insists on using foul means to prolong his stay in power beyond 2022.

2. The Philippines also has elections coming up in 2022. (I promise this will be the only question about bourgeois elections.) Duterte stands as an obstacle for

the resumption of peace talks with the CPP-NPA. Would any foreseeable electoral outcome open up the possibility of a diplomatic approach?

JMS: Duterte is confident that he can get his daughter Sara elected to the presidency and himself to vice presidency through the 2022 presidential elections because he controls the national vote count through his Comelec appointees and through the TIM Corporation, which he and his crony Dennis Uy own; and is the Philippine counterpart of Smartmatic. He can again rig the presidential elections as he did the 2019 mid-term elections, which enabled him to capture both houses of Congress.

And he is ready to declare a pseudo-revolutionary government before or after the 2022 elections in order to counter the possible mass uprisings of the people as in 1986 against the fascist dictator Marcos. There is yet no clear indication whether the electoral opposition has succeeded in persuading the US to require Smartmatic to follow definite measures to ensure a clean vote count. Otherwise, there will be more social turmoil for the ruling system if the elections are fraudulent and manipulated under the current conditions of state terrorism.

If Duterte stays in power, with his daughter as his stooge, there will certainly be no resumption of the peace negotiations. In response, the revolutionary movement will be focused on waging the people's war. If the electoral opposition wins in the 2022 elections, there is a possibility for the peace negotiations to resume. But we have to know first who will be the new president and how different is he or she from previous reactionary presidents who pretended to be for peace negotiations and yet were interested only in the capitulation or military suppression of the revolutionary movement.

In view of the rapidly worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and that of the Philippine ruling system, the conditions are increasingly favorable for the people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war. If the new president does not like to negotiate a just peace, then there is no choice for the people and their revolutionary forces but to keep on fighting without being distracted by peace negotiations.

If the new president seriously wants peace negotiations, then these can be resumed in accordance with the GRP-NDFP Joint Declaration which sets forth the aims and purposes of the negotiations, the substantive agenda of basic economic, social, political and constitutional reforms and the methods of

negotiating and drafting the comprehensive agreements.

3. One aspect of Philippine politics that cannot be ignored is its position in the great power competition between the United States and China. You have made clear that you share the analysis of the CPP and other Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties -that China and the United States are locked in an intensifying inter-imperialist rivalry, and that the only way out for the Philippines is to assert its sovereignty and free itself from domination by both Chinese and US capital. Today, the US enforces sanctions and other limits to the development of socialist states like Cuba and the DPRK, transitional states with socialist governments like Venezuela and Bolivia, and non-socialist states like Iran. On the other hand, the governments of these nations have engaged in extensive diplomatic and economic relations with China's government, which has helped them survive while under siege. If, say, elements of the NDF gained control within the existing government, or if the CPP established a revolutionary government, it is likely that the Philippines would similarly be subject to economic attack by the US and its allies. Would you recommend that such a government reject a tactical alliance with China in this scenario, and why?

JMS: You are correct in assuming that the CPP and the revolutionary movement of the people will consistently assert, defend and advance Philippine national sovereign and territorial integrity. You are also correct in anticipating the violent reaction of US imperialism to the revolutionary movement when it shall come to power in the Philippines or have a leading role in a coalition government. There is therefore a need for the revolutionary forces and the people to avail of proletarian internationalism and international anti-imperialist solidarity.

If the revolutionary movement wins political power in the Philippines or the CPP becomes the leading force against the US being the No. 1 imperialist power over the Philippines, the Philippine revolutionary government will try to persuade China to respect Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the 2016 judgment of the Permanent Court of Arbitration with regard to the West Philippine Sea and will respect and support China's national sovereignty over Taiwan, Hong Kong, the Daoyu islands, Tibet and Xinjiang.

Even now, the revolutionary movement of the Filipino people observes and appreciates how China supports and assists countries and peoples that are resisting US imperialism and are the target of imperialist economic and military

blockades and all sorts of sanctions. It sees the possibility of diplomatically settling with China any serious problems to achieve better relations and higher aims. As a matter of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist principle, the CPP has been critical of how China has become blatantly capitalist since 1978. But party-to-party relations are distinguishable from state-to-state relations.

4. Regarding the specific issue of maritime territory in the West Philippine Sea, the latest incident just this year concerned Chinese fishing vessels anchoring near the Whitsun Reef, a part of the Spratly Islands widely considered to be a Philippine territory in those islands. The Chinese government, for their part, also considers this an issue of sovereignty, and their operations are likely spurred on by the US's continuing presence in these waters, which together with their bases in neighboring countries might be said to form a "noose" around that country. Do you see a realistic pathway to a resolution among the Philippines, China, and the other Asian countries involved? Can such an issue even be resolved through diplomatic means?

JMS: In my answer to your previous question, I have already asserted the sovereign and maritime rights of the Philippines over its exclusive economic zone and extended continental shelf in the West Philippines and pointed to the need for China to respect these rights, the UNCLOS and the 2016 judgment of the PAC. I have also pointed out that through diplomatic negotiations China can signify its respect for Philippine sovereign and maritime rights over the West Philippine Sea. On the Philippine side, there is no problem about recognizing and supporting China where it legitimately asserts its national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

But now and insofar as China continues to disrespect Philippine national sovereign and maritime rights over the West Philippine Sea, the revolutionary movement considers it positive and necessary for all countries to keep the high seas of the South China Sea open for free navigation and reject the false and baseless claim of China that it owns 90 per cent of the entire South China Sea. It is also positive and necessary for the Philippines to demand the withdrawal of China from the artificial islands and military bases that it has made in the West Philippine Sea, pay rent for the duration of the illegal occupation and pay for the damage and destruction of the marine features and environment.

5. An analysis of the United States and China as an inter-imperialist conflict can lead one to the difficult position where denouncing one country's policy works as

a tacit endorsement of the others. One example is the CPP's endorsement of the Hong Kong protest movement in 2020 (a post was briefly on its website before being removed) -there is evidence that some of the civil society groups that drove this movement had material support from the "soft" wings of American regime change apparatus, like the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). What does the CPP (and its sympathizers worldwide) need to do to ensure that its "pox on both houses" position does not serve imperialist ends?

JMS: It is just and proper for the CPP and the Filipino people to criticize and condemn the all-round domination of the Philippines by US imperialism and at the same time China's aggressive transgression of Philippine sovereign and maritime rights in the West Philippine Sea. The issue is clear against each of the two imperialist powers. The CPP and Filipino people can continue to recognize China's national sovereignty over Hong Kong and distinguish it from the autonomy and democratic rights of the Hong Kong people and the transition measures agreed upon by the Chinese and British states.

In expressing support for the autonomy and democratic rights of the Hong Kong people, the CPP and the Filipino people do not deny the China's national sovereignty over Hong Kong as qualified by the transition measures agreed to by China itself. Neither do they become responsible for or become identical to all sorts of people and organizations that also support the autonomy and democratic rights of the Hong Kong people, including those US entities that wish to make Hong Kong independent of and hostile to China.

All proletarian revolutionaries are critical of monopoly capitalism and all imperialist countries. But they must consider and evaluate the economic and political circumstances, the differences and contradictions among the imperialist powers. The Bolsheviks were able to take advantage of the contradictions and shifting alliances of the imperialist powers. The Soviet Union was able to join the Allied Powers against the Axis powers which were fascist and aggressive. A socialist country can maintain and develop diplomatic and trade relations with all countries, irrespective of ideology and social system.

6. July 2021 marked the 100-year anniversary of the Communist Party of China (CPC). You have previously made clear that your stance is that the CPC has undergone a revisionist counterrevolution from 1976 onwards. You have also stated that it is only a matter of time before the CPC sheds its branding as a communist party, and that the only hope for the Chinese proletariat is a new

communist party that reasserts the primacy of Mao Zedong Thought. It is true that the role of the Chinese party-state somewhat diminished in society after 1976, with the injection of capital introducing contradictions that were not seen in China under Mao. This also fueled a number of new “left” movements within China. Yet in the years since 2012, with the rise of Xi Jinping, there has been something of a reassessment or reappraisal of the CPC leadership, especially among younger left-wing Chinese citizens. With Xi’s anti-corruption drive seen as widely justified and necessary to clean out the corrupt bureaucracy created by Reform and Opening Up, with his strengthening of Marxist education in schools, and with his creative maneuvers to reassert party control over even privately held firms, Xi is starting to look like he’s addressing at least some of the contradictions created since 1976. What do you make of these developments? In your eyes, do they represent a return to a socialist path? If not, what concrete steps would convince you that they have turned away from revisionism and returned to the revolutionary road?

JMS: I do not think that Xi Jinping has done anything since 2012 to undo the comprehensive and thoroughgoing capitalist restoration on China since 1978 when the Chinese revisionists or capitalist roaders used their seizure of political power in the October 1976 counterrevolutionary coup to undertake the full restoration of capitalism in China. The anti-corruption drive so-called has been carried out at best to control the rampant corruption at every level of the Chinese bureaucracy, the mountains of bad debts made by state and private corporations and the scandalous sale of land by local governments to private corporations. As in the revisionist-ruled Soviet Union, it was quite easy for the anti-Marxists to pretend carrying out Marxist education only to misrepresent and ridicule Marxist theory and practice and play up the antisocialist and capitalist-oriented reforms.

I suggest that you read the annotations of the Communist Party of the Philippines on the speech of Xi Jinping in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Communist Party of China. The speech reveals how much Marxism-Leninism-Maoism Xi Jinping has. He consistently refers to the CPC as the party of the entire people and never as party of the proletariat and the people. He is quite skilful at avoiding any reference to the CPC as the advanced detachment of the proletariat, the socialist state as a class dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian internationalism even in Mao’s period. The CPP annotations try to critique many major points. They can somehow help you in answering the question whether the anti-corruption campaign of Xi Jinping and his other reported actions will undo the comprehensive and deepgoing restoration and

development of private and state monopoly capitalism by the phoney communist party.

I also attach hereto my long article, “Influences and Relations between China and the National Democratic Movement in the Philippines” by way of answering your questions. This can give you a clear view of my summing up and analysis of the background, course and defeat of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution by the Dengist counterrevolutionary coup in October 1976, the arrest and mass expulsion of those CPC cadres and members who supported the GPCR, the proclamation of the blatantly anti-socialist and capitalist reforms and opening up for China’s integration with the world capitalist system in 1978 and the collaboration of US and Chinese monopoly capitalism in promoting and carrying out the neoliberal policy until their recent sharpening of inter-imperialist contradictions.

In 1979 the US started its diplomatic relations with China, after making preparations for these since the Nixon visit to China in 1972. US and China carried out in earnest their partnership in promoting the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization in the 1980s onward. But being cautious in giving concessions to China and pressuring it to bend further, the US promoted sweat shop operations in China, the delivery of low-end technology and Chinese exports of garments, shoes and other consumer goods to the US market. By 1989, the inadequacies of the US-China economic relations showed with the rise of mass discontent against flagrant corruption and inflation in China.

Consequent to the mass uprisings in Beijing and many other Chinese cities in 1989, China under the over-all leadership of Deng begged the US to grant more economic concessions to China and promised to further liberalize the entry of US and other foreign investments and open special economic zones. In turn, the US demanded that China join the World Trade Organization and further open up the Chinese economy. China joined the WTO in 2001 and the US and China became undoubtedly the main partners in promoting and carrying out the neoliberal policy. Since then, the economic growth of China accelerated on the capitalist road to become the largest capitalist power after the US.

To make monopoly capitalism dominant in China, the phoney Communist Party and the monopoly bureaucrats have plundered the social wealth created by the Chinese working people under the Red flag of socialism and have submitted the working people to extreme conditions of exploitation, mass poverty and

deprivation. The dismantling of the commune system drove great numbers of peasants to urban poverty and exploitation by Chinese and foreign companies. The abolition of the right to strike and the lack of labor rights have generalized the 996 rule of wage slavery, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. work for 6 days a week, reminiscent of early 19th century England. Even the highly educated white-collar employees are subjected to this rule. Gross inequality and social injustice reign in China.

State monopoly capitalism has served to accelerate strategic economic and military production and to expand private monopoly capitalism to the extent that this has become larger in share values than the state sector. Shares of stocks in state corporations as well as in state-private corporations are publicly traded and acquired by private stock owners. As of 2003, according to a survey report done by the OECD, the private sector share in value-added in the entire Chinese economy was already 59.2 per cent and was growing at an accelerated rate since the 1990s. As of 2020, China claimed that its private sector owned 60 per cent of the economy and accounted for the GDP to the same extent.

As of 2021, according to the Hurun Global Rich List, China had the most billionaires in the world, with 1058 in comparison to 696 in the US. Millionaires and billionaires like Jack Ma of Alibaba are highly honored members of the CPC. In the National People's Congress as of 2016, more than 100 delegates were billionaires in US dollars (like Pony Ma of Tencent Holdings, Robin Li of Baidu and Kei Jun of Xiaomi) and 209 other delegates had net assets above 2 billion yuan or USD 300 million. In the US Congress at the time, there was no billionaire and the richest was California Republican Rep. Daniel Issa who had as net worth only USD 440 million.

Members of the CPC Central Committee have generally concealed their private assets. But immediate and close relatives have openly become millionaires and billionaires with large shares of stocks in major private corporations, in real estate, technology, energy, manufacturing, commerce, banks and finance. The big bourgeoisie is flagrantly in power in the CPC and the State and in the big private corporations. Corruption has been so rampant in the CPC and the State that President Xi Jinping has so prominently crusaded against it. But Quora researchers point out that the sister of Xi, Qi Qiaoqiao, has accumulated assets of more than USD 1.7 billion.

State monopoly corporations have been intertwined with private monopoly

corporations and even sell shares to big private capitalists. Take a look at the list of the 500 largest Chinese private corporations. Let me just mention here the 10 with the largest capital: Huawei (in electronics), Pacific Construction Group, Amer International Group (metals), Hengli Group (chemicals), Country Garden Holdings (real estate), Evergrande Group (real estate), Legend Holdings Ltd (electronics), Gome Holdings Group (retail), China Vanke Co Ltd (real estate) and Geely Holding Group (motors). Huawei's largest capital is 858 billion yuan or USD 126 billion and Geely's is 330 billion yuan.

The 10 largest private banks of China are: China Merchants Bank, Industrial and Commercial Bank of China, Bank of China, Agricultural Bank of China, China Construction Bank, China International Capital Corporation, Bank of Communications, Shanghai Pudong Development Bank, China CITIC Bank and China Minsheng Bank. The following are the 5 largest private insurance companies: China Life Insurance Company, Ping An Insurance Group, China Pacific Insurance Group, People's Insurance Company of China and New China Life Insurance.

7. You've stated that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) is "the greatest epoch-making contribution of Mao." Do you think that Mao or the Gang of Four made any errors in the implementation of the GPCR? If so, what were they? On a related note, is your view that the Philippines will require a cultural revolution of its own, after political power is seized by its proletarian movement?

JMS: In the course of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution from 1966 onwards, the CPC itself acclaimed it as the greatest epoch-making contribution of Mao. The GPCR was supposed to be the practical application of Mao's theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. It was supposed to be greatest contribution of Mao to the development of Marxism-Leninism on top of his contributions to Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy, social science, rectification movement as requisite for Party building and the strategic line of protracted people's war by encircling the cities from the countryside.

The importance and necessity of the GPCR from 1966 to 1978 could not be underestimated because the Soviet Union was already afflicted by modern revisionism and had become a social-imperialist power and cast a lot of

influence and pressures even within the CPC. The Rightists and revisionists within the CPC Central Committee who opposed the Great Leap Forward and wanted to perpetuate the concessions to the bourgeoisie and the rich peasants were influenced by the Soviet modern revisionists. The correctness of the GPCR in posing modern revisionism as a lethal problem for socialism is well verified by the collapse of the Soviet Union and China's own comprehensive and thoroughgoing restoration of capitalism.

Like the Paris Commune of 1871, the GPCR won great victories before it was defeated. As a result of the GPCR, the youth were mobilized as Red Guards, as revolutionary successors in combination with the toiling masses of workers and peasants. Art and literature were revolutionized to serve the people and honor the revolutionary workers, peasants and soldiers as the heroes. The theatrical models were promoted. The educational system was reformed to stop the phenomenon of university students coming mostly from former exploiting classes and from strata higher than those of the workers and peasants. Barefoot doctors were trained to spread and raise the level of health care in the rural areas.

Revolutionary committees were created as new organs of political power. Three-in-one leading committees were formed in the factories, communes and institutions to combine the representatives of the Party, the masses and the experts. The Anshan Constitution became the model for organizing the workers. The Tachai and Taching models were promoted. Even the economic growth rate during the GPCR averaged more than 10 per cent per year. So, it was successful even in economic terms. The superstructure was revolutionized to put politics in command of production and to enhance production.

The GPCR was defeated but it succeeded in posing the problem of revisionism within socialist society, brought up the principles and methods of fighting it and provided the positive and negative lessons from which succeeding proletarian revolutionaries can learn from. After great victories from 1966 to 1971 in the GPCR, the Left committed errors of ultra-Leftism (which was reflected in the line of condemning both Lin Biao and Chou Enlai) turned off the Middle against the Left and prevented the Left from winning over the Middle to defeat the Right and became vulnerable to intrigues and splitting tactics by the Right which amplified its strength by winning over the Middle.

As in the Soviet Union, when Khrushchov rose to power by splitting the Stalinists like Molotov, Voroshilov, Malenkov and others, Deng skilfully got the

support of Chou Enlai, Yeh Jianying Chen Yun, Li Xiannian and Hua Guofeng to bring down one after the other Lin Biao, Chen Boda, members of the Group of Four and posthumously Kang Sheng after the counterrevolutionary coup of 1976. After 1971, the health of Mao was deteriorating but Chou Enlai was most assiduous in consulting him and letting him grace diplomatic occasions. The latter succeeded putting on record even the informal comments of Mao critical of the Group of Four.

The Rightist-Centrist combine succeeded in undermining and depreciating the class struggle as the key link in favor of diplomatic maneuvers to develop relations with US imperialism against its Soviet superpower rival for the purpose of modernization, access to latest technology, capitalist reforms and integration in the world capitalist system. Indeed, the Chinese monopoly bourgeoisie has been quite successful in the last more than four decades in restoring and developing capitalism. But it has also brought into China the exploitative and oppressive conditions of the capitalist system which can arouse the proletariat and the entire people to fight back and bring back socialism in due time.

On the subject of cultural revolution in relation to the Philippine revolution, I say that there is the appropriate cultural revolution correspondent to every stage of the Philippine revolution. Right now, the Filipino proletariat and people are carrying out the new democratic revolution against the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system. They are now carrying out a national, democratic and scientific cultural revolution in line with the new-democratic economic, social and political demands. When they reach the socialist stage of the revolution, they will carry out the socialist cultural revolution corresponding to every phase of the socialist revolution and aiming for the ultimate goal of communism.

8. In previous interviews you have said that China is concerned about separatist elements in the regions of Tibet, Hong Kong, and Xinjiang. In the US and allied countries, where much of our readership resides, the news and discourse about China and the CPC is almost exclusively occupied by allegations of human rights violations in these regions. In our own analysis of the reports about Xinjiang in particular, we have called it an “atrocities propaganda blitz” whose ultimate purpose is to provide grounds for war, much like the US did with Iraq. (To me, they’re reminiscent of stories I heard throughout my childhood about the NPA, as fed by the Philippine government through the bourgeois media.) What is the correct stance for organizations and individuals who are asked to address these allegations? Do you consider it worthwhile to push back against them,

even if you regard the CPC as a revisionist party?

JMS: China has national sovereignty over Tibet, Hongkong and Xinjiang as in Taiwan and Daoyu islands. The human rights and the autonomy rights of the people must be respected. Wherever certain transitory measures have been agreed upon by Chinese central and local authorities must be respected. At the same time, US imperialism and its agents should be prevented from interfering with China's internal affairs and should stop making provocations. They should be condemned for carrying out propaganda and activities for the purpose of interference and possible aggression.

9. Our last question is regarding the Communist Party of Peru Shining Path. You've previously pointed out that Abimael Guzmán committed errors in terms of both being ultra-left sectarian earlier on, and then swinging to the right after his capture. Today, the newly elected Peruvian socialist Pedro Castillo faces many challenges, including smears of being sympathetic toward or similar to the Shining Path. Can you explicate your view of where the Gonzalo leadership went wrong? Are explanations that fault left-adventurism and the romanticization of violence, correct? Even if the CPP-NPA has not committed these errors, why does it seem that they have not escaped similar criticism?

JMS: The background of Pedro Castillo as a peasant, rural teacher and union leader is quite impressive and his electoral success is quite spectacular. According to the Libre Peru, he is not a communist. At any rate, he faces tremendous odds because the US is telling him what to do and uses the US-controlled Peruvian army to threaten him and he does not have control over Congress and it will take a great deal of effort to change the Peruvian constitution. I hope that he can find ways of upholding and realizing national independence, democratic rights, social justice and development in Peru. I also hope that he can free Comrade Gonzalo and other political prisoners who have been languishing in jail for so long.

The people's war started by Comrade Gonzalo is widely reported as having declined. I think that the cadres and members of his party are the ones in the best position to sum up, analyze and evaluate their experience. Their criticism and self-criticism and their determination to rectify errors and shortcomings are far more important than what outsiders like me can say.

The Communist Party of the Philippines and the New Peoples' Army have

summed up their own experiences periodically and made some major rectification movements to learn from positive and negative lessons, to work and fight more resolutely and vigorously and to achieve greater victories in the revolutionary struggle.

(One last administrative concern: do you operate the following Twitter account? JMS: Some comrades operate it. You can mention it in your publications. <https://twitter.com/josemariasison?lang=en>. When we publish the interview, we'd like to mention it if you have no objections to that.)

We appreciate your response to these questions and we're looking forward to presenting a fair exposure of your viewpoints to our readership.

Maraming salamat po.

Carlo Francisco

redsails.org

Author's Remarks

On the Launch of *On People's War and Imperialism in Turmoil, Socialism in Prospect*

March 27, 2022

Dear friends, I wish to thank the International Office of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines and the International Network of Philippine Studies for sponsoring and organizing this cyber launch of the book *On People's War and Imperialism in Turmoil, Socialism in Prospect*.

I also thank the book reviewers Jacob Bodden and Dr. Fred Engst and the moderator, Ms Marianne Runia for giving us an overview of the two books and for encouraging the public to acquire copies of the books.

You may use Google Search to find out which publishing outlet is most convenient for you to order the books.

I take this opportunity to relate the two books inasmuch as they are being presented to you at the same time.

On People's War gives you insights on how the people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war has persevered and grown in strength self-reliantly in the Philippines. And Imperialism in Turmoil, Socialism in Prospect provides the insights why in the current and the forthcoming decades the Philippine revolution would benefit from more favorable conditions in the national and global contexts.

The people's war in the Philippines has been inspired and guided by the teachings of Mao on how to apply the revolutionary class line in the strategy of encircling the cities from the countryside. But we, the Filipino revolutionaries, have also made our own contributions to the development of the theory and practice of people's war in an archipelagic country.

To try to measure the success of the people's war in the Philippines, it is not enough enough to simply acknowledge simply to acknowledge how from a small and weak fore with a few rifles in 1969 in one district of Tarlac province the New People's Army has grown nationwide with more than 110 guerrilla fronts with thousands of Red fighters, augmented by tens of thousands of people's militia and hundreds of thousands of self-dense units of revolutionary mass organizations. This people's army has been instrumental in building the most dedicated members of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the various types of mass organizations and the organs of political power that constitute the people's democratic government.

The people's war in the Philippines has developed without the benefit of cross-border advantages as when the Chinese revolution was able to receive support from the Soviet Union from 1924 to 1927 against the Northern Warlords and then from 1937 to 1945 against the Japanese aggressor; or s when the Indochinese revolution also benefited from cross-border relations with the Chinese revolutionaries.

What makes the success of Filipino revolutionaries even more remarkable is that it did not receive any significant amount of material support from any fraternal party and would be overtaken by the betrayal of socialism and proletarian internationalism, especially after the Dengist counterrevolutionary coup in October 1976.

Since then, the Philippine revolution has been confronted by the concatenation of anti-communism, neocolonialism, revisionist betrayal, neoliberalism, and neoconservatism generated by US imperialism. But now under conditions covered in Imperialism in Turmoil, Socialism in Prospect, we find conditions more favorable for the revolutionary movement to preserve itself and advance in the current and future decades.

From 1978 onward, we saw the flagrant restoration of capitalism in China and its collaboration with the US in the promotion of the imperialist policy of neoliberal globalization. Now the two imperialist powers are the chief economic competitors and political rivals.

On the Historic Mission of the Proletariat to Defeat Capitalism and Build Socialism

May 1, 2022

On May First, it is important and interesting to review the course that the international proletariat has taken in carrying out its historic mission of defeating capitalism and building socialism, learn lessons from the persistence of the world capitalist system and from the revolutionary experience of the proletariat and foresee how the epochal class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat will further develop.

Since thousands of years ago, upon the advent of civilization with metallurgy, class struggle and literacy, the embryo of capitalism in social relations has been nurtured within slave and feudal societies. But since the 13th century in Italian city states, stimulated by Mediterranean trade, capitalism has steadily developed from the stage of handicrafts, onward to steam powered manufacturing in the 18th century and further on to large-scale machine production powered by electro-mechanical processes in the 19th century.

It was in the social setting of the capitalist Industrial Revolution in England in the 19th century that Marx and Engels started the first comprehensive and profound critique of the internal laws of motion of free competition industrial capitalism and offered the philosophy, political economy and social science by which the industrial proletariat could develop the revolutionary theory and practice to defeat the bourgeoisie and realize the historic mission of building socialism.

From the issuance of the Communist Manifesto in 1848 to the end of the 19th century, the most that could be accomplished by the industrial proletariat was to

learn from the teachings of Marx and Engels, seize power briefly in the Paris Commune of 1871 during the First International, learn from the defeat of the Commune and promote Marxism as the main trend of the workers' movement in the last decade of the 19th century through the Second International.

In the meantime, since 1871 free competition capitalism developed into monopoly capitalism in several countries, including the US, Germany, France, Italy, Russia and Japan. Like England, monopoly capitalism became dominant in their economies, with industrial and commercial bank capital merging to form a finance oligarchy, with surplus capital for direct and indirect investments abroad and with strong impulses to form conflicting blocs against each other and to catch up with the capitalist powers ahead in the game of acquiring colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries.

Emergence of socialist societies and revisionist betrayal

It was Lenin who first described the world era as one of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution in the 20th century. He observed that by themselves the imperialist powers were driven by the exploitation of the proletariat and the crisis of overproduction and manifested the decadent and moribund character of monopoly capitalism, especially by engaging in wars of aggression. And he pointed out the need to overthrow the bourgeois state and to turn the first inter-imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war.

Under his leadership, the Bolsheviks successfully carried out the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1917 and prevailed in the subsequent civil war and war against the foreign interventionists. After the New Economic Policy succeeded in reviving the economy, Stalin carried out a series of five-year economic plans to build a socialist industry and to collectivize and mechanize agriculture, to strengthen the Soviet Union and to proclaim the victory of Leninism as a further development of Marxist theory and practice.

Stalin was able to defeat the Right and "Left" opportunists and counterrevolutionary currents and the anti-Soviet maneuvers of the imperialist powers and the all-out war of aggression spearheaded by Nazi Germany in World War II. As a result of World War II, several socialist countries and national liberation movements arose on an international scale. Stalin was able to industrialize the Soviet Union for the second time, break the US monopoly of nuclear weapons and assist the Chinese and Korean peoples win resounding

victories in their wars of national liberation. US imperialism was also defeated in its war of aggression against Vietnam and the whole of Indochina in 1975 and began to be afflicted by the problem of stagflation.

Exactly at the point when one third of humanity was governed and led by communist and workers' parties, the modern revisionists headed by Khrushchov were able to seize political power with a coup d'état in the Soviet Union in 1956, totally negate Stalin, decentralize the economy and restore capitalism under the slogans of bourgeois populism (state and party of the "whole" people and bourgeois pacifism (peaceful transition, competition and co-existence).

Brezhnev made his own coup d'état against the Khrushchov ruling clique. He ruled for a longer period of time than Khrushchov and sought to recentralize the state and the economy for the purpose of engaging the US in superpower rivalry and arms race, accelerating capitalist restoration and carrying out social fascism and social imperialism. The Soviet Union was weakened by economic disintegration and by self-defeating military adventures, especially in Africa and Afghanistan.

By the time Gorbachov, Yeltsin and their likes took over the reins of government, the Soviet Union was ripe for further disintegration in the latter 1980s and total collapse in 1991. The revisionist leaders had their factional rivalries but shared the common illusion that if they took the capitalist road, destroy the Soviet Union and dissolve the Warsaw Pact they could enjoy the life of the capitalist oligarchy in peace and prosperity.

They forgot that World Wars I and II had been inter-imperialist wars arising from the very nature and internal laws of motion of monopoly capitalism and that World War III had been postponed for more than 46 years because of the loss by the US over its monopoly of nuclear weapons, the fear of mutually assured destruction, the rise of several socialist countries and national liberation movements due to World War II and the consensus of the imperialist powers to wage nonnuclear proxy wars among themselves and direct imperialist wars of aggression only against the underdeveloped and impoverished countries.

While the Soviet Union deteriorated in the quagmire of modern revisionism and capitalist restoration from 1956 onwards, the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Mao Zedong acted for a while in defense of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism and carried out a series of revolutionary

achievements, such as the anti-Rightist campaign, the Great Leap Forward, the socialist education movement and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR).

The GPCR was started in 1966 and was conducted in accordance with what Mao and the Chinese communists themselves considered as Mao's highest theoretical and practical achievement in combatting modern revisionism, preventing capitalist restoration and consolidating socialism. The GPCR was optimistically regarded as the guarantee for the worldwide victory of socialism and even for the imminent collapse of imperialism.

But after the Shanghai Commune, factional struggles and allegations against and death of Lin Biao surfaced, policy shifts were initiated by a Centrist-Rightist combination veering away from the proletarian class struggle and leading to the Nixon diplomatic visit, the rehabilitation and promotion of Deng Xiaoping, reinterpretations of the GPCR and the three-worlds theory by Deng and the increasing calls for modernization through capitalist reforms and opening up for integration with the US and world capitalist system.

After the death of Chou Enlai in February 1976, Deng was removed from office for promoting big comprador ideology. But after the death of Mao in September 1976, the October coup resulted in the arrest and imprisonment of the so-called Gang of Four by the combination of Hua Guofeng and Deng. After the latter gained the upper hand over the former who resigned, the GPCR was declared a complete catastrophe, Mao no less was castigated for it and millions of CPC cadres and members were expelled. Liu Xiaogi the No. 1 capitalist-roader was rehabilitated. The communes were dismantled and public assets were privatized in earnest. The sweat shop operations for the US market began.

In the 1980s the revisionist-ruled countries of the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China accelerated the restoration of capitalism. By the time that the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the US had become the sole superpower proclaiming a new world order, acting as the patron of neoliberal globalization among the former socialist countries and other countries and applying the neoconservative policy of state terrorism and ceaseless wars of aggression. While the Soviet Union dissolved the Warsaw Pact, the US and its allies did not dissolve the NATO and prepared for NATO expansion.

The reunification of Germany was the first step in the NATO expansion and led

to a number of former Warsaw Pact members requesting to join NATO. In 1994, Poland Hungary and the Czech Republic joined NATO. In 1999 the US and the NATO demonstrated their ability to destroy Yugoslavia and create several puppet states from it. Another expansion came with the accession of seven Central and Eastern European countries: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. In 2022, NATO recognized the following states as having applied for membership: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia and Ukraine. The NATO encirclement of Russia has tightened.

In coordination with the NATO expansion in Central and Eastern Europe and the show of imperialist force in the Balkans, the US imperialists, goaded by the Israeli Zionists, began to launch wars of aggression against such countries as Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and Syria that reflected a measure of nonalignment or the balance of power in the previous bipolar world. They also announced the neoconservative policy of ceaseless wars and full-spectrum dominance, especially high-tech military power, to make the 21st century a century of Pax Americana.

The US continued to be chieftain of such multilateral agencies as the Group of 7, OECD, IMF, World Bank and the World Trade Organization. Eventually, China and Russia took the lead in forming the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) and the New Development Bank. They have their respective international development projects, the Belt-Road-Initiative and Eurasian Economic Union. They tended to come together as a bloc of new imperialist powers against the bloc of the traditional imperialist powers.

The “sole superpower moment” of US imperialism did not last long. The financial crash of 2008 exposed the unravelling of the US-instigated neoliberal policy and the untenability of US concessions to China and the extremely unsustainable costs of the ceaseless wars of aggression already running at \$ 6 trillion with no significant expansion of economic territory. Under the Obama regime, the US expressed wariness over the economic and military rise of China and began to make countermoves in the East Asia-Pacific region.

Under the Trump regime, the US strategists started to openly refer to China as chief economic competitor and chief political rival of the US and to accuse it of using a two-tier economy, manipulating its currency and market and stealing technology from US subsidiaries in China as well as from the research and

developments of private corporations and from institutes in the US.

The US is definitely no longer the sole superpower in the unipolar world of 1991 to 2008. The new imperialist power China is most assertive that there is now a multipolar world. But the US is still the No. 1 imperialist power in terms of GDP and military power even as it continues to suffer strategic decline because of the crisis of overproduction and overaccumulation of capital and runaway costs of the ceaseless wars of aggression.

China is still a far No. 2 to the US, especially if we look at its GDP per capita. Thus, it often presents itself as shy from entering a world war that prejudices its capitalist advance and ambitions to succeed with its BRI, which would change the focus of the world economy and trade. On its part, the US has decided to disrupt the capitalist advance of China by cutting down its export surplus to the US market through high tariff walls, restricting technology transfer and restraining further development of trade and economic relations. The US expects that by withdrawing its concessions to China in the last 40 years, China would suffer economic and political decline.

China has been reckless in claiming more than 90 per cent of the South China Sea in violation of the UN Convention on Law of Sea and the 2016 judgment of the Permanent Arbitration Commission in favor of the Philippines against China. Thus, the US has put together the Quad Security Dialogue among the US, Australia, Japan and India in order to keep open the Indo-Pacific Ocean route and to assure the littoral ASEAN states that China can neither deprive them of their exclusive zones and extended continental shelves nor compel them to abandon such route.

Upon the outbreak of the Russian-Ukrainian war, it has become obvious once more that since the destruction of Yugoslavia, the sequence of the Soviet revisionist betrayal of socialism and sell out to the US and NATO has been the cause for war coming to Europe. The fact is also exposed that Russia has recovered from the debilitation it had suffered from the collapse of the Soviet Union and that China is its most reliable ally and rear in confronting the NATO expansion to its borders.

At the same time, the limits of US imperialist power and NATO are exposed as the Ukrainian fascists are left to fight Russia. Nevertheless, quite a number of those partisan to US imperialism are happy that the NATO expansion is pressing

on the borders of Russia and that a new Cold War is on and a third world war is in prospect. For decades to come, we shall witness the rise of inter-imperialist contradictions between the old set and the new set of imperialist powers.

A world of multiple crises and the prospect of socialist resurgence

We are living today in a world beset by multiple crises, including gross social inequality, economic depression, high rates of unemployment and mass poverty, state terrorism, fascism, wars of aggression, threats of nuclear war, pandemic, environmental destruction and global heating. All of these are due to the dominance of the extremely exploitative and oppressive monopoly bourgeoisie in the imperialist countries and underdeveloped countries. Ultimately, all these crises can be resolved only by the proletariat recovering from its major setbacks since 1956, taking power and building socialism.

The world capitalist system is now stricken by a prolonged depression due to the crisis of overproduction and over-accumulation of capital. A few hundreds of billionaires now own most of the productive assets of the world and continue to accumulate their private wealth, while billions of people live in poverty. The social and economic crisis is aggravated by the lockdowns and shutdowns as a result of the Covid 19 pandemic. Most governments do not know how to solve the crisis except by using neoliberal measures favoring the monopoly capitalists, government deficit spending and foreign borrowing. Almost all governments now suffer from public debt crisis, involving a total of US\$281 trillion, which is more than 355 percent of global gross domestic product (GDP).

There are major supply gluts in steel, grains, crude oil and oil products. There is a temporary shortfall in the production of semiconductors. There is now a race between US and Chinese monopoly capitalists to invest billions of dollars in the production of electronic chips and semiconductors. Under the recently enacted National Defense Authorization Act, the Biden government is promoting domestic semiconductor production to grab the biggest share of rising demand. This is connected with state investments in military research and production in both the US and China.

In trying to revive their economies, the advanced capitalist countries are pouring trillions of dollars' worth of stimulus packages to monopoly firms. But they are running the risk of economic overheating and generating a debt bubble that could burst in the coming years. Under the Biden administration, the US

government has recently approved a US\$1.9-trillion economic stimulus package. This will provide subsidies for domestic production and distribute cash to almost every American to promote consumption.

Other major capitalist countries are also planning to spend huge amounts of money to stimulate their own economies, like Japan (\$710 billion), Germany (US\$250 billion), the United Kingdom (\$210 billion) and France (US\$120.5 billion). China plans to achieve a 6 percent economic expansion by financing the operations of state-owned corporations.

The billions of the impoverished people in the undeveloped economies will suffer the prolonged effects of the global economic recession because these economies have long been wasted by super-profit taking by foreign monopolies and by unsustainable domestic and foreign public debts. By conservative estimate, the number of people living in extreme poverty (less than US\$2 per day) in 2020 has increased by 124 million. This is expected to increase by another 150 million in 2021.

The toiling masses of workers and peasants suffer the worst effects of the economic lockdowns such as insufficient income and inflated prices of basic goods and services. Under the neoliberal policy, the cash-strapped underdeveloped countries will be compelled to borrow more money, further open up their economies to foreign monopolies, liberalization and depression of wages in order to draw in foreign capital and investments.

While the world is laid prostrate by the economic crisis, the Biden administration is set on a policy of military aggressiveness and intensifying inter-imperialist rivalries. Biden declared that he will more vigorously secure US economic and political interests in Asia in the face of growing challenges of imperialist rival China.

The US recently conducted military exercises using two carrier strike groups in the South China Sea and Taiwan Strait directly challenging China's claims over these international waters. It touted building the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue between the US, Japan, India and Australia in order to press for American military forces and weapons to be forward-deployed to these countries and to put more economic, military and political pressure on China.

In the Middle East, soon after assuming the US presidency, Biden ordered a

missile attack in Syria, violating its sovereign territory, against what it claimed was arms transport from Iran. While it extended the New Start agreement with Russia, which sets limits to strategic offensive arms, the US has yet to announce a rollback of development and production of nuclear arms and intermediate-range missiles promoted under the Trump government. These have been overtaken by the US and NATO proxy war against Russia. In the meantime, Biden has not yet reinstated the nuclear deal with Iran nor lifted sanctions against the country despite Iran's expressed willingness to comply with previous agreements.

China is relentless in aggressively asserting its sovereignty over more than 90 percent of the South China Sea and continues to maintain military presence in the West Philippine Sea. Border conflicts have erupted intermittently between China and India. Russia recently opened a naval base in Sudan in the Red Sea, in conjunction with its air base in Syria and naval base in Yemen, to maintain the capacity to control strategic transit routes in the Middle East and a gateway to Africa.

As the inter-imperialist rivalries for world hegemony intensify, military spending by rival powers continued to rise by 3.9 percent to \$1.83 trillion last year, despite the severe world economic crisis. The US is the biggest military spender with US\$801 billion, with China running second at \$293 billion, an increase of 4.7 percent compared with 2020. China's military spending has grown for 27 consecutive years. Exports of major weapons remain close to highest levels since the past 30 years, with the US share increasing to 37 percent.

All major contradictions in the world are intensifying: those between capital and labor in the imperialist countries; those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations; those between the imperialist powers and governments assertive of national independence and socialist programs and aspirations; and those between blocs of imperialist powers, such as the bloc of the traditional imperialist powers and the bloc of new imperialist powers, China and Russia.

The worsening crisis of the world capitalist system engenders revolutionary resistance among the proletariat and the rest of the people because of the escalation of class exploitation and oppression. On a global scale, the proletariat must work and fight hard to recover the trade union and other democratic rights undermined or suppressed by neoliberalism and fascism. The ultimate aim is to

wage revolution and build socialism. But before the revolutionary resistance wins victory, the ruling big bourgeoisie uses state terrorism or fascism against it. The open rule of terror by fascist regimes are rising in an increasing number of countries.

While conditions of exploitation are escalating, brazen attacks against national and democratic rights are being carried out by the big bourgeoisie in order to pre-empt, deter or suppress revolutionary resistance. But the escalating conditions of both exploitation and oppression make armed revolution necessary and urgent. History has proven that the proletariat is at its best in leading the revolution when the imperialist powers themselves cannot avoid waging war among themselves directly, as in World War I and II, or by proxy and by wars of aggression by an imperialist power or combine of imperialist powers against an underdeveloped country.

Imperialist war is the worst form of terrorism as proven by World Wars I and II and by the post-World War II situation when US imperialism can at will unleash wars of aggression and kill 25 to 30 million people. Only new democratic and socialist revolutions led by the proletariat can defeat imperialism and solve all the problems that it brings about, such as national and class oppression and exploitation, fascism, war of aggression, threat of nuclear war and human extinction, epidemics and global heating.

In the continuing era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, the role of the proletariat to turn imperialist wars to revolutionary civil wars and build socialism cannot be underestimated and should be upheld and carried out by the broad masses of the exploited and oppressed peoples. The upsurge of anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles and the perseverance in people's wars for national and social liberation are the prelude to the resurgence of the world proletarian-socialist revolution. In this decade and the next decade, the proletariat and its revolutionary forces must work and fight for this resurgence.