

# The real aim of the pamphlet *TWO ROADS-- THE ORIGINS OF THE SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE* Written by Jack Scott: **PHONEY DEFENCE OF CHINA AND REAL SLANDER OF LENINISM AND THE GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION**

By A Member of The Workers' College Committee Of CPC(M-L)

Jack Scott has done a serious disservice to the friendship between the Canadian and Chinese people, as well as to the Canada-China Friendship Association, by publishing in the name of the Association a pamphlet called *Two Roads: The origins of the Sino-Soviet dispute*. The pamphlet is in fact a service to Soviet social-imperialism, and their modern revisionist agents in the so-called "Communist" Party of Canada. For many years the Soviet revisionists and their agents in various revisionist parties have slandered the Communist Party of China and Chairman Mao Tsetung as being "anti-Soviet". They charge that the Communist Party of China has violated the Leninist proletarian revolutionary line and has deviated on its own nationalist, Chinese "exceptionalist" road. Further, the modern revisionists charge that the Chinese party violates proletarian internationalism by pitting the struggle of the peoples of the Third World against the struggles of the proletariat in the capitalist countries struggling for socialism. All these Soviet revisionist slanders, of course, stand truth on its head. It was Khrushchevite revisionism which betrayed the proletarian revolutionary line of Lenin and Stalin, led the all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, betrayed proletarian internationalism, and created conditions for the fullscale Soviet social-imperialist policies of the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique. Today, the Soviet Union and the United States are the main enemies of the world's peoples. These two superpowers, after a number of years of collusion to prevent proletarian revolution and national liberation, are now in sharp contention to re-divide the world market, plunder raw materials, and seek world hegemony. This sharp contention is the cause of the intransquility in the world and is threatening the world's peoples with a third world war yet more devastating than the first two. It is the glorious People's Republic of China led by its Communist Party and Chairman Mao Tsetung that upholds the proletarian revolutionary line of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It is the Chinese Communist Party led by Mao Tsetung that carries on along the great road opened up by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia under the leadership of great Lenin. The Chinese Communist Party declared in 1963: "Only by strictly following the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the general road of the October Revolution is it possible to have correct understanding of the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement and a correct attitude towards them." (*Proposal Concerning The General Line Of The International Communist Movement*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1963, p.3)

We are including in this part 1, the first portion of the two-part series of criticism and repudiation of Jack Scott's slander of Leninism and the Great October Revolution, specific exposure of Jack Scott's plagiarism of U.S. imperialist propagandists and Chiang Kai-shek. Even though we have made certain comments on his theoretical basis and outlook, we will concentrate on this portion in the second part. Part 2 will also include an explanatory note on the Chinese Eastern Railway.

\*Jack Scott's pamphlet serves the modern revisionists by promoting his own version of their line that in fact the Chinese revolution follows a "different road" from the Great October Revolution. Scott attacks the Bolshevik revolution, denies the link between the Russian revolution and the Chinese revolution, and in so doing refreshes all the anti-Soviet slanders used by arch-reactionary Chiang Kai-shek and the U.S. imperialists to divide the Chinese people from the Soviet Union during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat led by Comrade Stalin. Instead of analysing the essential, objective relationship between the Soviet Union and the Chinese revolution as part of the same world proletarian-socialist revolutionary process, Scott arrogantly assumes the role of a "scholar-expert" and oppresses the reader with all kinds of detailed, so-called "facts", which he plagiarises from various U.S. imperialist agents, in order to obscure the truth with his own version of their reactionary, racist line on the present contradiction between socialist China and social-imperialist Soviet Union. Scott's version of the U.S. imperialist reactionary line "explains" the difference between Soviet social-imperialists and the People's Republic of China as being caused by some inherent national characteristics stamped from the past onto the present. With this reactionary, metaphysical, idealist notion of history, Jack Scott completely denies the role of the masses as the makers of history, and class struggle as the motive force of social change and development. Furthermore, he completely obscures the Chinese analysis of the contemporary world, which they clearly state is a continuation of the era analysed by Lenin in *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, and he completely obscures the radical rupture from the dictatorship of the proletariat undertaken by the modern revisionist Khrushchevite, later Brezhnev-Kosygin, social-imperialist cliques to restore a new form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie within the Soviet Union. Thus, instead of accurately pin-pointing the blame for the present antagonism

and aggression of Soviet social-imperialism toward the People's Republic of China on the outlook and policies of modern revisionism and social-imperialism in its life-and-death struggle against Marxism-Leninism and proletarian revolution, Jack Scott adds, in the name of the Canada-China Friendship Association, his own "personal" version of the standard reactionary line that there is an inherent contradiction between the Russian and Chinese people that pre-dates the October revolution, that continued during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat under Comrades Lenin and Stalin, and which Soviet social-imperialism carries on today. But because the man is extremely devious and deceitful, it is necessary to trace all of his arguments in detail, to sort out fact from fiction, and to isolate and expose his over all anti-China, anti-Marxist-Leninist line. Under the signboard of "friendship" and "marxism-Leninism", Scott is doing considerable harm to various Canadian circles interested in promoting as widely as possible China's revolutionary line on internal reconstruction and international relations, both of which are in opposition to the superpower theories and policies of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. While we are in complete sympathy with the aims of the Canada-China Friendship Association, we strongly believe that Scott has done a grave disservice to the Association by spreading his own reactionary, anti-communist views in the name of "friendship" to China.

Scott's pamphlet is divided into four parts. The first is a foreword by Al Birnie which sets out the main thesis that present-day social-imperialist policies of the revisionists are a continuation of policies of the Soviet Union under Lenin and Stalin, in turn a continuation of Tsarist foreign policy toward China. The next three portions are written by Scott.

The first, *Relations before 1945*, is Scott's effort to obscure the objective relationship between China and the Soviet Union under the dictatorship of the proletariat; that is, the period from Tsarist aggression through the October Socialist Revolution to the end of world war two. The second portion, *Two Roads*, presents Scott's historical idealist theory as to why China today is fundamentally different from the Soviet Union. In this portion he promotes his theory of "original aims" of nations, another version of national, chauvinist and racial theories of history, and thus obscures the class content of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union carried out by the modern revisionists. The third portion, *China Stands Up*, is Scott's attempt to promote anarcho-syndicalist theories in order to discredit the dictatorship of the proletariat led by Comrade Stalin, to further confuse the policies of modern revisionism with those of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to muddle the life-and-death struggle between present-day Marxist-Leninist line of the Communist Party of China, which is the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the People's Republic of China, and the social-imperialist line of the so-called "Communist" Party of the Soviet Union, which is the instrument of the dictatorship of the new monopoly capitalist class of the Soviet Union.

First, with regard to the author of the *Foreword*, Al Birnie, we should explain to our readers that this man has a long history in attacking communism. During his days as a student journalist at the University of British Columbia, he attacked various spokesmen of the student left and promoted disunity amongst the masses in the youth and student upheaval of the 1960's. Later he joined forces with a number of opportunists in a futile effort to liquidate The Internationalists, an anti-imperialist youth and student organisation in Vancouver, B.C., and from the 1970's he has been closely associated with Jack Scott's efforts to prevent the unity of Marxist-Leninists and the building of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) in our country. To this end, he has continuously engaged in the gutter politics of gossip and slander, and has opportunistically promoted himself in order to sow confusion in Canadian left-wing circles. What he says in his *Foreword* is therefore a natural continuation of his role as a mystifier, gossip and anti-communist splitter. An example of his mystification is his list of ten, what he first calls, "examples of economic exploitation and political coercion practised by the United States and other openly imperialist countries". He later claims his "examples" to be "definitions" of imperialism. Yet in all of his "examples" or "definitions", he never once speaks of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism, as the era of monopoly, finance capital, as the era of parasitical, dying capitalism and proletarian revolution. In short, he obscures all of the basic, scientific class analysis which is the basis of the People's Republic of China's domestic and foreign policy clearly stated in the Ninth and Tenth Congress documents of the Communist Party of China, and which is repeated continuously in all the popular literature published in English by the Chinese Party and government. Following immediately from his mystification of the nature of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, Birnie proceeds to present the anti-

communist slander promoted by both rightist reactionaries like Chiang Kai-shek and "left" counter-revolutionaries like Trotsky. Birnie says:

"This pamphlet focuses with historical documentation on the particular aspect of the Soviet Union's policies towards China, from 1919 to the present, to argue that the revolutionary and socialist phraseology of the Soviet Union simply masks blatantly imperialist goals and methods in relations with foreign countries.

"Except for an interlude of one month at the founding of the state, the Soviet Union simply carried on Czarist imperialist policies concerning, at that time, a weak and divided China; policies which included seizure of territories, armed attacks to preserve economic interests, collusion with the Japanese during their invasion of China, and looting of Manchurian industry following World War Two." (Al Birnie, *Foreword*, to *Two Roads: The origins of the Sino-Soviet dispute*, written by Jack Scott, New Star Books and Canada-China Friendship Association, 1974, p.vi. All future references to *Two Roads* will be indicated simply by the page in brackets after the reference.)

Birnie bases his profoundly anti-communist slander against the first socialist society in history on his equally anti-communist slander on the nature of the October Socialist Revolution itself. He says:

"The CPSU ... after a virtual armed coup by a relatively small band of Bolsheviks, was forced to incorporate a host of former Czarist officials and pseudo-revolutionary opportunists into its power structure which eventually helped promote the development of an elite bourgeoisie class..." (p. viii)

Anyone familiar at all with the history of the world communist movement during the past sixty years or so will recognise that Birnie is simply repeating all of the slanders against Bolshevism promoted by Kautsky and the opportunist Second International, Trotsky and his "left" opportunist imperialist agency (the so-called "fourth" international), and the outright reactionary line of Chiang Kai-shek. The latter uses almost the same terminology as Birnie. Chiang says: "Lenin's successful coup d'etat in Russia, in 1917, not only ushered in a new Russian regime, but also started a chain of events which later came to pose a deadly threat to humanistic civilizations in both Asia and Europe." (Chiang Kai-shek, *Soviet Russia in China*, Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, New York, 1958, p.5) Chiang proceeds to claim: "I came to the conclusion that once the Russian Communists consolidated their political power, the possibility of a revival of Czarist ambitions against China could not be ruled out." (Ibid., p.25) To no one's surprise, this arch-reactionary enemy of the Chinese and world's peoples concludes "that Soviet Russia was continuing Czarist Russia's aggressive designs in China". (Ibid., p.62) Later in our criticism of the specific "examples" used by Scott to slander the Soviet Union during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, we shall show how in fact it is impossible not to conclude that these two "friends of People's China", and "experts" on "Sino-Soviet" relations, used Chiang Kai-shek as both a source of "information" as well as ideological "inspiration" in their writing of *Two Roads*.

Birnie proceeds to cast slander against the glorious achievements of the proletarian revolution of 1917 and the first dictatorship of the proletariat which lasted in the Soviet Union from then until the death of Stalin in 1953. With the puffed-up arrogance of a little Trotsky, Birnie advises his readers that Scott's pamphlet "does however touch on some brief explanations of how the socialist goals of the Bolsheviks became subverted — the Soviet experience being a rich but relatively untapped source of mistakes to aid in the education of socialists throughout the world" (p.vii); (our emphasis) Thus, the glorious October Revolution, the civil war against counter-revolution, the economic reconstruction, collectivisation of agriculture and industrialisation of the economy (1925-41), the complete route of the anti-Soviet conspiracy and fifth column within the Communist Party in 1937-38, the Great Patriotic War against fascism (1941-45), and finally the economic recovery from the war and implacable resistance to U.S. imperialist nuclear blackmail (1945-53) — all this, together with the Soviet Union's unstinting assistance for the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America, Birnie reduces to an "untapped source of mistakes". This is the kind of intellectual and spiritual poverty that "inspires" the whole pamphlet. No one who is a true friend of China, which proclaims itself to be the heir of the Great October Revolution and today's practitioners of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung can denounce the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union with the hatred and contempt shown by Al Birnie in his *Foreword* to Jack Scott's pamphlet.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

Let us now turn our attention to Jack Scott's first chapter, *Relations before 1945*. The first thing to note is Scott's method of writing. Throughout his essay, he simply plucks various quotations which he never footnotes with references, throws them at the reader, and then proceeds to put on airs as a learned scholar puffing up serious and straightforward questions into a kind of mysterious rhetorical pose from which he obscures simple, basic historical truths. At the very beginning of his essay, for example, he plucks a quotation from W.A.D. Jackson written in January 1962 in which the man says the alliance between the Soviet Union and China will remain strong, with China not playing an independent role for many decades. Scott then gets very puffed up, and with the hindsight advantage of writing in 1974, declares how China is playing an independent role. Now if he wanted to assist the friendship between China and Canada, why couldn't Scott simply have said that the Communist Party of China, despite its very sharp differences with the revisionist line of the Khrushchev leadership of the CPSU and other parties, maintained a principled stand of avoiding public polemic, of sorting out contradictions privately as among fraternal, comradely parties, in order to maintain a very strong united front against the common enemy, U.S. imperialism. Scott could have explained further that it was the Khrushchev revisionists which attacked the Albanian Party of Labour publicly at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU in 1961, and Khrushchev escalated his programme to split the communist movement when he engineered an attack on the Communist Party of China through a number of revisionist spokesmen in European communist parties at the end of 1962. It was only after Togliatti attacked the Chinese Communist Party in December 1962 that they answered him publicly. In their answer they say: "We have always stood for handling relations between fraternal Parties in accordance with the principles of independence, equality and the attainment of unanimity through consultation as laid down in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement (1957 and 1960 — editor). We have always held that differences between fraternal Parties should be resolved through inter-Party consultation by means of bilateral or multilateral talks or conferences of fraternal Parties." (*More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us*, Editorial Department of Hongqi (Red Flag), Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1963, p.1) Therefore it is no surprise that a bourgeois like Mr. Jackson should conclude in January 1962 that China would remain in a subordinate position to the Soviet Union: (a) because the bourgeoisie has no conception of communist relations based on democratic centralism and self-imposed discipline in the interest of world revolution, and (b) because the Marxist-Leninists in the world communist movement had prevented the Khrushchev revisionists from openly attacking the Marxist-Leninist line of the Communist Party of China until December 1962.

But Scott has no interest in explaining this important fact of history because he does not view modern revisionism as the main enemy of the communist movement, and as the world outlook which gave rise to the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and transformation of a socialist country into a social-imperialist country. Rather, he puffs himself up and rhetorically asks: "Why has so much remained constant between the imperialist and the revolutionary age? And where does the main responsibility for failure lie?" (p.2) The reason Scott poses these questions rather than provide simple straightforward answers to them based on what the Chinese Communist Party and government have to say on the issues, which is the least a genuine friend can do, is because Scott has his own reactionary theory he wants to promote. All the questions he raises having to do with inter-state relations ("Mongolia, Sinkiang and Chinese Turkestan, the Amur, Ussuri, Sungari River systems, Manchuria, the Chinese Eastern Railway, Port Arthur and Dairen") could not be sorted out during the period of China's civil wars and the invasion by Japan, but were in the main settled between 1949 and Stalin's death in 1953. Afterwards the rise of modern revisionism and social-chauvinism to a position of political power within the Soviet Union restored capitalism and resurrected the vile chauvinist policies of the Tsars with respect both to non-Russian nationalities within the Soviet Union and towards the People's Democracies in eastern Europe as well as Mongolia and China. In short, modern revisionism gave rise to social-imperialist foreign policies in the late 1960's. The issue is essentially a straightforward question of state power. When various reactionaries, agents of foreign imperialists and foreign imperialists themselves dominated the government of China, no settlement between the Soviet Union and China could be reached. During the brief period after liberation of China when the Soviet Union was still led by Comrade Stalin, many outstanding issues between the two countries were resolved, and then when the modern revisionists came to power they resurrected Tsarist policies towards China and other countries. There is no need whatsoever for mystification on these basic matters.

Scott, however, is intent on proving his theory that Soviet foreign policy was always reactionary and that the Great October Socialist Revolution did not qualitatively change the relations between the Soviet Union and the oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But Scott is a devious and deceitful man. He never comes right out and denounces Comrade Stalin; what he does is circle around and in a devious manner attack Comrade Stalin's leadership through various allegations and slanders which were essentially the same ones used by Chiang Kai-shek when it was in the interest of western imperialism and Chinese feudal-comprador reaction to split the Chinese people from their red revolutionary ally and true friend, the Soviet Union. Scott's rhetorical questions "Why has so much remained constant?" and "Where does responsibility lie?" (as well as directly following these rhetorical questions with some anecdotes about Russian military feudalist expansionism during the 19th century — in order to create an at-

mosphere from which he will be able to launch his slander that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union under Comrade Stalin's leadership followed the same policies as the Tsar), these tactics both obscure the issue of modern revisionism and deny the epochal changes in the world alignment of forces from the time Stalin took over leadership of the Soviet Union until the time of his death. Inevitably, therefore, Scott's anecdotes about pre-revolutionary Russian-Chinese relations must obscure any historical analysis of these relations. Russian feudalist-military expansionism in the first three-quarters of the 19th century coincided with the world expansion of British capitalism and the forced opening of markets in China during the Opium Wars in the 1840's. Reactionary feudalist Russian pan-Slavism and expansionism contended with English capitalism for world hegemony in Central Asia (India-Afghanistan), in the Black Sea, in the Far East, and even in North America until Russia sold Alaska to the United States in 1867. The Crimean War was but one instance of this world contention. In this contention between modern capitalism with its liberal bourgeois democratic state, against the backward feudalist Russian system with its arch-reactionary absolutist-clerical state, the leaders of the modern proletariat, Marx and Engels, unequivocally supported capitalism over feudalism and trained the European proletariat in internationalism by agitating and supporting all the national bourgeois democratic revolutions against Russian absolutism. In fact, when the bourgeoisie reneged in their support for the Polish revolution for national independence from Tsarism, Marx and Engels trained the working class to take up their own independent political position unequivocally supporting the Polish bourgeois democratic revolution whether the European bourgeoisie felt it was opportune to do so or not. Thus the first anecdote Scott tells regarding the Treaty of Peking (1860) belong to this period of history — that is, the period of contention between capitalism and feudalism, when capitalism was already in the process of accommodating itself to the germs of European reaction, Tsarist Russia, and the working class had begun to assert its independent political role under the leadership of Marx and Engels.

Scott passes directly from this period to tell more anecdotes about a second, qualitatively different stage of capitalist history, the period of the late 19th and early 20th century; i.e., imperialism. He does not clarify that during the era of imperialism — moribund, dying capitalism — and proletarian world revolution, a few rentier states dominate the rest of the world through their system of colonies, international debt payments, cartels and so forth — Tsarist Russia itself was to a large degree dominated by the finance capitalists of western Europe, particularly France and Britain. Thus, Tsarist feudal-military imperialism became fused with and subordinated to a large degree to the interests of French and British imperialism. Coincident with the rise of imperialism, the imperialists bribed a section of the working class and corrupted the leaders of the workers' parties and trade unions with social-chauvinism and opportunism. It was precisely in Tsarist Russia, which had entered a period of rapid capitalist development due to western European finance capital but which itself had not undergone a bourgeois democratic revolution, that the fight against opportunism was most sharp. Bolshevism grew up in opposition to opportunism and social-chauvinism. Nowhere does Scott mention that the leading force in mobilising armed revolution to overthrow Tsarism and its military adventure in the Far East in 1905-07 was the Bolshevik Party led by Lenin and Stalin. Thus, long before the October Revolution, the Bolsheviks were steered in practical proletarian internationalism by organising armed revolution against their own reactionary Tsarist government, enemy of the Asian masses. But Scott does not mention this aspect of the Russian nation, the aspect of proletarian internationalism led by the Bolshevik Party. And so his anecdotes and professorial stories in this portion of his essay explain nothing about the nature of imperialism, nor anything about how imperialism established a labour aristocracy as its principal social prop right within the working class movement, against which Lenin led his Bolshevik Party. Nor does Scott explain how Lenin's Bolshevik Party fought against opportunism for revolutionary Marxism and proletarian internationalism.

Scott reveals his deep-seated contempt and hatred for the Great October Socialist Revolution which drove finance capital off one-sixth of the globe and aroused the Asian masses against imperialism. He says:

"During the early months of the revolution the Soviets concentrated their attention on Western Europe, in the hope and expectation that there would be a rapid spread of the Bolshevik revolution in that direction, resulting in a mobilization of the European industrial proletariat. But Europe at that time proved to be as impervious to the spread of Bolshevik revolution as it had to penetration by the Czars at an earlier date. With the defeat of the German revolution, in the spring of 1919, hopes of an early victory for the revolutionary cause receded and Russia, hard-pressed by enemies on all sides, looked elsewhere for allies, particularly to China and the Far East." (pp.5-6)

Scott equates the 'resistance' of Europe to Bolshevism with 'penetration by the Czars'. Now was this not precisely the nature of western imperialist propaganda against proletarian revolution in western Europe after world war one. Is this not precisely the line taken up by such 'civilised' European traitors to proletarian revolution as Karl Kautsky and the other renegades in the western European social-chauvinist parties? And was not one of the central issues which divided opportunism from Marxism one's attitude toward one's "own" imperialists' plunder of the oppressed masses of the East? Jack Scott turns history completely upside down. The Bolshevik line of Lenin and Stalin had always counted on the peasants of Russia and the agrarian masses of the East as the most stalwart and revolutionary allies of the modern proletariat. It was the social-chauvinist 'allies' in the second international and their 'left-Trotskyist and right-Bukharinist' allies within the Bolshevik party who opposed the alliance with the Russian peasantry and who opposed the great world alliance between

the proletariat of the West with the revolutionary national liberation struggles of the agrarian East. Scott reduces Bolshevism principle and science to a mere question of pragmatic expediency. Civilised Europe, he suggests, was as "impervious" to Bolshevism as it was to Tsarism. Thereby he promotes in a devious underhanded way the same racist lie about "Russian barbarism" that was promoted by the whole post-world war one alliance of European landlords, finance capitalists, liberals, fascists, social-chauvinist and social-fascist renegades from socialism in the second international — all of whom trembled in mortal fear of proletarian revolution. Furthermore, there is an abundance of evidence from Bolshevik literature that the Leninist-Stalinist line of "Workers and oppressed nations unite!" was advocated long before any pragmatic necessity compelled them to "look elsewhere for allies". The Bolsheviks had passed through 15 years (1903-17) of being steered in all forms of revolutionary struggle, guided by the selfless spirit of proletarian revolution and proletarian internationalism. They had fought for the democratic right of the nations in the Russian empire to self-determination against Tsarism and Menshevik social-chauvinism. Their attitude to the oppressed masses of the East was a natural and inevitable outcome of their consistent proletarian revolutionary world outlook and revolutionary, uncompromising political practise. Stalin wrote his article *Don't Forget the East* on November 24, 1918 just after the armistice on the western front and several months before the defeat of the German revolution, which Scott says is the date the Bolsheviks "looked to the East". We shall quote all of Stalin's article, for it illustrates his insight into the nature of the world alignment of forces in the era of imperialism and the proletarian-socialist world revolution. He charts a course for an alliance between the proletarian state and the oppressed nations of the East from which Comrade Stalin never deviated:

"At a time when the revolutionary movement is rising in Europe, when old thrones and crowns are tumbling and giving place to revolutionary Soviets of Workers and Soldiers, and the occupied regions are ejecting the creatures of imperialism from their territories, the eyes of all are naturally turned to the West. It is there, in the West, that the chains of imperialism, which were forged in Europe and which are strangling the whole world must first of all be smashed. It is there, first of all in the West, that the new, socialist life must vigorously develop. At such a moment, one 'involutionarily' tends to lose sight of, to forget the far East, with its hundreds of millions of inhabitants enslaved by imperialism.

"Yet the East should not be forgotten for a single moment, if only because it represents the 'inexhaustible' reserve and 'most reliable' rear of world imperialism.

"The imperialists have always looked upon the East as the basis of their prosperity. Have not the inestimable natural resources (cotton, oil, gold, coal, ores) of the East been an 'apple of discord' between the imperialists of all countries? That, in fact, explains why, while fighting in Europe and prating about the West, the imperialists have never ceased to think of China, India, Persia, Egypt and Morocco, because the East was always the real point at issue. It is this that chiefly explains why they so zealously maintain 'law and order' in the countries of the East — without this, imperialism's far rear would not be secure.

"But it is not only the wealth of the East that the imperialists need. They also need the 'obedient' 'man power' which abounds in the colonies and semi-colonies of the East. They need the 'compliant' and cheap 'labour power' of the Eastern peoples. They need, furthermore, the 'obedient' 'young lads' of the countries of the East from whom they recruit the so-called 'coloured' troops which they will not hesitate to hurl against 'their own' revolutionary workers. That is why they call the Eastern countries their 'inexhaustible' reserve.

"It is the task of communism to break the age-long sleep of the oppressed peoples of the East, to infect the workers and peasants of these countries with the emancipatory spirit of revolution, to rouse them to fight imperialism, and thus deprive world imperialism of its 'most reliable' rear and 'inexhaustible' reserve.

"Without this, the definite triumph of socialism, complete victory over imperialism is, unthinkable.

"The revolution in Russia was the first to rouse the oppressed peoples of the East to fight imperialism. The Soviets in Persia, India and China are a clear symptom that the age-long sleep of the workers and peasants of the East is becoming a thing of the past.

"Revolution in the West will undoubtedly give a new spur to the revolutionary movement in the East, will infuse it with courage and faith in victory.

"And no little help in revolutionising the East will be rendered by the imperialists themselves, with their new annexations, which are drawing new countries into the fight against imperialism and extending the base of world revolution.

"It is the duty of the Communists to intervene in the growing spontaneous movement in the East and to develop it further, into a conscious struggle against imperialism.

"From that standpoint, the resolution of the recent Conference of Moslem Communists, calling for more intense propaganda in the East — in Persia, India and China — is undoubtedly of profound revolutionary significance.

"Let us hope that our Moslem comrades will carry out their highly important decision.

"For the truth must be grasped once and for all that whoever desires triumph of socialism must not forget the East."

(J. Stalin, editorial in *Zhizn Natsionalnostei*, No.3, November 24, 1918. Cited in *Selected Works*, Vol.IV, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1953, pp.174-76)

This prophetic insight which both Comrades Lenin and Stalin shared about the revolutionary awakening of the peoples of the East proved true. The anti-imperialist, anti-federal May 4th Movement in 1919 in China gave rise to the Communist Party of China and the most advanced youth and students took up Marxism-Leninism as their world outlook. From then on, communists "intervened" as Comrade Stalin urged and

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

transformed the struggle in China "into a conscious struggle against imperialism." Chairman Mao, in exposing the historical idealism of Dean Acheson's White Paper in 1949, wrote:

"The Russian Revolution of 1917 awakened the Chinese, and they learned something new, Marxism-Leninism. In China, the Communist Party was born, an epoch-making event. Sun Yat-sen, too, advocated learning from Russia and alliance with Russia and the Communist Party." In a word, from that time China changed her orientation." (Mao Tsetung, *Bankruptcy of the Idealist Conception of History, Selected Works*, Vol. IV, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1969, p. 456)

Chairman Mao proceeds to say: "The Chinese Communist Party had been organized in the early twenties under the ideological impetus of the Russian revolution. Here Acheson is right. This ideology was none other than Marxism-Leninism. This ideology is immeasurably superior to that of the Western bourgeoisie..." (Ibid., p. 456) Chairman Mao then describes how Marxism-Leninism defeated the culture of the western imperialists, and asserts: "We are historical materialists, opposed to historical idealism." (Ibid., p. 457)

Clearly, therefore, any genuine friend of China will also oppose historical idealism when analysing the relationship between the Russian revolution and the Chinese revolution. The Russian revolution awakened the peoples of the East; it brought the Chinese people Marxism-Leninism which they linked with the objective realities, the objective needs of the masses of Chinese people and thus solved the problems of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal new democratic revolution, and from which the Chinese Communist Party proceeded to follow the road of the October Socialist Revolution and, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, proceeded to carry through the socialist revolution in the economic base and cultural superstructure. This latter aspect, accomplished during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution personally led by Chairman Mao, practically summed up and solved the historical problem posed to the international communist movement and the proletarian-socialist world revolution by the rise of modern revisionism and all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. Thus, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is an advance down the same road towards communism opened up by the Great October Socialist Revolution and boldly pushed forward by the Soviet Union under Comrade Stalin's proletarian leadership.

Jack Scott has nothing to say about this fundamental historical truth regarding the relationship between the Russian and Chinese revolutions. Instead, he seizes on all sorts of details, anecdotes, slanders and distortions in order to push his line that the Soviet Union was always hostile to China, and that the source of this hostility is inherent in the two countries' "national characteristics". Even his phraseology is designed to promote his reactionary thesis that Tsarist and Soviet policy toward China were the same. He says: "Russia, wanting to expand her borders of empire, found Europe too powerful an adversary to be a likely victim. The Czar turned his eyes eastward and decided to join the condominium of bullies carving up China." (p. 2) We have already shown Scott's historical idealism in "analysing" Tsarist foreign policy. The fact is that Tsarism did "expand her borders of empire" in Europe — into Poland, central Europe and the Balkans. Scott then makes his bogus historical parallel about "Europe" being "impervious" to Bolshevism, an historical analogy that completely ignores any analysis of the concrete conditions, especially the role of revisionism in the European socialist parties and rise of social-imperialism there. Scott then proceeds with another historical part. He says: "In July, 1919, eyes now turned toward the East in search of allies." First the Tsar's eyes 'shift' east, then the Bolsheviks' eyes 'turn' east. Such is Scott's historical idealism. Why would a person who claims to be a 'friend of China' not simply tell the Canadian people what Chairman Mao says about the impact of the Russian revolution on China. Chairman Mao says clearly and succinctly that after the Russian revolution, "China changed her orientation". This new orientation was to pursue the line of anti-feudal, anti-imperialist revolution.

Lenin's whole thesis of world revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat rests on the necessary class alliance between the proletariat in the capitalist countries and the non-proletarian toiling masses of the Third World. Victory of the proletarian socialist world revolution was guaranteed he said because the majority of mankind lives in the Third World whose wars of national liberation against imperialism are as one with proletarian armed insurrection in the capitalist countries. Both constitute one revolutionary whole and support one another against their common enemy, imperialism and social-imperialism. Stalin repeats Lenin's analysis in *The Foundations of Leninism* (1924) and his essays in defence of the Chinese agrarian revolution written in 1927 to oppose Trotsky, Radek, Zinoviev and other social-chauvinists. Stalin says that because the imperialist camp is not divided into warring factions as it was during the Russian revolution, "The Chinese revolution will encounter far greater difficulties than did the revolution in Russia, and that desertions and betrayals in the course of this revolution will be incomparably more numerous than during the Civil War in the USSR." He outlines the two paths for the development of events in China:

"...either the national bourgeoisie smashes the proletariat, makes a deal with imperialism and together with it launches a campaign against the revolution in order to end the latter by establishing the rule of capitalism;

or the proletariat pushes aside the national bourgeoisie, consolidates its hegemony and assumes the lead of the vast masses of the working people in town and country, in order to overcome the resistance of the national bourgeoisie, secure the complete victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and then gradually convert it into a socialist revolution, with all the consequences following from that." (I. Stalin, *Questions of the Chinese Revolution, Selected Works*, op.cit., Vol. IX, p. 225)

Stalin analyses the two stages of revolution: the united front with the Kuomintang and the Northern Expedition against the Warlords (1926-27), and the second stage of Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary coup in Shanghai. Stalin says of this

second stage "that a swing has begun away from the revolution of an all-national united front and towards a revolution of the vast masses of the workers and peasants, towards an agrarian revolution, which will strengthen and broaden the struggle against imperialism, against the gentry and the feudal landlords, and against the militarists and Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary coup." (Ibid., p. 229) At the same time, Stalin attacks the so-called 'left' opposition and singles out Radek as not understanding the nature of the Chinese revolution nor the international setting in which it was taking place. Stalin called for maintenance of the united front with the Kuomintang in the Wuhan government, and for agrarian revolution. It was precisely the capitulationist policies of Chen and the 'left' Trotskyist-Radek policies of Roy, that led to the liquidation of the Wuhan government and the loss of considerable revolutionary forces. It was only Chairman Mao together with Chu Teh who, on the basis of their own analysis, of the concrete historical conditions, led them to the same conclusions as were advanced by Comrade Stalin.

The reason for mentioning all this is that Scott has nothing to say in his thirteen pages on *Sino-Soviet relations — 1917-1945* about the Chinese revolution. He spends all this space going through a labyrinth of historical half-truths, slanders and gossips about state relations between the Soviet Union, and a whole number of various reactionary warlord, Kuomintang or outright Japanese puppet governments. Scott's central charge against the Soviet Union is their attitude towards the Chinese Eastern Railway constructed during the period of Tsarist imperialist expansion. The railway connected the old Tsarist naval base of Port Arthur with the trans-Siberian railway passing north through the Manchurian cities of Changchun and Harbin. In the course of the Civil War in Russia, this railway had been used by White counter-revolutionary forces in league with various Chinese warlord governments. Scott becomes quite rabidly anti-Soviet in this section; and gives the line of Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek. He gets everything backwards. British imperialism tried to provoke its dependent lackeys in China into war in 1927 in an international effort to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. The scheme failed. In 1929 imperialism made trouble between China and the Soviet Union again. Scott presents everything from the point of view of imperialist agent Chiang Kai-shek.

For example, in the fall of 1929, the reactionary Chinese government, in order to break the friendship between the Chinese and Soviet people and thus hope to defeat the agrarian revolution to the south, used Soviet assistance to the Chinese revolution as a pretext to provoke a war against the Soviet Union and take over the railway. Scott describes the Soviet Union's policy toward the Chinese Eastern Railway as being "in traditional imperialist fashion", and with regard to an incident provoked by the Kuomintang in 1929, Scott says:

"The Soviet forces, much better equipped than the Chinese, easily overran Chinese positions, killing and capturing large numbers of the defending troops. China capitulated, acceding to all the Soviet demands, and Russian monopoly over the Chinese Eastern Railway, and its industrial and commercial subsidiaries, was re-established." (p. 12)

Chiang Kai-shek says practically the same thing: "An interlude of some significance revealing Soviet policy toward China occurred on October 12, 1929, when Russian troops invaded Manchuria and Hailan in the Northeast Provinces during a dispute over the Chinese Eastern Railway. Our local authorities there were forced to sign the Khabarovsk Protocol on December 22. This is another proof that Soviet Russia was continuing Czarist Russia's aggressive designs in China despite the Chicherin Report of 1918 and the Karakhan Declaration of 1919. (Chiang Kai-shek, op.cit., p. 62)

Scott's line is virtually identical with Chiang's on the question of the Soviet Union allegedly carrying on a Tsarist policy, especially with respect to the Chinese Eastern Railway. Another example which illustrates how closely Scott follows Chiang's reactionary, anti-Soviet line is with respect to Mongolia. Scott writes:

"In 1921 the Soviets detached a section of Outer Mongolia, named it Tannu-Tuva, and linked the detached member to Soviet Siberia. Later, in 1944, it was attached directly to Moscow as the Tuvan Autonomous Oblast — a development of which the world was totally unaware for many months." (p. 16)

Now here is Chiang's version:

"On August 17, 1944, also at Soviet Russia's instigation, it petitioned Moscow for Tangu Urianghai's incorporation into the Soviet Union. On October 11 of the same year, the Supreme Soviet approved the inclusion of Tangu Urianghai as an 'autonomous' region. Thus, from a Soviet satellite, Tangu Urianghai became a part of the Soviet Union. (Footnote:) The incorporation of Tangu Urianghai into the Russian Soviet Federated Republic was not formally announced by Moscow until March 17, 1948, and, even, then, only by radio."

Jack Scott's only addition to Chiang Kai-shek's anti-communist tale is to replace Chiang's dates with the phrase "many months".

The Chinese Communist Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were at this time first and foremost concerned with welding together a world wide united front against the Japanese-Italian-German fascist alliance. Die-hard anti-communist reactionaries like Chiang Kai-shek did everything possible to prevent such an alliance, and this explains why they concocted anti-Soviet slanders. Chiang Kai-shek wanted to bloc a militant national war against Japanese imperialism, and instead wage war against the Chinese Communist Party and the liberated areas.

Scott makes no analysis whatever of international politics in the 1929-45 period, nor does he analyse the history of the Chinese revolution. Instead he simply makes charges against the Soviet Union. In addition to those already cited Scott says:

1) In 1936, a Soviet-Mongolian defence alliance (which) together with the economic and other concessions already granted, made of Outer Mongolia a virtual vassal state. (p. 16)

2) The Soviet Union signed a "neutrality pact" with Japan in April 1941 which "permitted" Japan to re-direct 100,000 troops against China. (p. 17)

3) The Soviet Union fought "its brief, and relatively cheap" war against Japan in order to seize rewards from China in the form of territory and concessions in Manchuria (p. 17)

4) He summarises the first section of his pamphlet with a quotation from Edgar Snow's book, *Red Star Over China*, in order to deviously embroil this true friend of China into Scott's anti-China tirade.

It will be useful, therefore, to start with Edgar Snow's book to refute Scott's distortion of history with regards to Soviet-China relations. Snow emphasises the enormous impact the Great October Revolution in Russia had upon China:

"Certainly and obviously Russia has for the past dozen years (1920's-1930's — editor) been a dominating influence — and particularly among educated youth it had been the dominating external influence — on Chinese thought about the social, political, economic, and cultural problems of the country. This has been almost as true, though unacknowledged, in the Kuomintang areas as it has been an openly glorified fact in the Soviet districts. Everywhere that youth has any fervent revolutionary beliefs in China the impact of a Marxist ideology is apparent... Among such young Chinese, Lenin is almost worshipped, Stalin is the most popular foreign leader, socialism is taken for granted as the future form of Chinese society, and Russian literature has the largest following — Maxim Gorky's works for example, outselling all native writers except Lu Hsiang, who was himself a great social revolutionary." (Edgar Snow, *Red Star Over China*, Grove Press, 1938, N.Y., pp. 404-5)

This analysis is completely in keeping with Mao Tsetung's view already quoted. Snow continues to explain how the Chinese revolutionaries led by the Communist Party of China regard the Soviet Union:

"The role of the Soviet Union for them has been most potent as a living example, an ideal that bred hope and faith. Soviet Russian experience has been the fire and forge that helped anneal in them the steel-like qualities of heroic character that many people had not supposed Chinese possessed. These Reds stoutly believe that the Chinese revolution is not isolated, and that hundreds of millions of workers, not only in Russia, but throughout the world, are anxiously watching them, and when the time comes will emulate them, even as they themselves have emulated the comrades in Russia. In the day of Marx and Engels it may have been correct to say that 'the workers have no country', but these Chinese Communists today believe that, besides their own little bases of proletarian rule, they have a mighty fatherland of their own in the Soviet Union. These earnest have been a tremendous source of encouragement and revolutionary nourishment to them.

"The Soviet Government in China," reads the Constitution adopted at the first All-China Soviet Congress, "declares its readiness to form a revolutionary united front with the world proletariat and all oppressed nations, and proclaims the Soviet Union, the land of proletarian dictatorship, to be its loyal ally." How much the words emphasised meant to the Chinese Soviets, which in truth most of the time were completely isolated geographically, economically; and politically, is hard to understand for any Westerner who has never known a Chinese Communist." (pp. 405-06)

Clearly this assessment is completely opposite from that presented by Scott. He can protest, of course, that he is referring in his pamphlet only to inter-state relations. But even on this front his charges are taken from the arsenal of anti-communist reaction and do not accord with the facts.

First of all let us summarise the main periods of Soviet-Chinese relations which Scott muddies up in this portion of the pamphlet.

1) 1917-1923: This is the period of revolution and civil war during which the Soviet government renounced its past Tsarist territorial and economic concessions in China. Marxism-Leninism is brought to China, the Communist Party of China is founded, a 'new orientation' towards national revolution against imperialism and friendship with Russia is adopted by Sun Yat-sen.

2) 1923-1927: This is a period of alliance between the national bourgeoisie and Chinese people, between the Kuomintang government and the Soviet Union. It ends with the betrayal of the revolution by Chiang Kai-shek in Shanghai and the beginning of the agrarian, anti-feudal, anti-imperialist revolution in the country-side. It is also the period during which Comrade Stalin opposed and defeated the adventurist lines of Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev and Radek with respect to the Chinese revolution, as well as many other questions facing the world communist revolution, and outlined a Marxist-Leninist line on the Chinese agrarian revolution put into practice by Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China.

3) 1927-1933: In this period the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries pursue a hostile anti-Soviet and repression of Communism campaign in China. During this period many hostile actions were taken against the Soviet Union by Chiang and various warlords. These hostilities, as we have shown, have been converted by Scott into examples, drawn from Chiang Kai-shek's propaganda arsenal, of **Red Imperialism**.

4) 1933-1939: This is a complex period of international relations marked by world capitalist economic crisis, emergence of a fascist alliance of Japan, Italy and Germany, and the beginning of a new world war to redivide the capitalist world market and sources of raw materials. During this period the Soviet Union attempted to organise a system of collective security against the fascist powers. The 'democratic' imperialist countries Britain, France and the United States rejected this path, and followed a policy of so-called non-intervention. In practise this meant encouraging Italian aggression in Ethiopia, German-Italian aggression against Spain, German aggression against Austria and Czechoslovakia, and Japanese aggression against China. In addition these fascist countries were directed by the 'non-intervention' powers to attack the Soviet Union so the U.S., British and French imperialists could pick up the pieces. The Soviet Union under the Marxist-Leninist leadership of Stalin completely thwarted the plans of these imperialists

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

and prepared conditions for defeating the fascist powers.

The course of the Chinese revolution was naturally completely interwoven with the inter-imperialist struggle for the revision of the market and raw materials. Within this context let us look at Scott's slander against the Mutual Defense Pact concluded between the Autonomous Outer Mongolian Republic and the Soviet Union in 1936. This Pact was one of a number the Soviet Union tried to conclude in Europe and Asia to block aggression from the fascist so-called Anti-Comintern Axis. Mutual defence pacts were rejected by the French, British and U.S. imperialists and their puppets, because they wanted the fascist powers to isolate and wage war against the Soviet Union. Naturally in their propaganda the imperialists denounced the Soviet efforts as an expression of, "Red imperialism" and "Bolshevik aggression" in much the same way Scott denounces the Defense Pact successfully concluded with Mongolia. What Scott doesn't mention is that the Soviet Union offered to sign an identical pact with the Kuomintang government in China. Chiang Kai-shek's government, divided in loyalty at this time between the fascist alliance including the Japanese aggressors and 'non-interventionist alliance' of US, French and British imperialism, rejected the pact. Chiang's line was "until every Red soldier in China is exterminated, and every communist is in prison ... then would it be possible to cooperate with Russia." (Snow, *Ibid.*, p.435) Snow comments, "Time may yet show that no costlier mistake has been made in the modern history of Chinese diplomacy." (*Ibid.*, p.435) Scott makes it appear that Mongolia was singled out as a 'victim' of Soviet aggression by being partner to this Pact, exactly the line used to denounce Soviet mutual defence treaties by fascist and 'democratic' imperialists alike in that period. But it was precisely the united effort of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party in this 1936-37 period which led to the famous Sian meeting during which Chiang Kai-shek was kidnapped and forced into a united front against Japanese imperialism. During the Sian incident the Chinese People's Liberation Army occupied big new areas in the northwest. Edgar Snow describes the strategic importance of this area for the Chinese national liberation struggle against Japan. He says:

"It was one of only two Chinese frontiers, and sources of supply which Japan could not blockade. More than half of Chinese Turkestan, which is roughly 550,000 square miles in area, was already under a government sympathetic to the Chinese Reds, semi-independent of Nanking, and a loose affiliate of the USSR. North-east of it, the Autonomous Outer Mongolian Republic, another 900,000 square miles of former dependency of China — and the Chinese suzerainty of which was still nominally recognized, even by Russia — was now definitely under the Red banner, as a result of the military alliance (Mutual Defense Pact) concluded with the USSR in 1936." (Snow, *Ibid.*, pp.472-73)

Scott's historical idealism rests in his simple transposition of the present day situation in which Soviet social-imperialism dominates Mongolia and exploits her raw materials and labour power to an entirely opposite situation in 1936. Then the Soviet-Mongolian alliance was the red revolutionary rear of the Chinese national war of liberation against Japanese imperialism. It was Chiang Kai-shek's government which denounced Soviet influence in Sinkiang and Mongolia as "Red imperialism." For Scott to try and peddle the same line in 1974 on the basis that today the Soviet Union has been transformed from a socialist into a social-imperialist country simply plays into the hands of the Soviet revisionists who also claim that their present day policies are the same as those followed under the dictatorship of the proletariat. This, of course, is simply untrue.

The most clear proof of the esteem in which Comrade Mao Tse Tung held Comrade Stalin and the Soviet Union in this period is his essay, *Stalin, friend of the Chinese people*, written on December 20, 1939. This essay has been printed in Comrade Mao's *Selected Works* (1965) and this emphasises the Chinese Communist Party holds to this analysis, in opposition to the revisionists heaped on Comrade Stalin by the modern revisionists. In the essay Chairman Mao warmly congratulates Stalin on his sixtieth birthday. He says "mankind can free itself from suffering only by the road pointed out by Stalin and with his help." This statement alone debunks Jack Scott's whole reactionary national chauvinist thesis about 'two roads'. There is only one road, the road of Great October 1917 of proletarian revolution and national liberation, the road pointed out by Stalin and with whose help suffering mankind moved forward. Chairman Mao denounces China's false "friends", the imperialists. He says:

"However, there are friends of another kind, friends who have real sympathy with us and regard us as brothers. Who are they? They are the Soviet people and Stalin.

"No other country has renounced its privileges in China; the Soviet Union alone has done so.

"All the imperialists opposed us during our First Great Revolution; the Soviet Union alone helped us.

"No government of any imperialist country has given us real help since the outbreak of the War of Resistance Against Japan; the Soviet Union alone has helped China with its aviation and supplies.

"Is not the point clear enough?

"Only the land of socialism, its leaders and people, and socialist thinkers, statesmen and workers can give real help to the cause of liberation of the Chinese nation and the Chinese people, and without their help our cause cannot win final victory.

"Stalin is the true friend of the cause of liberation of the Chinese people. No attempt to sow dissension, no lies and calumnies, can affect the Chinese people's whole-hearted love and respect for Stalin and our genuine friendship for the Soviet Union." (Mao Tse Tung, *Selected Works*, Vol.II, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965, pp.335-36)

The "lies and calumnies" of the anti-communist enemies of China repeated by Scott in 1974 when the Soviet Union has changed into its opposite, does not change the content of the

"lies and calumnies": They are still anti-communist slanders and hostile to the People's Republic of China.

Let us look now at Scott's slander against the 'neutrality pact' signed with Japan in April 1941. Scott does not mention the fact that on May 7, 1939 Italy and Germany had signed a formal military-political alliance and that on May 11, 1939 fascist Japan invaded Mongolia, therefore, through its commitment vis-à-vis the Mutual Defense Pact of 1936, also attacked the Soviet Union. The strategy of 'non-intervention' which Stalin had so precisely analysed in his Report to the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on March 10, 1939 was unfolding as he predicted. But he warned at the time:

"Far be it from me to moralize on the policy of non-intervention, to talk of treason, treachery and so on. It would be naive to preach morals to people who recognize no human morality. Politics are politics as the case hardened bourgeois diplomats say. It must be remarked, however, that the big and dangerous political game started by the supporters of the policy of non-intervention may end in serious fiasco for them." (J.V. Stalin, *Report to the 18th Congress of the CPSU(B) on the Work of the Central Committee*, March 10, 1939. Cited in *The Essential Stalin's Major Theoretical Writings 1905-1952* edited by B. Franklin, Anchor Books, New York, 1972, p.344)

The "serious fiasco" was the brilliant stroke of Soviet foreign policy of August 1939, when the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact was signed. Thus the whole strategy of 'non-intervention' to set Italy, Germany and Japan against the Soviet Union collapsed. Japan was defeated in the East by the Red Army and Japan sued for peace. Meanwhile the western front had been precluded from Italian-German aggression by the Non-Aggression Pact. Stalin played quite brilliantly on the selfish contradictory interests of the enemy camp following the general Marxist-Leninist principle of uniting the many against the few. As Stalin said in March 1939:

"The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is clear and explicit:

1. We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country.

2. We stand for peaceful, close and friendly relations with all neighbouring countries which have common frontiers with the USSR. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass, directly or indirectly, on the integrity and inviolability of the frontiers of the Soviet State.

3. We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country.

4. We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and are ready to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war who attempted to violate the Soviet borders. (*Ibid.*, pp.345-6)

Once Japan had been isolated from Germany, Stalin reversed the situation and isolated Germany from Japan just three months before Germany attacked the Soviet Union in June 22, 1941. In the first instance Germany had been directed west against France giving the Soviet Union time to prepare for war and at the same time neutralising Japan in the East. In the second case, Japan had been directed west against the United States leaving the Soviet Union's eastern border free in order to wipe out German aggression. Finally the Soviet Union would switch to the east again in August 1945 and wipe out Japan. Thus instead of the 'non-intervention' strategy of the western imperialists isolating the Soviet Union and world revolutionary forces, these forces were able to bring into play a united front against fascism to isolate and defeat Germany, Italy and Japan. In short the non-aggression pact signed with Japan in 1941 was part of the world revolutionary strategy of Comrade Stalin and the Soviet Union to unite the broadest possible alliance of forces against the fascist alliance, the main enemy of the world's peoples. China today follows and pushes forward precisely this glorious Marxist-Leninist road in foreign policy opened up by the first socialist state. Today as the consequence of revisionist restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the main enemy of the world's people is U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

We would assume that if Scott's assessment of the Soviet-Japanese non-aggression treaty were anywhere near accurate, the Chinese Communist Party would be the first to denounce it. After all it was the People's Liberation Army which bore the main brunt of the war against Japan. Chairman Mao Tse Tung in his essay, *The identity of interests between the Soviet Union and all mankind*, written September 28, 1939, clearly analyses the international situation of the time. He says:

"The Soviet Union is a socialist country, a country in which the Communist Party is in power, and it necessarily maintains a clear-cut two-fold attitude towards wars: (1) It firmly refuses to take part in any unjust, predatory and imperialist war and maintains strict neutrality towards the belligerents. Hence the Soviet Red Army will never disregard principles and join either of the imperialist war fronts. (2) It actively supports just and non-predatory wars of liberation. For instance, it helped the Chinese people in their war of the Northern Expedition thirteen years ago and the Spanish people in their war against Germany and Italy up to this last year; it has been helping the Chinese people in their War of Resistance Against Japan for the last two years and the Mongolian people in resisting Japan for the last few months; and it will certainly give help to any war for the liberation of the masses or a nation which may break out in other countries in the future, and will certainly give help to any wars that contribute to the defence of peace." (Mao Tse Tung, Vol.II, op. cit., pp.277-78)

Chairman Mao then welcomes the Soviet-German non-aggression treaty:

"The whole situation since the conclusion of the Soviet-German non-aggression treaty constitutes a great blow to Japan and a great help to China; it strengthens the position of those resisting Japan and weakens the capitulators. (*Ibid.*, p.281) Chairman Mao then proceeds to deal with the rumours spread

by British and US news agencies about an imminent non-aggression treaty with Japan:

"As for the talk about a Japanese-Soviet non-aggression treaty, the Soviet Union has been proposing it for many years but Japan has invariably rejected it. Now there is a section of the Japanese ruling class that wants such a treaty with the Soviet Union, but whether the Soviet Union will be willing depends on the basic principle of whether the treaty will accord with the basic interests of the Soviet Union and of the overwhelming majority of mankind ... The interests of the Soviet Union will always conform and never conflict with the interests of China's national liberation. I hold this as absolutely beyond doubt. People who are prejudiced against the Soviet Union are capitalizing on the Nomonhon truce agreement (1) and on the talk about a Japanese-Soviet non-aggression treaty in order to make trouble and stir up ill feeling between the two great nations of China and the Soviet Union. That is what the British, US and French intriguers and Chinese capitulators are doing; it is highly dangerous and we must thoroughly expose their dirty tricks." (*Ibid.*, p.281)

(1) The Nomonhon truce agreement was concluded in Moscow in September 1939. In May 1939 the Japanese and 'Manchuko' troops had jointly attacked the troops of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mongolia at Nomonhon, on the border between Mongolia and 'Manchuko', and were completely defeated by Soviet and Mongolian forces in a heroic war of self-defence. The Japanese then sued for peace. The truce agreement provided for an immediate cease-fire and the formation of a commission of four, with two representatives from each side, to demarcate the frontier between the Mongolian People's Republic and the puppet state of 'Manchuko' at places where the conflict had taken place." (Footnote in *Selected Works*, Vol.II, p.283)

Thus, far from being an 'imperialist' scheme to dominate Mongolia as Scott says, the Mutual Defense Pact of 1936 helped save the independence of Mongolia from Japanese aggression!

Note that in 1939 Mao Tse Tung was warning the Chinese people about the "dirty tricks" of, "British, US and French intriguers and Chinese capitulators", who were trying to make trouble between the Soviet and Chinese nations over the issue of a non-aggression treaty. Does the fact that since the death of Comrade Stalin modern revisionists have turned the Soviet Union into a social-imperialist country change the character of past Soviet relations with China. Not at all. Thus for Scott to peddle the same lies in 1974 as the imperialists and capitulators did in 1939 makes him also a dirty trickster, and all the more deceitful because he claims to be a "friend of People's China."

If Scott wants to assert that the portion we have quoted from Chairman Mao was written before the pact was signed let us remind him that Chairman Mao mentions the issue in his May 8, 1941 essay *Conclusions on the repulse of the second anti-communist onslaught*. He assesses new factors in the Chinese national liberation war as: "The spread of the imperialist war. The upsurge of the international revolutionary movement, the neutrality pact between the Soviet Union and Japan, the defeat of the Kuomintang's second anti-communist onslaught and the consequent decline in the political standing of the Kuomintang and rise in that of the Communist Party, and, furthermore the latest preparations by Japan for a new large-scale offensive against China." (*Ibid.*, p.463) The footnote to this passage, published in the *Selected Works* in 1965, after the usurpation of power in the Soviet Union by Brezhnev and Kosygin, and the beginning of overt social-imperialism, says:

"The neutrality pact between the Soviet Union and Japan, concluded on April 13, 1941, ensured peace on the eastern border of the Soviet Union, thus crushing the plot for a joint German, Italian and Japanese attack on the Soviet Union. It marked a major victory for the Soviet Union's peaceful foreign policy." (*Ibid.*, p.468)

Do the Chinese comrades falsify Soviet history because capitalist restoration in the USSR. No they do not. The Chinese comrades are historical materialists, and highly treasure the glorious victories of the world's first socialist country, and have complete faith in the inevitability of the Soviet proletariat waging another revolution. Next time against the new Tsars. But Scott hates the proletarian revolution, and merely uses the present world situation to do anti-communist propaganda under the signboard of "friendship to China." But one who attacks the dictatorship of the proletariat or parrots worn out imperialist lies to heap abuse on Comrade Stalin (without ever daring to mention his name) is no friend of China.

Let us now deal with Scott's slander against the Soviet Union's participation in the war against Japan in August 1945. Scott says Soviet "intervention" was "brief and relatively cheap." The fact is that after sacrificing 25 million lives to defeat Nazi Germany and liberate Europe, the Soviet government transported its army 5000 miles to formally begin action on August 8 against Japan in Manchuria as agreed upon at Potsdam. Two days before the agreed upon action U.S. imperialists, without consultation with the Soviet Union, dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima. Thus began the era of atomic blackmail against the Soviet Union and world revolution. Nevertheless the Soviet Union carried on its war plans and engaged the main Japanese army sweeping it from Manchuria, the southern half of Sakhalin Island, the Kuriles and liberating by agreement the northern half of Korea. Chairman Mao welcomed the Soviet action as follows:

"The Chinese people heartily welcome the Soviet government's declaration of war on Japan on August 8. The Soviet Union's action will very much shorten the war against Japan. The war is already in its last stage and the time has come to inflict final defeat on the Japanese aggressors and all their running dogs." (*Selected Works*, Vol.III, p.289) Thus on every point of history in the first section of Scott's pamphlet we see how he reshapes all the old anti-communist, anti-Soviet slanders. On not one single issue does his analysis coincide with that of Chairman Mao, the Communist Party of China and government of the People's Republic. But on every issue Scott's

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

analysis does coincide with Chiang Kai-shek and various imperialist "lies and calumnies." After stating that today the Soviet Union occupies Sinkiang and Mongolia with troops Scott concludes this portion of his pamphlet with another rhetorical question. "Why," he asks, "the wide chasm between promise and reality?" (p.119) This gesture of his is just another cheap and devious trick to hide his real motivation which is to obscure the role of modern revisionism in restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union, and turning a socialist country into a social-imperialist country. One of the main factors in shaping public opinion against the Communist Party of China's scientific analysis of present day Soviet Union is that such an event is unprecedented in history, and the full force of public-opinion-making of all imperialists and reactionaries is concentrated to perpetuate the big lie that the Soviet Union is 'communist'. Thus Scott, by deliberately obscuring the role of modern revisionism and peddling his slanders about the similarity of present Soviet social-imperialist foreign policies with past socialist policies, assists the modern revisionists and U.S. imperialists and attacks the scientific teachings of Chairman Mao. Scott is indeed a 'friend' with "honey on his lips and murder in his heart."

Scott has no interest in exposing and combating modern revisionism even though it is both Chinese Communist Party and state policy to uphold Marxism-Leninism against modern revisionism. Instead Scott has his own reactionary theory of history to 'explain' social-imperialism which he expounds at the opening of the second section of his pamphlet. He says "The past puts its stamp upon the present and the imprint is carved well into the future. How we act at any moment can influence events for years to come." He says that the Soviet Union needed to "break with past practice" in foreign relations, "not just in theory but in actual practice." He says, "Failure to develop an external policy with a revolutionary content that keeps pace with internal revolutionary objectives will, in time, turn inward and deflect the nation from its original aims." (p.20) All of this is abstract metaphysical nonsense that has nothing whatever to do with a concrete analysis of class alignment of forces, and the actual stage of revolutionary development existing at the time. We have already shown that in fact Soviet foreign policy was the opposite to Tsarist foreign policy, and all of Scott's charges are simply a rebash of imperialist slanders. Furthermore he raises foreign policy to a question of primary importance asserting that somehow an 'external' policy can be independent of an 'internal' policy, and 'external' policy can deflect a "nation from its original aims." This 'theory' that a nation has an "original aim" is a very reactionary metaphysical idea. Russia as a nation existed under feudalism, capitalism and socialism. Yet in each period of its history the ruling class of the nation imposed its will, its outlook on both internal and external policy. In fact external policy is simply a reflection of internal class relationship of forces, i.e. of which class has state power. When the old Tsars and finance capitalists ruled the Russian state, Russia pursued a chauvinist, imperialist policy toward nations within the Russian empire, and towards other oppressed nations like China. Just as it was in the selfish class interests of the old Tsars and capitalists to ruthlessly oppress and exploit the Russian working class and peasants, so was it in their selfish interest to oppress and plunder the Ukraine, Poland, the Central Asian nationalities, and China. With the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1917 the proletariat seized power, smashed up the old state apparatus, and in alliance with the peasantry established its own rule over Russian society. Under Comrades Lenin and Stalin the political power of the proletariat was consolidated and the economic base of Russian society was revolutionised. Russia was transformed into a modern industrialised socialist society, modern industry belonged to the society as a whole, and modern socialist farms belonged to the collective peasantry. During the period of dictatorship of the proletariat oppressed nations of the old Russian empire achieved autonomy and equality with the Russians and enjoyed all-round renaissance of development. The Soviet Union under Lenin and Stalin embarked on a revolutionary foreign policy. This road was highly praised by Chairman Mao, and today China advances further along it. In short there have never been any "original aims" of the Russian nation. There were always social classes and class struggle. When the proletariat had power the Soviet Union pursued proletarian policies of peaceful co-existence and support for oppressed nations fighting for their liberation.

What Scott obscures with his metaphysics is that class struggle also takes place in the cultural superstructure of a new socialist society, and becomes particularly acute there after the economic base is transformed. In Soviet experience Comrade Lenin and Stalin had successfully led the political revolution against capitalism and consolidated it during the civil war. In the course of this struggle they also had to fight the internal sabotage of Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev who took opportunist and defeatist lines. Then during the period of revolutionary transformation of the economic base (industrialisation and collectivisation of agriculture) Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky joined forces to sabotage this revolutionary phase of development. Class struggle was very sharp and Comrade Stalin led the Soviet people in overthrowing the resistance of the capitalist class and destroying the hidden traitors of revolution within the CPSU(B) in the purges and trials of the late 1930s. During the last years of his life Comrade Stalin became increasingly aware of a sharpening class struggle in the cultural superstructure. His latest theoretical works on linguistics and economic problems focused on the rise of revisionism, he attacked the revisionist theory of "productive forces" being decisive over "relations of production" and so on. But Comrade Stalin did not live to lead a proletarian cultural revolution. The process which he started was undermined by the Khrushchevite revisionists who usurped state power after Stalin's death. Slowly these revisionist usurpers undermined the socialist base, reinstated the capitalist market for private enrichment and converted state socialist property into state capitalist property for the en-

richment of a new class of bureaucratic monopoly capitalists. This process occurred over a relatively short period of time. Nor is it the first time in history that an old dispossessed class becomes restored to power in a new form. The epoch of revolutionary change from capitalism to socialism covers a considerably long period of history. In this process there are victories as well as set backs although the main inevitable trend of history is toward proletarian revolution. The Chinese workers and peasants led by the Communist Party and Chairman Mao made a great contribution to world revolution with the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This rich experience of the masses has been summed up in the Ninth and Tenth Congresses of the CPC, as well as in the Fourth National People's Congress. But Jack Scott who calls himself a "friend of China" and an "expert" on the Cultural Revolution, completely denies the analysis of the Chinese with respect to capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union, and the danger of restoration in China.

The restoration of the old class in a new form within the Soviet Union was naturally reflected in Soviet foreign policy. Just as the new Tsars exploit the Russian workers and peasants, so too do they oppress and plunder the small nations within the Soviet Union, and strive for world hegemony in order to dominate world markets and plunder raw materials outside their borders. The practise of Russian chauvinism and hegemonism is a reflection of the restoration of state monopoly capitalist relations of production within the Soviet Union. There is no mystery to the present Soviet social-imperialist foreign policy. It was not "stamped" on Russia for all time. Rather the foreign policy as well as the relations of production reflect the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Scott obscures this essential fact of history. Instead of clarifying this point Scott seizes upon a half-truth and blows it up into a 'theory' of his 'own'. He says "the act of liberation, the soil from which it sprang and the methods employed in reaching the destined goal, will play an important part in future developments." (p.20) There is a half-truth of sorts here, but it is of no particular value. The key to grasping historical development is revolutionary dialectics, the truth that things turn into their opposite in great leaps, revolutionary transformations and radical ruptures from the past. Furthermore revolution can be transformed into its opposite by counter-revolution. A new governing class can temporarily be overthrown by a restoration of the old governing class. This is the essence of dialectics, and when applied to the specific, concrete historical alignment of class forces provides the proletariat with a powerful science to change the world. But Scott's outlook is both mechanical and idealist. Thus he neither sees politics in the process of change and development into their opposite, nor does he grasp the particular concrete historical situation and analyse that in itself. We have shown how his method in practice results in simply repeating worn-out imperialist slanders against the Soviet Union and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now in the second portion of his pamphlet, *Two Roads* Scott extends his distortions of history into a reactionary theory that Russia and China followed two different roads to revolution. Scott says that Russia was an oppressor nation and China was an oppressed nation. This is true, but what conclusions does Scott draw from this fact? He says: "A crucial part of the Soviet heritage were the imperialist claims and conquests of the delinquent Tsarist regime. The ability or inability, as the case may be, of the Soviets' ability to handle the problems devolving from this situation in an effective and revolutionary way, could not help but affect the whole course of Soviet development, for good or ill." (p.21) This is mere hot air and double talk. Scott has already written a whole section of his pamphlet 'proving' through slander, innuendo, half truth and lie that the Soviet Union failed to change from its past Tsarist foreign policy. He equivocates at this point because he does not want to come out openly and admit he believes it is impossible to have a proletarian revolution in an imperialist country. But his profound faith in imperialism and lack of faith in the modern proletariat is in fact the basis of his 'theory' of two roads. Historically, October 1917 and socialist construction in the Soviet Union proved in practice the destiny of the modern proletariat. All the old patterns were smashed up, and new socialist relations struggled into being on many fronts, including the front of inter-state relations. Soviet Union did break from its past in a most effective and decisive manner. The restoration of the old ruling class in a new form has nothing whatever to do with the fact that the Soviet Union was an oppressor country. Otherwise why would the Chinese Communist Party, leader of an oppressed nation, emphasise so often the danger of capitalist restoration in China?

What Scott says in effect with his notion of the past stamping the present and imprinting the future is that a nation (with its "original aims") is "one and indivisible". In fact the slogan "Russia, one and indivisible" was a reactionary slogan of the old Tsars. A modern version of this slogan is "government of the whole people" which the modern revisionists use to masquerade the dictatorship of the new Tsars. But Comrade Stalin long ago exploded this lie of a nation "one and indivisible." He said:

"The time when people boldly proclaimed 'Russia, one and indivisible' has gone. Today (1905 — editor) even a child knows that there is no such thing as Russia 'one and indivisible', that Russia long ago split up into two opposite classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Today it is no secret to anyone that the struggle between these two classes has become the axis around which our contemporary life revolves... Before us has unfolded the magnificent picture of the struggle between the two Russias — bourgeois Russia and proletarian Russia. Two big armies have entered the arena — the army of the proletarians and the army of the bourgeoisie — and the struggle between these two armies embraces the whole of our social life." (J. Stalin, *The Proletarian Class and the Proletarian Party, Works*, Vol.1, pp.63-4)

These two Russian armies are, a mere seventy years later, still in the arena. During these past seventy years of class war the

Russian proletariat won major victories, and recently suffered major set-backs. But they are the advanced class and inevitably they will arise again and win new victories. So where is the stamp? Does Scott not recognise that the past of the proletariat also stamps its present? Just as the past of the Russian bourgeoisie stamps its present, so too the revolutionary past of the Russian proletariat reasserts itself. Scott's fundamental error is to evoke the idea of a nation, single and indivisible, rather than a nation split into opposite classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat.

Scott extends his theory to China as well and says that as an oppressed nation "China was more closely attuned to the fears, anxieties and problems of the oppressed, more knowledgeable of the strengths and weaknesses of the oppressor." (p.21) This is social-fascist logic. Did the Chinese feudalists and compradors share this 'national' insight? If so how does Scott explain the Great Han chauvinism of Chiang Kai-shek to the non-Han nationalities in China, including several massacres of non-Han peoples? Mao Tsetung and the Chinese Communist Party never speak of China's "national characteristic". Rather they speak of class struggle, and of the proletariat and peasantry winning national liberation (at times in alliance with the national bourgeoisie) and the establishment after the New Democratic Revolution of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Not surprising it is the social-fascist (who always called himself a 'revolutionary' and 'nationalist') Chiang Kai-shek, who gives the theory of a Chinese "national character." "If our entire population," he writes in 1958 propped up on the island province of Taiwan by U.S. imperialism, "upholds our national honor and maintains our traditional spirit of righteousness; if we preserve and value our sublime national culture and our glorious long, long history; and if we remember our past pains even when they no longer hurt, develop national strength and remove the cause of national humiliation... (we can) fulfill our sacred fourfold mission of fighting communism, resisting Russia, recovering the mainland, and attaining the goals in our National Revolution and National Reconstruction." (Chiang Kai-shek, op.cit. p.370) Is not Chiang Kai-shek's dream of restoring his lost paradise based on the same historical idealist theory of 'nations' promoted by Jack Scott? Chiang appeals to China's long suffering history as an oppressed nation, and evokes China's "national culture" and "glorious long, long history." But what China? The China of feudal landlords and comprador bureaucrat capitalists. New China is the China of modern proletarians and peasants guided by the new culture of Marxism-Leninism brought to China by the glorious October Revolution, and now advanced and summed up to a higher stage in Mao Tsetung Thought, Marxism-Leninism in the present era. Thus Jack Scott not only repeats Chiang Kai-shek's slanders and lies about the history of Sino-Soviet relations, he even rebashes his metaphysical theory of history and 'nationality'. This is the 'unity' of Scott's 'theory' and 'practise' in writing 'history'.

Scott then connects his ideas about the differences between the "national characteristics" of China and Russia with the so-called "two roads" each revolution followed. He says: "The circumstances of the Russian crisis and the disintegration of the bourgeois political base enabled the Bolsheviks to seize power at the centre, and then, after a relatively brief civil war period, social revolution was carried to the outlying areas embracing an often uncooperative peasantry." (p.21) This is altogether wrong. The reason the Civil War in Russia was relatively short was because the imperialists on an international scale were at war with one another. Furthermore, despite the brevity of the Civil War, it was extremely devastating and violent. Lenin says: "The West European capitalist powers partly deliberately and partly unconsciously did everything they could to throw us back, to utilise the elements of the Civil War in Russia in order to spread as much ruin in the country as possible." (V.I. Lenin, *Better Fewer But Better, Collected Works*, Vol. XXXII, Moscow, 1962, p.498) Scott has called for proletarian revolution he is blind to basic facts admitted even by most bourgeois historians.

Scott goes on to say "Whereas Russian conditions had dictated the armed seizure of the political and administrative power centers, to be used as a fulcrum for social revolution, the dynamics of the Chinese revolution, on the other hand, demanded the mobilisation of the popular masses for the conquest of the power centres. As a consequence, the Russians have come to place an excessive reliance on administrative methods, while the Chinese have tended to put more reliance and confidence in the masses' of the people and place their trust in methods of persuasion."

"These divergent experiences and profound differences in background and historical development of the two parties, the differences in strategy by which power was conquered and the methods afterwards employed, have produced different ideological climates, different forms of inner-party life and different styles of work. These differences are now reflected in wide, even totally separate, views on intra-party relations, and on all other forms of international relations as well." (p.22)

"Hidden in these words is even more devious and sinister propaganda for modern revisionism. Scott writes in these two paragraphs as if the 'Communist' Party of the Soviet Union is in fact a communist party which has 'differences' and "even totally separate views" from the Communist Party of China. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is the ideology, scientific world outlook of the modern proletarian class in all nations and countries. If Scott were even a friend of China, let alone his claims of being a 'Marxist-Leninist', he would at least give China's very clear, unequivocal and correct analysis that the CPSU is today a fascist party, and is the instrument of the dictatorship of the new bureaucratic monopoly capitalist class over the proletariat in the Soviet Union. Scott is simply once again concocting a 'theory' based on a bogus 'analysis'. In ordinary language what Scott is talking about is that the October 1917 revolution was a proletarian socialist revolution organised in the main Russian cities. The battlefields of the Civil War were both in the countryside and in some cities. The Bolshevik Party

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

won the Civil War in a relatively short period for three main reasons: 1) Under the correct leadership of Lenin and Stalin the Party successfully mobilised the urban and rural proletariat and forged an alliance with the poor and middle peasants; and 2) the imperialist powers were themselves, as Lenin said, like two locomotives in head-on collision and thus unable to concentrate their forces to defeat the revolution; 3) the world revolutionary upsurge of workers and oppressed nations against imperialism and in support of the Russian revolution undermined imperialist intervention against the revolution.

Certainly the Chinese revolution was different from the Soviet revolution. For one thing the bourgeois democratic phase of the Russian revolution had been completed in February 1917. The contradictions of world war accelerated the process of revolution, and because of the steved, scientific and experienced leadership of the Bolshevik Party, a successful proletarian socialist revolution was organised. In China the first phase of national revolution was betrayed by the national bourgeoisie in the Chiang Kai-shek coup of 1927. As Comrade Stalin analysed at the time, and which we have already cited, two possibilities were facing China: either victory of the bourgeoisie in a deal with imperialism against the proletariat, or the proletariat consolidates hegemony and leads the workers and peasants to complete the bourgeois democratic revolution and then converts it into a socialist revolution. He said further:

"The crisis of world capitalism and the existence in the USSR of a proletarian dictatorship whose experience may be successfully utilised by the Chinese proletariat considerably enhance the possibility of the Chinese revolution taking the second path.

"On the other hand, the fact that imperialism is attacking the Chinese revolution, in the main with a united front, that there is not at the present time that division and war among the imperialists which, for instance existed in the imperialist camp prior to the October Revolution, and which tended to weaken imperialism — this fact indicates that on its path to victory the Chinese revolution will encounter far greater difficulties than did the revolution in Russia, and that the desertions and betrayals in the course of this revolution will be incomparably more numerous than during the Civil War in the USSR." (J. Stalin, *Questions of the Chinese Revolution*, op.cit., p.225)

Comrade Stalin gave the world communist movement a straightforward objective analysis of the Chinese revolution. In his struggle against the vacillating subjective bourgeois views of Kamenev, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Radek and others who first veered to the 'right' and then to the 'left', Comrade Stalin stated:

"Comrade Kamenev said that the policy of the Communist International was responsible for the defeat of the Chinese Revolution, and that we 'bred Cavaignacs in China'... How can it be asserted that the tactics of a party can abolish or reverse the relations of class forces? What are we to say of people who forget the relation of class forces in time of revolution, and who try to explain everything by the tactics of a party? Only one thing can be said of such people — that they have abandoned Marxism." (Cited by Edgar Snow, *Red Star Over China*, op.cit., p.413-4)

Now is this not what in fact Jack Scott is doing when he declares that the "methods" of the Chinese and Soviet parties were "different." Is he not also neglecting to make an analysis of the class alignment of forces within the Soviet Union at the time of Comrade Stalin's death, and the alignment of class forces in China which prevented restoration and gave rise to the Proletarian cultural revolution? In short what Scott does with his 'explanation' about "different ideological climates" is to rehash Trotsky's theory that revolutions only grow in certain 'climates.' Whereas Trotsky's line opposed the line of national liberation and armed agrarian revolution in the Third World, Scott makes a somewhat less heralded attempt to negate the possibility of proletarian revolution in imperialist countries.

But Jack Scott, like Trotsky, is a devious and tricky fellow in argument. He is not quite prepared to come out directly and say Comrade Stalin was a social imperialist, and a revisionist. What he says is that after "the first flush of victory" in 1917, "uncorrected errors and difficult conditions caused a drift", and this drift carried on in a quantitative manner until Stalin's death they "sooq became a 180 degree turn". (p.22) Here Scott reveals his mechanistic thinking. After a "flush", things "drift" back to capitalism in the Soviet Union. In fact Soviet life was marked by fierce class struggle several times right within the Bolshevik Party. There was the sharp struggle against the 'left' and 'right' capitulationist lines during the period of seizure of political power in 1917-18. Another period marked by sharp class struggle, also reflected in the Party, was during the period of revolutionary transformation of the economic base of the Soviet Union, and the opposition to industrialisation and collectivisation by the 'right' and 'left' which degenerated into outright betrayal of socialism, and collaboration with Nazi Germany and other imperialist powers. Then there was a period of "national alliance" in the Great Patriotic War (1941-45) and during the latter period of Stalin's life the beginnings of sharp class struggle in the cultural superstructure. In China too there were many two-line struggles in the Communist Party, and these became even more intense, more of a life and death nature after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China. When China denounces Liu Shiao Chi as China's Khrushchev, and Lin Biao as the superspy for Soviet social-imperialism, does not this mean that their 'method' and tactics were exactly the same as their class brothers in the Soviet Union? What difference did it make that the Soviet Union's proletarian revolution and civil war followed a different course than China's? Did not in fact the same class struggle between proletarian and bourgeois lines give rise to a life and death struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism in both parties? Of course it did. Scott is merely trying to throw sand in the eyes of some unsuspecting youth, and is providing both modern revisionists and U.S. imperialist agents in Canada with yet more ammunition for their anti-communist, anti-China propaganda — all in the name of 'friendship.' Such is the

practical result of his bogus "theory" about two roads, "two national characteristics" and so on.

But our investigation shows that all of Scott's bogus "theories" are simply a flimsy cover to hide the fact that most of his "facts" and "conclusions" are gleaned from U.S. imperialist sources, plus a few from Chiang Kai-shek. This is why Scott does not provide his readers with a single footnote or bibliographical list, despite his numerous quotations. For example, we find that the portion already quoted from Part One in his pamphlet about the Soviet Union's "cheap intervention in the war against Japan" is but a rehash of the line presented by David Floyd's book *Mao Against Khrushchev*, published by the CIA-financed Praeger Publishing Company. Floyd's CIA, anti-communist line is as follows:

"As the end of the war approached and the ultimate defeat of Japan became inevitable, Stalin hastened to turn the wartime alliance to Russia's advantage in the Far East. At Yalta in 1945, he extracted from Roosevelt and Churchill (in return for a promise of Russian participation in the war against Japan), a guarantee of the status quo in Mongolia, the promise of the return to Russia of the whole of Sakhalin, a guarantee of Russian rights in the port of Dairen and Port Arthur and in the Chinese Eastern Railway, and the transfer to Russia of the Kurile Islands. This deal was arrived at without consultation with the Chinese, Nationalist or Communist. Thus, in return for what in the event was a nominal contribution to the defeat of Japan, Stalin secured the return of all Chinese concessions which the Tsarist regime had lost to Japan in 1904." (David Floyd, *Mao Against Khrushchev*, Praeger, New York, 1963, pp.7-8)

This almost verbatim is Scott's line. In fact, Scott returns to the so-called 'Treaty of Yalta' in his Part Two, page 23, where he repeats Floyd's charges, and then quotes almost verbatim from the 'conditions' of what Floyd calls "an agreement about the conditions on which the Soviet Union would eventually enter the war against Japan". Scott conceals this into a 'secret Treaty of Yalta', thus outdoing the CIA by a notch. In fact the specific agreements about Soviet action against Japan were worked out at Potsdam, and it was U.S. imperialism that violated the agreements by their unilateral and secret decision to drop an atomic bomb on Japan two days before the agreed-upon Soviet action against the Japanese army in Manchuria, and one day after those actions began. However, neither Scott nor Floyd naturally have anything to say about this fact.

After Scott gets all puffed up and moralistic in repeating Floyd's CIA anti-Soviet slanders, Scott proceeds to cite from another U.S. imperialist book — this one published by The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. Scott of course pretends he has researched his own material and so, following his denunciation of the non-existent 'secret Treaty of Yalta', he cites an alleged statement from Chairman Mao given to, Scott claims, "a socialist journalist from Japan". (p.23) In truth, the quotation Scott gives is lifted from *Territorial Claims in the Sino-Soviet Conflict (Documents and Analysis)* by Dennis J. Doolin, published by The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, on July 11, 1964. (The book makes a typographical error and dates the statement "August 11", which Scott carelessly repeats in his pamphlet — proving conclusively the source of his material.) The quotation is from the Japanese paper *Seikai Shuho* and was made by a delegation of the Japanese Socialist Party which had met with Chairman Mao. The importance of this statement was that it was immediately picked up by the Soviet social-imperialists and used to slander the position of Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party. If Scott harboured one ounce of friendship towards China, or even a shred of bourgeois honesty, he would have cited the fact that the same book carries an alleged interview with Premier Chou En-lai by Okada, Socialist member of the Diet, in which Chou En-lai is quoted as saying:

"I. There were some incorrect comments by the Japanese press concerning Chairman Mao Tsetung's statement. Japan should take care to accept Chinese support of Japan's demand for retrocession of the Kurile Islands... The USSR is holding a large amount of territory which was taken from others since the Czarist period, and it is logical and justifiable for newly independent countries to claim their former territories.

2. At the interview with Premier Khrushchev in January 1957, I requested that the USSR make proper arrangements for the territorial issues covering Japan, China, the Middle East, and the Eastern European countries including Finland. I could not get a satisfactory answer from him then, but the announcement of the issue was kept secret because the Sino-Soviet dispute was not public at the time." (Cited by D. Hoolin, *Territorial Claims in the Sino-Soviet Conflict*, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, 1965, pp.45-46)

The portion that Scott quotes from Hoolin's book is precisely the portion Chou En-lai is quoted in, a page later in the same book as containing "some incorrect comments." It was these "incorrect comments" that were seized upon by the modern revisionists in the Soviet Union to make maximum anti-communist, anti-Chinese propaganda. Scott then proceeds from his unqualified reproduction of the "incorrect comments" from the Japanese press to say: "Khrushchev's son-in-law, Adzhubei, chose the locale of West Berlin to offer a reply to the Chinese. And his answer was couched in terms reminiscent of the most jingoistic of imperialist aggressors." (p.24) Following this, he presents another citation from Hoolin's book, given on page 47. Now Hoolin does, in fact, cite an excerpt from Adzhubei's interview with *Der Spiegel* made in Hamburg, but this is not what Scott quotes. What he quotes is a portion from a Tass International Service story of August 10, 1964 that Hoolin cites in his 'documentation'. The Tass story is introduced as follows: "Moscow — The *Izvestia* of August 10 printed a second feature by Soviet journalists Adzhubei, Lednev, Polyakov and Pralnikov who visited the German Federal Republic at the invitation of three West German newspapers." (Ibid., p.46) Then follow two paragraphs, the second one of which is presented by Scott as Adzhubei's West Berlin reply to the Chinese. Scott is clearly an outright charlatan, even by bourgeois academic standards. First of all, he presents a CIA line on the Soviet Union's war against Japan without acknowledging his source. Then he

proceeds to repeat some "incorrect comments" from Japanese newspapers reprinted from a Hoover Institute book of 'documents'. And then he carries on in melodramatic fashion exaggerating and distorting simple and trivial facts in order to make himself appear to be very "scholarly" and of course very morally outraged.

The next number of slanders against Stalin, the Soviet Union and Soviet-Chinese relations of the 1930's-1940's period are plagiarised by Scott from a thoroughly anti-communist, anti-Chinese book called *The Sino-Soviet Territorial Dispute* by a pro-U.S. imperialist agent, Tai Sung-an. His line on the nature of the contradiction between Soviet social-imperialism and People's China is essentially the same as that dished out by Scott. In the introduction to his book, Tai says: "The Sino-Soviet conflict, which began as an ideological dispute in 1960, has degenerated into a nationalistic clash based on territorial disputes." (Tai Sung-an, *The Sino-Soviet Territorial Dispute*, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1973, p.13) Mr. Tai is blatantly anti-communist and to support his line he presents a number of slanders. For example, he says:

"The historically well established fact is that Mao Tsetung has always hated the Russians. Stalin, for his part, liked Chiang Kai-shek better than Mao, and it is possible that the Soviet dictator would have preferred to deal with a weak China under Chiang Kai-shek. According to a U.S. Department of State document released in 1969, Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai in 1945 had repeatedly tried to establish relations with the United States, probably in order to pursue an independent, 'Titoist' course." (Ibid., p.64)

This slander of both Comrade Stalin and Chairman Mao is rehashed by Scott. Only Scott dare not slander Chairman Mao directly, so he only infers throughout the pamphlet that China follows its 'independent road', as opposed to following the road of the October Revolution. Here is the portion from Tai that Scott plagiarises directly:

"The rise of a Communist-led government in China would certainly upset the status quo. Such a prospect would obviously bring no joy to the hearts of the Soviets. While Moscow would probably have been prepared to welcome a strong party with a fair degree of influence, and prepared to accept Russian tutelage, there is ample evidence to show that they would prefer to deal with a weak Chiang Kai-shek ruling over a divided country. And a Chinese victory would well have repercussions far beyond China itself. A Communist China might decide, as Chinese Communists have so often before, to follow a course independent of Moscow's wishes and advice." (p.25) Here we see how Scott deviously repeats the same two baselines that Mr. Tai openly asserts: one, that Comrade Stalin liked the Chinese traitor Chiang Kai-shek more than China's revolutionary leaders, and two, the Chinese Communist Party followed an 'independent course', meaning really a non-Marxist-Leninist course even though Scott of course can not say this openly and expect to retain any credibility as a 'friend' of China. Tai promotes his slanders against Comrade Stalin as presented by various U.S. imperialist spokesmen such as former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, Averell Harriman and former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes. Tai says:

"V.M. Molotov, one of the Soviet leaders, expressed this identical view (i.e. that 'the Chinese Communists are not real Communists') in talks with various Americans (e.g. Patrick J. Hurley, Donald M. Nelson) by saying: 'The Soviet Government could bear no responsibility for international affairs of development in China for which at times it had been unjustifiably held responsible... In part of that country the people were half starved and miserable; and thus they called themselves 'Communists' but they had no relation to Communism; they used the name as a way of expressing their discontent over their conditions; but if these were improved, they would forget that they were 'Communists'; and so, if the United States helped these unfortunate people, there would be fewer 'Communists' in China... The Soviet people would be very glad if the United States helped in China.'" (Ibid., p.62-3)

Now let us see how Scott plagiarises this U.S. imperialist slander cited by Mr. Tai. Scott says:

"Moscow did indicate there would be no joy in Russian governing circles over a Communist victory in China, and tried to discourage the Chinese Communists from attempting the overthrow of Chiang. The official position in Moscow was that only Chiang could unify the nation. And Molotov, Foreign Affairs Commissar was disparaging of the Chinese Communists. In a statement to Patrick J. Hurley and Donald M. Nelson, Molotov declared: 'In part of that country China the people were half-starved and miserable; and thus they called themselves 'Communists', but they have no relation to Communism; they used the name as a way of expressing their discontent over their conditions; but if these were improved, they would forget that they were 'Communists' and so if the United States helped these unfortunate people, there would be fewer Communists in China... The Soviet people would be very glad if the United States helped China.'" (p.26)

Scott then follows this plagiarism from Tai's book with a very selective quotation from Chairman Mao's essay, *The Situation and Our Policy after the Victory in the War of Resistance against Japan* (August 13, 1945) in an attempt to give credence to the Hurley-Nelson slanders. Scott says:

"It must have been by way of a reply to Soviet advice on desisting from civil war that Mao Tsetung, in the course of an address given to a meeting of cadres in Yanan in August 1945, made the following statement: 'During the past eight years the people and army of our Liberated areas, receiving no aid whatsoever from outside and relying solely on their own efforts, liberated vast territories and resisted and pinned down the bulk of the Japanese invading forces and practically all the puppet troops... Chiang Kai-shek hid on Mount Omei with guards in front of him — the guards were the liberated areas, the people and army of the Liberated Areas — we protected this 'generalissimo'... and gave him both the time and space to sit around waiting for victory with folded arms. 'On what base should our policy rest? It should rest on our strength, and that

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

means regeneration through one's own efforts. We are not alone; all the countries and people in the world opposed to imperialism are our friends... Relying on the forces we ourselves organise we can defeat all Chinese and foreign reactionaries... China definitely does not belong to Chiang Kai-shek, China belongs to the Chinese people." (p.26)

In fact Scott's quotation from Chairman Mao's essay distorts the main points of it. The first paragraph of the essay Scott quotes from is as follows:

"These are days of tremendous change in the situation in the Far East. The surrender of Japanese imperialism is now a foregone conclusion. The decisive factor for Japan's surrender is the entry of the Soviet Union into the war. A million Red Army troops are entering China's Northeast; this force is irresistible. Japanese imperialism can no longer continue the fight. (Mao Tsetung, *The Situation and our policy after the Victory in the war of resistance against Japan*, Selected Works, Vol.I, p.11)

At this point in the Selected Works there is a footnote which says the following:

"On August 8, 1945, the Soviet government declared war on Japan. On August 10 the Mongolian government declared war on Japan. The Soviet Red Army moved by land and sea into China's Northeast and into Korea and swiftly routed the Japanese Kwantung Army. The joint Soviet-Mongolian armies crossed the Inner Mongolian desert and entered Jehol and Chahar Provinces. On August 10 the Japanese government was compelled to send a note begging to surrender and on the 14th it formally announced its unconditional surrender. The Kwantung Army was the cream of the main force of the Japanese Army and constituted Japan's general strategic reserve. The Japanese imperialists had dreamed of relying on this force to carry on a long-drawn-out war from their favourable strategic position in China's Northeast and in Korea. This scheme was completely wrecked by the entry of the Soviet Union into the war, and the Japanese government had to admit defeat and surrender. (Ibid., pp.22-23)

Chairman Mao then analyses the heroic role played by the Chinese Liberation Army in the war against Japan, and the treasonous role played by Chiang Kai-shek. But Chairman Mao goes on to explain very carefully that the Chinese Communist Party policy is to prevent civil war. He says:

"Our policy, the policy of the people, is against civil war. The opponents of civil war consist only of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people — it is a pity that they do not include Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang. Here one side does not want to fight and the other does. If both did not want it, there would be no fighting. Now, since only one side is against it and this side is not yet strong enough to check the other, the danger of civil war is extremely grave. (Ibid., p.74) He proceeds to explain the history of the Chinese Communist Party, and how after long study and investigation they discovered that only by fighting fit-for-fat could the people win their rights against the landlords and imperialists. He then asks to whom should the fruits of victory over Japan go, to Chiang Kai-shek who did nothing to bring about victory, or to the Chinese people and Liberation Army who fought the long War of Resistance against Japan. It is from this portion of the essay that Scott takes the first part of his quotation out of context. Chairman Mao proceeds to call upon the Chinese Party, Liberation Army and people to sweep up reactionaries from China if Chiang Kai-shek imposes civil war on China. He says: "It is up to us to organize the people. As for the reactionaries in China, it is up to us to organise the people to overthrow them. Everything reactionary is the same; if you don't hit it, it won't fall. It is like sweeping the floor; where the broom does not reach, the dust never vanishes of itself... That is how things are in this world. Bells don't ring till you strike them. Tables don't move till you shift them. Japan did not surrender until the Red Army of the Soviet Union entered northeastern China. The enemy and puppet troops never handed over their arms until our troops fought them." (Ibid., pp.19-20)

At this point in his essay, Chairman Mao rouses the Chinese Communist Party, Liberation Army and people to wake up at the break of day to sweep China free from reactionaries an inch at a time. It is at this point he proclaims China's policy to be that of self-reliance, i.e. the second portion of Scott's quotation taken out of context from Chairman Mao's essay. Following this Chairman Mao again emphasized the decisive role of the Red Army of the Soviet Union in preparing material conditions for the then new situation in China:

"The Soviet Union has sent its troops, the Red Army has come to help the Chinese people drive out the aggressor; such an event has never happened before in Chinese history. Its influence is immeasurable. The propaganda organs of the United States and Chiang Kai-shek hoped to sweep away the Red Army's political influence with two atom bombs. But it can't be swept away that isn't so easy. Can atom bombs decide wars? No, they can't. Atom bombs could not make Japan surrender. Without the struggles waged by the people, atom bombs by themselves would be of no avail. If atom bombs could decide the war, then why was it necessary to ask the Soviet Union to send its troops? Why didn't Japan surrender when the two atom bombs were dropped on her and why did she surrender as soon as the Soviet Union sent troops? Some of our comrades, too, believe that the atom bomb is all-powerful; that is a big mistake. These comrades show even less judgement than a British peer. There is a certain British peer called Lord Mountbatten. He said the worst possible mistake is to think that the atom bomb can decide a war. These comrades are more backward than Mountbatten. What influence has made these comrades look upon the atom bomb as something miraculous? Bourgeois influence. Where does it come from? From their education in bourgeois schools, from the bourgeois press and news agencies. There are two world outlooks and two methodologies, the proletarian world outlook and methodology and the bourgeois world outlook and methodology. The theory that 'weapons decide everything', the purely military viewpoint, a bureaucratic style of work divorced

from the masses, individualist thinking, and the like — all these are bourgeois influences in our ranks. We must constantly sweep these bourgeois things out of our ranks just as we sweep dust.

"The entry of the Soviet Union into the war has decided Japan's surrender and the situation in China is entering a new period. (Ibid., pp.21-22)

The editors of Selected Works make the following two footnotes to the passage quoted above:

"The United States dropped an atom bomb on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, and another on Nagasaki on August 9. The propaganda organs of the United States and of Kuomintang made much of the event, alleging that the Japanese government had surrendered because it was afraid of the U.S. atom bombs. By such propaganda they hoped to belittle the decisive role played by the entry of the Soviet Union into the war in compelling Japan to surrender.

"Mountbatten, then Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Southeast Asia, made a statement on August 9, 1945, welcoming the entry of the Soviet Union into the war against Japan. He also said that the worst possible mistake would be to believe that the atom bomb could end the war in the Far East." (Ibid., p.26)

Here we have the official view of the Chinese Communist Party on the decisive role played by the Red Army of the Soviet Union in defeating Japan. Compare this to the statement from Scott previously examined in which he speaks of the Soviet Union's "brief, and relatively cheap intervention in the war against Japan". Now in this portion of *Two Roads*, Scott quotes Chairman Mao out of context to give the impression that the Chinese Communist Party indirectly agrees with the anti-Soviet slanders of the U.S. imperialists. The extensive quotations we have made from Chairman Mao's essay show very clearly that Chairman Mao fully grasped the role played by the Soviet Union under Comrade Stalin, and further, educated the Chinese Communist Party in a proletarian class outlook, not a Chinese 'separate need' outlook, as is suggested by all imperialist reactionaries, and repeated by Scott.

Scott follows his out of context quotations from Chairman Mao with some rumours circulated by Mr. Tai:

"A Japanese journalist reported a big character poster in Peking which quoted a 1962 speech by Mao, as follows: 'The roots (of the conflict) were laid long before. They (the CPSU) did not allow China to make revolution. This was in 1945, when Stalin refused to permit the Chinese revolution by saying that we should not engage in any civil war and that we must collaborate with Chiang Kai-shek. Otherwise the Republic of China will collapse. At that time, we did not adhere to that, and the revolution was victorious.'" (p.26)

This fraud is stolen directly from Scott's anti-communist 'teacher', Mr. Tai Sung-an, who introduces the slander in his book as follows:

"What was even worse, Stalin, bent on re-creating the traditional Russian spheres of influence in the Chinese borderlands by keeping China divided and weak, was ready to sell out the Chinese Communist cause in 1945, urging the Chinese Communists to forget about revolution, to disband their armies and join Chiang Kai-shek's anti-Communist government as a minority. In his secret speech made to the Tenth Plenum of the Eighth Communist Party at Chungnanhai in Peking on September 28, 1962 Mao said: 'The roots (of the conflict between the Soviet Union and Communist China) were laid long before. They (the Soviet Communists) did not allow China to make (Communist) revolution. This was in 1945, when Stalin refused to permit the Chinese (Communists) revolution by saying that we should not engage in any civil war and that we must collaborate with Chiang Kai-shek. Otherwise, the Republic of China will collapse. At that time, we did not adhere to that, and the revolution was victorious.'" (The Sino-Soviet Territorial Dispute, op.cit.p.63)

Aside from a few minor 'original' parenthetical inserts used by Scott in an effort to erase his tracks, we can see that Scott merely copies the gossip-mongering used by outright imperialist agents to sow confusion among the masses, and to negate the common road linking the Great October Socialist Revolution and construction of socialism under Lenin and Stalin with China's new democratic, socialist and Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution led by Chairman Mao Tsetung. Scott even tries to use quotations from Chairman Mao's Selected Works to give 'authenticity' to rumours, gossips and outright lies peddled by the imperialists. This can not be called an act of 'friendship' towards China.

Jack Scott unites with the 'unholy alliance' of U.S. imperialism and modern revisionism in their hatred for both the October Socialist Revolution, as well as the socialist revolution in China. They harp endlessly on the theme that China followed a 'separate' road from the Soviet Union, and that the basis of the hostility of social-imperialism towards People's China is the inherent nationalism of both the Russian and Chinese people. In addition, to the slanders presented by the outright U.S. imperialist spokesmen cited by Mr. Tai and plagiarised by Jack Scott, it is well known in left-wing circles that the Yugoslav revisionists also spread gossips in a futile effort to poison the fraternal, comradely relations between the Communist Party of China led by Chairman Mao, and the Communist Party of Soviet Union when it was led by Comrade Stalin. Vladimir Deijer's book, *Tito Speaks* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1953) and Milovan Djilas' book, *Conversations with Stalin* (Rupert Hat-Dajs, London, 1962) are two often-cited modern revisionist sources of gossips and slanders about how Comrade Stalin 'betrayed' the Chinese revolution. Of course these two renegades have 'good' motives in promoting this lie. After all, the modern revisionists in Yugoslavia had themselves betrayed proletarian internationalism, and acted as agents for U.S. imperialism when they closed their borders to supply the Greek national liberation forces fighting against U.S. and British imperialism in 1948. These revisionist traitors, expelled from the International communist movement at the time for their crimes, tried, by gossips and slanders, to turn truth on its head and accuse Comrade Stalin and the Soviet Union for 'betraying' the Greek revolution. In this the Yugoslav modern

revisionists were following the right-in-essence, left-in-form criminal line of Trotsky, who also accused Comrade Stalin of 'betraying' the revolution. The same type of gossips are repeated today by U.S. imperialists, modern revisionists, and now by so-called 'friends' of China who are nothing more than neo-revisionists. For example, 'new left' opportunist David Horowitz wrote in 1965, "Even after the war, when it was clear to most observers that Chiang was finished, Stalin did not think much of the prospects of Chinese Communism." (David Horowitz, *The Free World Colours*, 1965, p.11 Cited by B. Franklin, *Introduction, The Essential Stalin*, op.cit.p.21) Now in 1974 we find Jack Scott, 'Marxist-Leninist' and 'friend' of China, up to his neck in the same old swamp of gossips and lies.

We have already quoted from the official Chinese Communist Party edition of Chairman Mao's Selected Works to clarify what the Chinese view about Soviet assistance was regarding their participation in the war against Japan. Now in order to further clarify how Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party analysed the objective relations between the new democratic revolution and the Soviet Union, we will cite two analyses presented by Chairman Mao, one before victory, on the eve of civil war in 1946, and one on the eve of complete victory against Chiang Kai-shek on the Chinese mainland in 1949. In 1946 Chairman Mao said:

"At present the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain all disapprove of civil war in China; (1) at the same time our Party has put forward the three great slogans of peace, democracy and unity (2) and is sending Comrades Mao Tsetung, Chou En-lai and Wang Jao-wei to Chungking to discuss with Chiang Kai-shek the great issues of unity and national reconstruction; thus it is possible that the civil war plot of the Chinese reactionaries may be frustrated... (He proceeds outlining some specifics in negotiations) We on our side are prepared to make such concessions as are necessary and as do not damage the fundamental interests of the people. Without such concessions, we cannot win the sympathy of world public opinion and the middle-of-the-roads within the country and cannot obtain in exchange legal status for our Party and a state of peace. But there are limits to such concessions: the principle is that they must not damage the fundamental interests of the people.

"If the Kuomintang still wants to launch civil war after our Party has taken the above steps, it will put itself in the wrong in the eyes of the whole nation and the whole world, and our Party will be justified in waging a war of self-defense to crush its attacks." (Mao Tsetung, *On Peace Negotiations with Kuomintang*, Selected Works, Vol.IV, p.48-9)

The footnotes explain further:

"1. Around the time of Japan's surrender, the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain for a period all expressed disapproval of civil war in China. Events soon demonstrated, however, that the U.S. statement about its so-called disapproval of civil war in China was only a screen for actively helping the reactionary Kuomintang government prepare for a counter-revolutionary civil war.

2. The three great slogans of peace, democracy and unity were put forward in the Declaration on the Current Situation by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on August 25, 1945. The declaration pointed out that after the surrender of Japanese imperialism, 'the important task confronting the whole nation is to consolidate unity in the country, safeguard domestic peace, bring about democracy and improve the people's livelihood so as, on the basis of peace, democracy and unity, to achieve national unification and build a new China, independent, free, prosperous and powerful.'" (Ibid., pp.50-1)

Here the Chinese comrades simply and clearly point out the world revolutionary and progressive forces led by the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and China had identical views on an over-all strategy for preventing civil war, but U.S. imperialism, puffing up with its atomic bombs, recklessly pursued civil war in China through their puppet Chiang Kai-shek. The Soviet Union remained throughout this period a close friend and supporter of the Chinese revolution. In fact, one way it did so was to continue its occupation of portions of Manchuria, perfectly legal in the absence of a peace treaty with Japan. Then Soviet Union also handed over masses of war material captured from the Japanese to the Chinese Liberation Army. This is why U.S. imperialism, great 'friend' of China, denounced Soviet occupation of China in this period. But in 1949 Chairman Mao himself makes it perfectly clear what the objective role of the Soviet Union was with respect to the Chinese Revolution. He opposes the wrong idea that China did not need international help. He says:

"Victory is possible even without international help." This is a mistaken idea. In the epoch in which imperialism exists, it is impossible for a genuine people's revolution to win victory in any country without various forms of help from the international revolutionary forces, and even if victory were won, it could not be consolidated. This was the case with the victory and consolidation of the Great October Revolution, as Lenin and Stalin told us long ago. This was also the case with the overthrow of the three imperialist powers in World War II and the establishment of the People's Democracies. And this is also the case with the present and the future of People's China. Just imagine! If the Soviet Union had not existed, if there had been no victory in the anti-fascist Second World War, if Japanese imperialism had not been defeated, if the People's Democracies had not come into being, if the oppressed nations of the East were not rising in struggle and if there were no struggle of the masses of the people against their reactionary rulers in the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and other capitalist countries — if not for all these in combination, the international revolutionary forces bearing down upon us would certainly be many times greater than now. In such circumstances, could we have won victory? Obviously not. And even with victory, there could be no consolidation. The Chinese people have had more than enough experience of this kind. This experience was reflected long ago in Sun Yat-sen's death-bed statement on the necessity of uniting with the international revolutionary forces. (Mao Tsetung, *On the People's*

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

**Democratic Dictatorship, Selected Works, Vol. IV, pp. 416-7.** Compare this analysis of the Chinese revolution written by Chairman Mao on June 30, 1949, and reprinted by the Chinese Communist Party in 1965, long after the seizure of power in the Soviet Union by the modern revisionists, with Jack Scott's theories plagiarised from a CIA Praeger publication, and the Hoover Institute. Just to make clear what Scott's opinion is again, compare Chairman Mao's analysis with the following:

"Whatever Moscow may have thought privately regarding the Communist-led social revolution in China — a revolution which owed little to Russian aid, training or material and certainly nothing to Russian aid — there was little choice but to voice public support and bid welcome to the new arrival in the socialist camp." (p. 28) Does this belittling utterance of Scott have any relationship to Chairman Mao's objective assessment? No, it does not. Scott tries to deny that Comrade Stalin greatly loved and cherished the world revolutionary movement and the emergence of new 'shock brigades' of world revolution which emerged after world war two. In his last public speech, to the 19th Congress of the CPSU, he says, "It would be a mistake to think that our Party, being now a mighty power, is no longer in need of support. This is untrue. Our Party and our country always were and always will be in need of the trust, sympathy, and support of fraternal peoples abroad." He says:

"Of course, it was quite hard to fulfill this esteemed role while the 'shock brigade' was still the only one of its kind, carrying out its vanguard role almost in solitude. That's how things used to be. Now — it's a completely different matter. Now, when from China and Korea to Czechoslovakia and Hungary new 'shock brigades' have emerged in the form of people's democracies, now it has become easier for our Party to carry out its task — and the work has gone more cheerfully. (J. Stalin, Speech to the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, October 14, 1952, Cited by B. Franklin, op.cit. p. 509)

This reflects the essentially revolutionary spirit of proletarian internationalism characteristic of the over-all leadership of Comrade Stalin. We shall present later Chairman Mao's assessment of Comrade Stalin's leadership. But for the moment let us return to examine some more of Jack Scott's reshaped U.S. imperialist slanders against the Soviet Union and China in the immediate post-world war two period.

Scott spends considerable space belittling the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and the Chinese People's Republic, as well as two separate agreements, "Agreement between the USSR and the CPR on the Chinese Changchun Railway, Port Arthur and Dalny", and "Agreement between the Government of the USSR and the Central People's Government of the CPR for the Granting of credit to the CPR," all signed on February 14, 1950 by Chou En-lai for China, and A. Vyshinsky for the Soviet Union. First of all, he confuses the straightforward mutual defence treaty with the two separate agreements. Scott's 'confusion' derives from the fact that he simply plagiarises the slanders found in the CIA book, **Mao Against Khrushchev**. For example, Scott says:

"The basic features of the treaty were as follows: (sic)  
1) The rendering of military and other assistance in the event of a Japanese attack. This worked in both directions, but in any event was not a very important commitment in view of Japan's very recent and overwhelming defeat." (p. 28)

Now let us see what David Floyd says in his CIA Praeger book. In his chapter Stalin against Mao, 1949-53 he writes, "The basic alliance was directed specifically against Japan and 'states allied with it' and provided for the rendering of military and other assistance in the event of a Japanese attack: not a very heavy commitment, coming indeed after Japan's defeat." (**Mao against Khrushchev**, op.cit. p. 11) "Not a very important commitment" (Scott) — "not a very heavy commitment" (Floyd). Here we see Scott's almost verbatim plagiarism of a CIA lie peddled in 1963 by U.S. imperialism to obscure the class nature of the struggle between Khrushchevite revisionism and Marxism-Leninism. Let us go further and point, counter-point Scott's plagiarism of Floyd on this issue of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Treaty.

**Floyd:** "The treaty also provided for 'consultation' between the Soviet and Chinese governments on all major international issues: a provision which the Russians had used to improve their policies on other potential and actual satellites." 9p.11)

**Scott:** "2) Consultation between the Soviet and Chinese governments on all major international issues. In such consultations Moscow, as 'senior member of the socialist camp' always expected to be deferred to and, in the event of differences, have its opinion ruled." (pp. 28-29)

**Floyd:** "(i) Manchuria. The Chinese-Changchun Railway was to be handed back to the Chinese by the end of 1952 at the latest (instead of by 1975) and without compensation, and the Russians were to hand over to the Chinese property seized from the Japanese." (p. 11)

**Scott:** "3) The Chinese-Changchun Railway to be ceded to China, without compensation, by the end of 1952, twenty-three years earlier than in the agreement with Chiang Kai-shek." (p. 29)

**Floyd:** "(ii) Port Arthur: The Russian command was to be replaced by a Soviet-Chinese commission pending its transfer to the Chinese by the end of 1952. But the Chinese were to pay for 'installations.'" (p. 11) **Scott:** "4) Port Arthur: The Russian command to be replaced by Chinese by the end of 1952. The Chinese to pay for all installations." (p. 29)

**Floyd:** "(iii) Dairen (Dalny). No change was agreed in the status of this port, which the Russians had established as a naval base. But the civil administration, as well as some Japanese property, was to be handed over to the Chinese. A mixed Sino-Soviet company was to be set up for ship building." (pp. 11-12) **Scott:** "5) Dairen: The naval base established by the Russians to remain in their control. But the civil administration, as well as some Japanese property, was to be handed over to the Chinese. A mixed Sino-Soviet company to be organized for shipbuilding and ship repair." (p. 29)

**Floyd:** "(iv) Sinkiang. The Russians recognized de facto Peking's sovereignty over the area, but secured agreement to the creation of joint companies for the exploitation of Sinkiang's oil and mineral resources, under the direction of Soviet experts—one of Stalin's favourite devices for penetrating neighbouring territories." (p. 12)

**Scott:** "6) Sinkiang: Moscow accepted de facto Chinese authority, but secured an agreement for the creation of joint-stock companies for the exploration of Sinkiang's oil and mineral resources, under the direction of Soviet experts." (p. 29)

**Floyd:** "(v) Outer Mongolia. The Chinese had no choice but to recognise the 'independent status' of this area, in which the Russians were firmly entrenched. But the Chinese managed to extract certain rights of immigration into Mongolia." (p. 12)

**Scott:** "7) Mongolia: China to recognize the 'independence' of Outer Mongolia, meaning acceptance of continued Russian domination—a situation which Mao had undoubtedly hoped to end." (p. 29)

Here on every point we see Scott plagiarise the line and almost the verbatim phraseology of Floyd. The plagiarism does not stop here however. After listing 'his' seven points, Scott goes on a long moralistic tirade about the \$300 million credit granted by the Soviet Union to China:

"Just as surprising was the limited amount of aid granted by the Russians under the 1950 treaty. The total amount agreed to was \$300 million, repayable over a 10-year period from 1955 in equal annual amounts with interest at one per cent." (p. 29) Following this his method is to create a smokescreen to hide his slander against the early friendship between socialist Soviet Union and People's China. Scott makes this smokescreen by launching into a tirade against the 1 per cent interest charge on this \$300 million credit. Instead of analysing this event in itself, Scott sallies forth once again to make a whole number of historical parallels between this 1950 treaty and Soviet socialist-imperialist policies in the 1960's and 1970's, after modern revisionism had seized political power, restored capitalism and turned the Soviet Union into a social-imperialist country. This of course is quite consistent with his method throughout the pamphlet, which in turn reflects his motivation to obscure the decisive and qualitative break between the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian internationalism which existed in the Soviet Union under Comrades Lenin and Stalin, and the rise of Khrushchevite modern revisionism to political power in 1953. But after laying this smokescreen to divert unsuspecting readers, Scott returns to this theme of attacking the 1950 agreement on credit. He says:

"The loan of 300 million dollars was not only nowhere nearly sufficient to meet ravaged China's basic needs — it is said that Mao had requested a three billion dollar loan — it did not even cover the cost of the capital goods the Russians looted in Manchuria after the disintegration of Japanese authority. What appears to be a careful American survey of equipment stripped from Manchurian factories, and seized by the Russians as 'war booty', had a total value of more than two billion dollars, and replacement value of more than two billion dollars. This seems to be a reasonable estimate, but even reduced by fifty per cent it would leave Russia a considerable profit on a loan that had to be repaid anyway." (p. 31)

In these two paragraphs on the \$300 million Soviet credit to China, Scott really outdoes himself in plagiarising reactionaries. Not only does he plagiarise the CIA line of Floyd, Scott splices 'his' version with plagiarism from Chiang Kai-shek! First compare Scott's words with the following from Floyd's chapter, **Stalin against Mao, 1949-1953:**

"It is all the more surprising, therefore, that the amount of aid promised by the Russians under the 1950 treaty was so giggardly. All Stalin would offer at the end of the two-months negotiations was a loan of \$3,000,000 at 1 per cent interest to be spread over five years. This was not too much to offer a country the size of China, just recovering from the two years of occupation and war and about to embark on a programme of major industrialisation. It was about a tenth of the amount Mao is rumoured to have asked for." (p. 12)

Scott says 'innocently': "It is said that Mao had requested a three billion dollar loan". Just what impersonal "it" said this is U.S. imperialist agent Floyd: "It (\$300 million) was about a tenth of the amount Mao is rumoured to have asked for." Thus a U.S. imperialist rumour becomes converted by Scott into a mere positive assertion "it is said". Of course if \$300 million is one-tenth of a "rumoured" amount, then that amount must come to \$3 billion. But then we already know that Scott is only passing-fair at simple arithmetic because if we look at his point No. 3, he says the railway was to be given back "by the end of 1952, twenty-three years earlier than....", whereas Floyd had phrased the issue, "by the end of 1952 at the latest (instead of by 1975)". And 1952 subtracted from 1975 is 23 years. Note too that Scott shares Floyd's 'surprise' at the "low" amount of credit granted to China by the Soviet Union

But whereas Scott eagerly plagiarises Floyd's U.S. imperialist 'analysis', Scott somehow manages to overlook some of the documentary evidence cited by Floyd to give his book 'authenticity', evidence which completely refutes his anti-communist clap-trap. For example, regarding Soviet-Chinese relations and the friendship between Comrades Stalin and Chairman Mao sealed in the Friendship Treaty, Floyd records the fact that on February 14, three weeks before his death, Comrade Stalin sent Chairman Mao a telegram on the third anniversary of the Treaty looking forward to a "further strengthening" of their friendship. Chairman Mao replied "in the same terms, adding his heartfelt gratitude for the genuinely selfless aid which the Soviet government and the Soviet people have extended to the new China..." (Floyd, op.cit. p. 216 **Pravda** commented the same day:

"The alliance and friendship between the Soviet Union and China are a model of a completely new kind of international relations, unknown and impossible in the capitalist world. These relations are based on the Leninist-Stalinist principles of internationalism, on the principles of equal rights, on close collaboration and mutual aid, and in a common striving for the

preservation of peace and the prevention of imperialist aggression.

"...The fraternal indestructible alliance between the Soviet and Chinese peoples — the great possession and hope of the whole of progressive and peace-loving humanity — is called on to play a mighty role in the further strengthening of the camp of peace, democracy and socialism." (Ibid.)

This firm friendship based on Marxist-Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism is also reflected in the slogans issued by the CPSU on October 30, 1951 for the celebration of the 35th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Those who may be influenced by Jack Scott's innuendo that People's China followed its 'own road' like the so-called 'independent road' of Tito's modern revisionism should note the contrast in the 6th and 10th slogans of the 35th anniversary celebration:

"6. Fraternal greetings to the great Chinese people who have achieved new successes in the construction of a mighty popular-democratic Chinese state! May the great friendship between the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union — the solid basis of peace and security in the Far East and the whole world — strengthen and flourish..." (Ibid.)

This salute to People's China reflected the joint Soviet-Chinese assistance to the Korean people in resisting U.S. imperialist aggression at that time. Contrast this with the slogan on Yugoslavia: "10. Greetings to the patriots in Yugoslavia who are fighting for the liberation of their country from the fascist yoke of the Tito-Rankovich clique and imperialist slavery!" (Ibid) All this Scott 'overlooks'.

But let us see how he splices this plagiarism with one from Chiang. In denouncing the Soviet credit, Scott throws in as an aside a slander about Russians looting Manchuria after the defeat of Japan. Now it so happens that Chiang's book has a whole section called **Russian looting in Northeast Provinces** in which he says: "The Russians proposed that all factories and enterprises formerly operated by Japan should go to the Soviet troops as 'war booty'." (**Soviet Russia in China**, op.cit., pp. 179-81; our emphasis—editor) Does Scott feel so self-conscious about the phrase "war booty" that he feels obliged to put it in quotation marks? Was it a twinge of consciousness at plagiarising the phrase from Chiang? No, Scott had no such twinge of conscience. He simply stole Chiang Kai-shek's line as it is reshaped in Mr. Tai's book. Here is how Tai repeats Chiang's lie:

"Also serving as an irritant to Mao in the 1940's was Stalin's predatory stripping of Manchurian industrial facilities as 'war booty' at the expense of both the Nationalists and the Communists — a step that was hardly consistent or compatible with the professed anti-imperialist revolutionary credentials of the Soviet Union as the 'fatherland of the world proletariat.'" (**The Sino-Soviet Territorial Dispute**, op.cit., p. 62)

Thus it is Mr. Tai who reproduced Chiang Kai-shek's phrase "war booty" in quotation marks, and Scott simply lifts Tai's use of it for his 'friendly' 'pro-China' pamphlet **Two Roads**. Scott also feigns 'innocence' when he introduces Chiang's lie about "Russian war booty" with the phrase "What appears to be a careful American survey of equipment stripped from Manchurian factories" (p. 31) Just where does this slander "appear"? Here is what Chiang Kai-shek has to say:

"On December 15, 1946, the U.S. State Department published the report of Edwin Pauley, American representative on the Allied Japanese Reparations Commission, on his investigation in the Northeast Provinces. The report disclosed that as the result of Soviet Russia's plundering, industries in that area suffered a direct loss of U.S. \$858,000,000, and that the losses would reach U.S. \$2,000,000,000 if they were estimated on the basis of replacement costs." (Ibid., p. 181)

Scott's "careful American survey" is the U.S. State Department report of December 15, 1946, published at precisely the time U.S. imperialism was whipping up maximum anti-Soviet, anti-communist hysteria to prepare for their renewal of civil war against the Chinese people. Furthermore, their "estimate" of \$2 billion replacement cost is clearly to prepare public opinion for the plunder of China's treasury to pay for expensive U.S. machinery as a means of expanding the market for U.S. finance capitalists faced with a post-war economic recession. That Scott can repeat such vicious anti-Chinese, anti-communist slanders straight from the propaganda mill of the U.S. State Department and their puppet Chiang Kai-shek does not speak lightly of his supposed friendship to People's China.

Of course Scott can claim 'innocence' by saying he never even read Chiang Kai-shek's book. Possibly he hasn't. But then all of Chiang's lies and repetition of the Pauley Commission findings of the U.S. State Department are repeated in Mr. Tai's book. And as we have shown, this book is one of Scott's main, but unacknowledged sources of 'information'.

We ask our readers to compare the Floyd-Scott slanders against the 1950 Treaty and Agreements with the content of the actual documents reprinted in the appendix of the article. The first thing to note about the Treaty is that it is clearly directed against both Japanese and U.S. imperialism. Article 1 says:

"The two Contracting Parties undertake jointly to adopt all necessary measures within their power to prevent a repetition of aggression and violation of peace on the part of Japan or of any State that may directly or indirectly join with Japan in acts of aggression. Should either of the Contracting Parties be attacked by Japan or by States allied with her and thus find itself in a state of war, the other Contracting Party shall immediately render it military and other assistance with all the means at its disposal. (Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance Between the USSR and the CPR, cited in supplement to **New Times**, No. 8, February 22, 1950, p. 1)

Now for obvious reasons Floyd, who was writing an anti-communist book for the CIA publishing house Praeger in 1963, wants to belittle the fact that in 1950 U.S. imperialism militarily occupied Japan under arch-militarist, arch-U.S. imperialist aggressor, General MacArthur. During the world revolutionary upsurge of the late 1940's with the victory of the People's Democracies and the Chinese revolution, U.S. imperialism

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

used the old revisionists, the so-called 'Socialist Party' in Japan to split the working class and progressive movements and create conditions for a neo-fascist, militarist regime from which U.S. imperialism, under MacArthur's leadership, would try to stem the revolutionary liberation movement in Asia, and overthrow the Chinese People's Republic. In early June 1950, only five months after the Soviet Union and China signed the Mutual Defense Treaty, MacArthur banned the Japanese Communist Party which a few days before the ban had won 2,984,627 votes, or 9.6 per cent of total votes cast in the general election. Following the ban of the Communist Party, U.S. imperialist occupiers and Japanese reactionaries purged the left and progressive forces from public life. (William Foster, *History of the Three Internationals*, International Publishers, New York, 1955, p.46) On June 25, 1950 U.S. imperialism, using Japan as its main military base, launched the Korean War. This followed precisely the same pattern of Japanese militarism in the 1930's — first repression of the Communist Party and progressive forces, then invasion of China. In the early 1950's however, Japanese imperialism was under the complete hegemony of U.S. imperialism. So while it is perfectly understandable for a U.S. imperialist agent writing in 1963 to belittle the epoch making alliance between the new People's Republic of China and socialist Soviet Union in 1950, it is a little peculiar for Scott, who calls himself a 'Marxist-Leninist' and a 'friend of China' to repeat this same line. Nor can Scott claim to be an 'innocent' or 'ignorant' of the situation which existed in 1950. He was himself a member of the so-called 'Communist' Party of Canada at that time, and had been for many years before then. He knew that U.S. imperialism was asserting itself at that time as the 'gendarme' of the world, and was propping up reactionary regimes like Japan to use as a spring board against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, including the People's Republic of China. So is it not reasonable to ask Mr. Scott, what are your motives in doing this? Is it not reasonable to assume that Mr. Scott's motives have nothing to do with promoting friendship between the Canadian people and People's China? Is he in fact not assisting modern revisionists to promote the lie that China has deviated from the road of the October Revolution, and is following its own 'nationalist' road? Opposition to imperialism without opposition to opportunism is a sham. It is opportunist to promote the U.S. and Soviet social-imperialist line that nationalism 'explains' the present struggle between Soviet Union and China, and to obscure the class nature of the struggle between modern revisionism and Marxism-Leninism. Yet this is the essence of Scott's 'contribution' in his supposedly 'friendly' pamphlet to China, **Two Roads**.

Scott's false 'friendship' and real attack against People's China reaches a new level in his 'analysis' of China's participation in the war of resistance against U.S. imperialism in Korea. He says that China's participation in the war was "at considerable cost to its economic development, and to its normalization with other countries." He says, "Even American analysts appear to be convinced that China originally had no intention of becoming embroiled in the Korean conflict." (p.32) Since when did the U.S. imperialist aggression against the Korean people become the "Korean conflict," from which People's China had "originally" intended to remain aloof? What kind of slander against China is this? Scott then cites another U.S. imperialist spokesman, David Dallin, who, according to Scott "assembles some evidence to prove that the Chinese were very reluctant to become participants, finally yielding to urgent Soviet requests and importunities, and the promise of extensive Russian aid." (pp.32-3) Can anyone imagine a so-called 'friend' of China actually trying to 'explain' the selfless proletarian internationalism of the Chinese people led by their glorious Communist Party and Chairman Mao with the slander that the Soviet Union had to coerce and bribe them into defending their own borders and assisting their heroic Korean comrades-in-arms? After repeating this charge against the Chinese, Scott adds as almost an aside: "U.S. Commander of the Pacific General Douglas MacArthur's aggression undoubtedly also played a part in helping to shape China's decision." (p.33) Is this Scott's 'sense of humour'? A friend of China should tell the Canadian people simply and clearly that U.S. imperialism, which had assumed the role of counter-revolutionary gendarme of the world after World War II, was smashed in its tracks by the glorious resistance of the Korean and Chinese people, supported in turn by the Soviet Union, and all progressive forces. In so doing the gains of the Chinese revolution were consolidated, and the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America was greatly assisted. Scott besmirches this glorious page of revolutionary history, attributes false motives to the Soviet Union and People's China.

Scott once again distorts the actual war the history of class struggle developed by leaping ahead in time to say: "The Soviet aid was supplied, but several years later the Chinese revealed they had to pay Russia the full cost for everything used in the Korean War." (p.33) The fact is that in February 1950 China had signed a mutual defence treaty with the Soviet Union, which Scott, as we showed, belittles in his parroting of U.S. imperialist propaganda. In June 1950 U.S. imperialism organised a surprise invasion of Korea in order to overthrow the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, and use Korea as a military base, as did imperialist Japan, to launch a war of aggression against China. The Soviet Union, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, carried forward the line of proletarian internationalism laid down by Stalin at the 18th Congress — "We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country." As long as Stalin was alive there was no question about supplying the Korean and Chinese liberation forces with an abundant supply of modern equipment, and no question raised about repaying' for it. Comrade Stalin died in early March, 1953. The new Soviet leadership followed a course of collusion with U.S. imperialism. The 'Korean question' remained unresolved, and the Korean nation remains divided at the 38th parallel. When modern revisionism had fully seized power,

Khrushchev concocted his demand for 'payment' of Soviet military supplies provided during the war. People's China, true to their proletarian internationalism and resolute communist spirit, made sacrifices in order to pay the revisionists every cent. Today People's China has neither internal nor external debts of any kind. But Scott deliberately muddles the two periods of Soviet-Chinese relations in order to further his aim of obscuring the role of modern revisionism in over-throwing socialism and proletarian internationalism in the Soviet Union.

Scott then presents an incredible concoction about how the Soviet Union actually had China 'set up' to enter the war in order that China would be branded an 'aggressor' in the United Nations and isolated from international politics! Let us examine this Alice in Wonderland story Scott no doubt has plagiarised from U.S. 'expert' on Sino-Soviet relations. Here is Scott's concoction:

"In the spring of 1950 it appeared that the United States might be prepared to reach some understanding with the People's Republic of China. In pursuit of that aim the Americans seemed prepared to entertain the idea of writing off Chiang and Taiwan as a total loss. President Truman indicated they considered neither Korea nor Taiwan vital to American security. During the spring Indian and Yugoslav delegates secured a United States commitment to accept an assembly decision—where no vote would apply—on China's disputed seat." (p.33)

Note in this paragraph how reasonable Scott presents U.S. imperialism. One would scarcely gather from this accounting that U.S. imperialists had just admitted through the Dean Acheson White Paper to being an active participant in the civil war against the People's Liberation Army in China from 1946 to 1949, with an admission as to why U.S. imperialism did not invade China with all its forces at that time. Chairman Mao sums up the reasons admitted by Dean Acheson, then Secretary of State in the U.S., for its policies in China from 1946-49:

"What a splendid ideal! The United States supplies the money and guns and Chiang Kai-shek the men to fight for the United States and slaughter the Chinese people, to 'destroy the communists' and turn China into a U.S. colony, so that the United States may fulfil its 'international responsibilities' and carry out its 'traditional policy of friendship for China'..."

"Let those Chinese who believe that 'victory is possible even without international help' listen. Acheson is giving you a lesson. Acheson is a good teacher, giving lessons free of charge, and he is telling the whole truth with tireless zeal and great candour. The United States refrained from dispatching large forces to attack China, not because the U.S. government didn't want to, but because it had worries. First worry: the Chinese people would oppose it, and the U.S. government was afraid of getting hopelessly bogged down in a quagmire. Second worry: the American people would oppose it, and so the U.S. government dared not order mobilisation. Third worry: the people of the Soviet Union, of Europe and of the rest of the world would oppose it, and the U.S. government would face universal condemnation. Acheson's charming candour has its limits and he is unwilling to mention the third worry. The reason he is afraid of losing face before the Soviet Union, he is afraid that the Marshall Plan in Europe, which is already a failure despite pretences to the contrary, may end finally in total collapse." (Mao Tsetung, *Farewell, Leighton Stuart. Selected Works*, Vol.IV, pp.436-7)

But Scott white-washes U.S. imperialism, and creates the illusion that U.S. imperialism had 'reconciled' itself to People's China. Certain pro-American elements in China during the last days of the civil war also harboured such illusions, and Chairman Mao warned them as follows:

"According to logic, Acheson's conclusion (from the premise stated in the U.S. White Paper that 'the civil war in China was beyond the control of the government of the United States'—editor) should be, as some muddle-headed Chinese intellectuals think or say, to act like 'the butcher who lays down his knife and at once becomes a Buddha' or 'the robber who has a change of heart and becomes a virtuous man', that is, he should treat People's China on the basis of equality and mutual benefit and stop making trouble. But no, says Acheson, trouble-making will continue, and definitely so..."

"How different is the logic of the imperialists from that of the people! 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 lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, all 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." (Mao Tsetung, *Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle, Selected Works*, Vol.IV, p.429)

This is what Chairman Mao wrote in August 14, 1949. As late as 1974 Jack Scott continued to present the 'muddle-headed line' of U.S. imperialism being a butcher who puts down his knife and at once becomes a Buddha. According to this muddle-headedness, U.S. imperialism was not only prepared to treat People's China "on the basis of equality and mutual benefit", but it was prepared to 'write-off' Korea and Taiwan as well! Furthermore, according to Scott the bourgeois government of India and the revisionist government of Yugoslavia had 'made a deal' with U.S. imperialism vis-à-vis China's seat in the United Nations. Thus Scott insinuates that these two countries were China's true 'friends' in 1949-50. Chairman Mao clearly explained in 1949 that:

"All bourgeois governments, including the governments of the German, Italian and Japanese reactionaries which are being shielded by imperialism, are governments of this type (Rightist totalitarian governments—the phrase used by Acheson—editor). The Tito government of Yugoslavia has now become an accomplice of this gang." (Mao Tsetung, *Why it is necessary to discuss the White Paper*, op.cit., p.445)

So, on the one hand, Scott turns truth on its head by saying that Yugoslavia and India were China's 'friends', and had made some 'deal' with the U.S. imperialist 'butcher turned Buddha', while on the other hand, Scott says that the Soviet Union betrayed and 'tricked' China into getting 'involved' in the Korean war, as part of a plot to isolate People's China from international relations. Scott continues as follows:

"But in May Soviet delegates suddenly withdrew from the United Nations with a declaration they were no longer willing to sit with Taiwan delegates (although they came back and sat with them for twenty years after), a singularly ill-advised action since a Soviet veto could have blocked United Nations action in Korea just over a month later." (p.33)

The truth of the matter is that the Soviet Union together with the People's Democracies had launched a resolute and principled struggle on the diplomatic front to isolate the U.S. imperialist line of not recognising People's China. The Soviet boycott of the United Nations, a powerful blow against U.S. imperialism, began, not as Scott says, one month before the Korean war, but on January 10, 1950, two months after Chou En-lai, then Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China, protested against placing Chiang Kai-shek's clique in China rightful UN General Assembly and Security Council seats. U.S. imperialism was in an extremely defensive position because of the upsurge of revolutionary forces led by the Soviet Union and People's China. As we mentioned earlier the Japanese masses were mobilising against militarism and U.S. imperialist occupation of their country. In Korea the People's Democratic Republic was being consolidated in the north, and in the south even the U.S. imperialist rigged election had put their puppet, Syngman Rhee, in a minority position within the puppet 'National Assembly', and the masses were mobilising to re-unify their country, and drive the U.S. imperialists out.

But had the U.S. imperialist butchers turned into Buddhas as Scott suggests? No, they had not. Rather they behaved just as Chairman Mao predicted they inevitably must: "Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again... till their doom." The next trouble they made was in Korea. While the Truman 'Democratic' administration was masquerading as Buddha, John Foster Dulles, 'Republican' advisor to the State Department and special emissary of the U.S. government, made trips to Korea and Japan in June 1950 to prepare a U.S. imperialist carefully conspired aggression against the Korean people. But Scott does not mention this fact. Here is what he says: "Since thousands of Soviet political and military advisors had been present in North Korea for some years, even occupying strategic administrative posts, it is inconceivable that Moscow could be ignorant of a military build-up, and the vast potential for conflict in the area. It was essentially Korea that heightened Sino-U.S. tension and served as 'justification' for the occupation of Taiwan and continued to give aid to the Chiang Kai-shek military clique."

"Russian advisors were hastily withdrawn from Korea as soon as hostilities erupted, to be later replaced when the military situation for North Korea became critical, by Chinese volunteers. The end result of the conflict was China branded as aggressor by the United Nations and excluded from her rightful place in the Assembly and the Security Council for twenty years. Russia avoided direct involvement and resumed her United Nations seat without incurring any vote of censure." (p.34)

Scott reasons as follows: U.S. imperialism was about to become China's friend, but the Soviet Union, by feigning ignorance of U.S. intentions in Korea insidiously enticed them to launch their aggression. This in turn heightened 'Sino-U.S. tension', which in turn forced the U.S. imperialists to occupy Taiwan and aid Chiang Kai-shek! Scott's reasoning is even more perverse than Dean Acheson's. The fact of the matter is that U.S. imperialism conspired to 'make trouble by invading Korea. Their 'success' was like lifting a rock to drop on their feet. After they succeeded in making trouble, they failed. Specifically what happened was that U.S. imperialism provoked aggression against the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. When the DRK responded tit-for-tat, U.S. imperialism feigned a retreat to the southern most tip of South Korea. I.F. Stone, a U.S. journalist, quoted one of MacArthur's own staff officers who said on July 30, 1950 that "the North Korean army had not carried out its mobilisation plan at the time the war began June 25... only six full divisions had been ready for combat when the invasion started, although the North Korean war plans called for thirteen to fifteen." Stone correctly concludes from this evidence that "It is hard to believe that the North would launch an attack before it was fully mobilised, and moreover at the very moment when it looked as though a hostile legislature might overthrow Syngman Rhee from within" (I.F. Stone, *The Hidden History of the Korean War, Monthly Review, New York, 1952*, p.66) Now how is it that not only 'Moscow' but also the Democratic People's Republic of Korea could be so 'ignorant' as not to know about the U.S. 'military build-up' as Scott charges? The reason is, there was no U.S. military build-up. After provoking attacks against the DRK, the U.S. imperialists ordered the South Korean puppets to retreat far to the south in order that U.S. imperialism could mobilise public opinion in the U.S. and elsewhere to launch their invasion. By noon June 27, U.S. imperialism had begun their military aggression in Korea. But it wasn't until 3:15 p.m. the same day that the U.S. imperialist agents were presenting the case of 'North Korean aggression' to the UN Security Council for 'action'. In short they had presented the UN with a **fait accompli**. Therefore Soviet presence in the Security Council, although it would have given the revolutionary forces some more diplomatic tactical advantages, would certainly not have stopped U.S. imperialism from making trouble in Korea.

Jack Scott's historical idealism has no bounds! Not U.S. imperialism and the reactionary governments who made up the majority of the UN are to blame or trying to isolate People's China. No, according to Scott, the Soviet Union — China's former comrade — is to blame. This is how he concludes:

"Canada was on the point of opening discussions with China

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

with a view toward the establishment of diplomatic relations in 1950. A number of other western countries would have assuredly followed suit, and there is no doubt that China would have taken her rightful place in the United Nations. But Korea, and the unjustified brand of aggressor placed on China, brought a twenty-year postponement during which China was encircled and attempts made to isolate her from wider international contacts." (p.34)

Why is Scott so upset about China being "isolated"? It was a very good thing that China was "isolated" by the reactionary United Nations for many years. Why is that? Because China had stood up to the reactionaries, and without a moment's hesitation gloriously joined their comrades in Korea to fight, gun in hand, U.S. imperialist aggression. Certainly China could have been "respectable" in just the way Tito made Yugoslavia "respectable" to U.S. imperialism. Scott demonstrates here his basic sympathy with the modern revisionist line of capitulating to the enemy instead of gloriously standing up to fight. Contrast Scott's line about China being "isolated" with Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist outlook:

**"What matter if we have to face some difficulties? Let them blockade us! Let them blockade us for eight or ten years! By that time all of China's problems will have been solved. Will the Chinese cover before difficulties when they are not afraid even of death? Lao Tsu said, 'The people fear not death, why threaten them with it?' U.S. imperialism and its running dogs, the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries, have not only 'threatened' us with death but actually put many of us to death. Besides people like Wen Yi-to, they have killed millions of Chinese in the last three years with U.S. carbines, machine-guns, mortars, bazookas, howitzers, tanks and bombs dropped from aeroplanes. This situation is now coming to an end. They have been defeated. It is we who are going in to attack them, not they who are coming out to attack us. They will soon be finished. True, the few problems left to us, such as blockade, unemployment, famine, inflation and rising prices, are difficulties, but we have already begun to breathe more easily than in the past three years. We have come triumphantly through the ordeal of the last three years, why can't we overcome these few difficulties of today? Why can't we live without the United States?" (Mao Tsetung, Farewell, Leighton Stuart, Selected Works, Vol. IV, op.cit., p.438)**

Does Jack Scott think that this spirit of new China had to be "coerced" and "bribed" by the Soviet Union to join their comrades in Korea in fighting U.S. imperialism? Does Jack Scott think that this spirit of new China was daunted by the fact that People's China was kept out of the United Nations until 1971? Scott actually does a disservice to the Canadian people by presenting People's China in this manner. China quite gloriously stood "alone" with her true friends, the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. And when the modern revisionists took over these countries, People's China, together with her true friend the People's Republic of Albania, defended Marxism-Leninism—once again defying world reaction. Today, both China and Albania have friends around the world, especially in the Third World, where over 2/3 of the world's people live, while U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism are the ones who are isolated and alone. Scott's reactionary historical idealism does not allow him to see the revolutionary essence of China's proletarian internationalism during the Korean War, nor the proletarian internationalism which linked People's China, together with Lenin and Stalin's Soviet Union, in an unbreakable bond of comradeship. Only after the modern revisionists seized state power in the Soviet Union and restored capitalism, and even then only after a tit-for-tat protracted struggle against modern revisionism both internationally and domestically, did the Soviet modern revisionists manage to split the Soviet Union from China, and turn friendship into its opposite. What Jack Scott says about the Soviet Union and China during the Korean war is altogether wrong. He is merely repeating the lies and calumnies of imperialists, revisionists and other reactionaries heaped upon the dictatorship of the proletariat in both the Soviet Union under Comrade Stalin's leadership and in China under Chairman Mao's leadership.

Further proof that Scott's line about People's China being excluded from the United Nations has nothing whatever to do with the actual policy and outlook of the Chinese government can be seen in a 1965 interview with then-Vice-President of China, Chen Yi:

**"The United Nations has long been controlled by the United States and has today become a place where two big powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, conduct political transactions. This state of affairs has not changed although dozens of Afro-Asian and peace-loving countries have made no small amount of efforts in the United Nations. China need not take part in such a United Nations."**

**"During the U.S. war of aggression against Korea, the United Nations adopted a resolution naming China as an aggressor. How can China be expected to take part in an international organization which calls her an aggressor? Calling China an aggressor and then asking the aggressor to join, would not the United Nations be slapping its own face?"**

**"Will the present U.N. General Assembly adopt a resolution expelling the elements of the Chiang Kai-shek clique and restoring China's legitimate rights? I think this is impossible as the United Nations is now controlled by the United States. If things really turn out that way, the question would still remain unresolved."**

**"The United Nations must rectify its mistakes and undergo a thorough reorganization and reform. It must admit and correct all its past mistakes. Among other things, it should cancel its resolution condemning China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as aggressors and adopt a resolution condemning the United States as the aggressor; the U.N. Charter must be reviewed and revised jointly by all countries, big and small; all independent states should be included in the United Nations; and all imperialist puppets should be expelled."**

**"For more than ten years, many countries have in the United**

**Nations firmly demanded the inclusion of China's legitimate rights. China is always grateful for this just and friendly action."** (Vice-Premier Chen Yi Answers Question Put by Correspondents, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1966, pp.15-17. Comrade Chen Yi has since died; he lived an ardent revolutionary life, and died a devoted Marxist-Leninist, Chinese patriot and proletarian internationalist — Editor)

Here in Comrade Chen Yi's statement we see the Marxist-Leninist spirit of the Chinese government, which so selflessly participated in resisting U.S. imperialist aggression in Korea from 1950 to 1953 re-emphasized over a decade later. As a consequence of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the realignment of world forces, People's China has now resumed her rightful seat in the United Nations. By standing firm on the Marxist-Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism, China actually leads the Third World countries in transforming the United Nations into its opposite — from a forum for the political transactions of the two superpowers into a forum reflecting the main trend in the world today: **countries want independence, nations want liberation, people want revolution.** Thus we see that People's China has remained consistent and true to its principled proletarian internationalism displayed during the war against U.S. imperialist aggression in Korea. On the other hand, the modern Khrushchevite revisionists misled the Soviet Union away from the road of socialism and proletarian internationalism mapped out under Comrade Stalin's leadership and took up the road of capitalism and social-imperialism under the new tsars. This is the basic historical truth which Scott consistently obscures in his pamphlet **Two Roads.**

Scott concludes the second portion of his pamphlet with a direct attack against Stalin. After saying that Stalin died before the end of the Korean war, he adds:

**"Despite his many serious blunders in the conduct of relations with China, Stalin, perhaps aided by world conditions and a revolutionary success in China that was very recent, was able to avoid an open break with the Chinese."** (p.34)

Here again, Scott's historical idealism simply promotes reactionary imperialist lies. The reason that China and the Soviet Union never split during the period of Comrade Stalin's leadership was simply because both Comrade Stalin and Chairman Mao were Marxist-Leninists, communists. And Marxist-Leninists don't split; they unite to fight the main enemy — imperialism and modern revisionism. This is what Comrades Mao Tsetung and Stalin did. Despite whatever secondary contradictions might have existed between them, or between the Soviet Union and People's China, both were profoundly united as communist leaders and as socialist countries. When Comrade Stalin died, Chairman Mao wrote a eulogy called **The Greatest Friendship**, which was printed in *Pravda*, March 10, 1953. A large portion of this tribute to Comrade Stalin is reprinted in Floyd's book, which Jack Scott finds so convenient to use as a reference for "analysis". But strangely he "overlooked" Chairman Mao's article summing up his views on Comrade Stalin. The following is a portion of the article cited in Floyd's book, which Scott "overlooked":

**"All the works of Comrade Stalin are an undying contribution to Marxism. His works: The Foundations of Leninism, History of the All-Union Communist Party — A Short Course, as well as his last great work Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR — these are an encyclopedia of Marxism-Leninism, a summary of the experience of the world Communist movement for the last hundred years. His speech at the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU is a precious testament for the Communists of all the countries of the world. We Chinese Communists, like Communists of all the countries of the world, find in the great works of Comrade Stalin the way to our victory."**

**"After Lenin's death Comrade Stalin was always the central figure in the world Communist movement. Gathered closely around him we used to receive instructions from him and constantly derived ideological strength from his works. Comrade Stalin cherished the warmest feelings for the oppressed peoples of the East. 'Do not forget the East' — that was the great slogan proclaimed by Stalin after the October Revolution."**

**"It was generally known that Comrade Stalin loved the Chinese people dearly and considered that the forces of the Chinese Revolution were beyond belief. On questions of the Chinese revolution he displayed the very greatest wisdom. Following the teachings of Lenin and Stalin and relying on the support of the great Soviet State, and all revolution forces of all countries, the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people achieved a few years ago an historic victory."**

**"Today we have lost a great teacher and a most sincere friend — Comrade Stalin. It is a great misfortune. It is impossible to express in words the grief which this misfortune has evoked...."**

**"May the unfolding name of the great Stalin live through the centuries!"** (Mao Tsetung, *The Greatest Friendship*, *Pravda*, March 10, 1963. Cited by D. Floyd, op.cit., p.217.)

We ask our readers how does this assessment, from which the Marxist-Leninist line in the Communist Party of China led by Chairman Mao has never once deviated to the present day, have anything to do with Scott's "assessment"? We remind Jack Scott that on the eve of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, when the life-and-death struggle between modern revisionism and Marxism-Leninism inside China had reached a critical, decisive stage, the Communist Party of China firmly rejected an invitation to attend the 23rd Congress of the CPSU. In their letter of March 23, 1966, the Chinese Communist Party again denounced the Soviet revisionists for their attack against Stalin:

**"... at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. you suddenly lashed out at Stalin. Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist. In attacking Stalin you were attacking Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet Union, Communist parties, China, the people, and all Marxist-Leninists of the world.... Russia is the native land of Leninism and used to be the centre of the international working class movement. After Stalin's death the leaders of the CPSU, headed by Khrushchev, gradually revealed their true features as betrayers of Lenin and Leninism."** (Cited in *The Sino-Soviet Dispute*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1969, p.88)

We ask our readers, how can Jack Scott's attack on Comrade

Stalin and the Soviet Union during the period of Stalin's leadership be seen as anything else but an attack against Marxism-Leninism and China? There can be no other explanation; Jack Scott's attacks against the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, and Stalin's Marxist-Leninist leadership, is an attack on the dictatorship of the proletariat in People's China and the Thought of Mao Tsetung, Marxism-Leninism in the present era. Even if someone is not a Marxist-Leninist, as Jack Scott pretends to be, but is a straightforward democratic friend of the People's Republic of China, he will never slander the dictatorship of the proletariat, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin or Chairman Mao. He will at least always give China's view that these five men are the great leaders and teachers of the modern proletariat, and emphasize the great love and respect the Communist Party of China, the Chinese government and people have for all five of these great proletarian leaders.

Jack Scott has no such love and respect himself, nor is he democratically-minded enough to promote the views of those he pretends are his "friends". Instead he promotes the views of the enemies of those he calls his "friends". Both U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism strive day and night to confuse the people about the nature of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union today, and always equate it with dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of Lenin and Stalin's leadership. They also try to create maximum confusion about the nature of the present contradiction between the Soviet Union and People's China by repeating again and again that the differences are "national" or "racial", thus promoting reactionary idealist theories of history. Scott is an agent of this effort in his pamphlet. Directly after his denunciation of Stalin, Scott concludes the second part of **Two Roads** with the following reactionary view:

**"But the group that had become dominant in the party during the previous period, and therefore controlled the state, adopted policies in both state and intra-party relations that ultimately led to a rupture with China. They resorted to attempted coercion in state relations in an effort to force the Chinese, as well as others, to accept Russian Party policy and decisions as binding on all. But the Communist Party of China possessed the experience, the strength, the prestige and the courage to resist Moscow pressures and give a lead in exposing the wrong course of action being adopted by the Soviet Party. Hatred born of fear prompted Moscow to launch attacks against the Chinese Party, in the hope that China would be isolated and her influence diminished."** (p.34)

Scott implies that the "group that had become dominant in the party during the previous period" were revisionist. The fact is Comrade Stalin had been dominant in both the Soviet Party and the world Communist movement, as Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party state many times. Furthermore, Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist. In keeping with his line throughout the pamphlet, Scott is implying here that the Soviet Union was revisionist, and social-imperialist, virtually from the first months after the October Revolution. We have already exposed his idealist theory of "national characteristics" that he uses to "explain" his attack on Stalin and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Here he presents the same national chauvinist theory in a somewhat more subtle manner. Scott presents the contradiction between modern revisionism and Marxism-Leninism as a fight between Russia and China rather than a fight between proletariat and bourgeoisie. Thus, he focuses attention on the aspect of the "Russian Party" imposing its views on other parties through state relations. (Firstly, the use of the term "Russian Party" is itself a distortion, since the CPSU was a democratic centralist proletarian party of all the nations and peoples of the Soviet Union, just as the Communist Party of China is a democratic centralist proletarian party of all the nations and peoples of China.) Secondly, state hegemonism is a feature of revisionism, and if not overcome degenerates into social-imperialism. But there is a fine line between the necessity to oppose modern revisionism in the world communist movement, such as that of the Tito clique, and practicing hegemony over other parties and countries. Stalin led the world communist movement in struggle against Tito's modern revisionism and correctly characterised revisionism as fascist collaboration with U.S. imperialism. Stalin was quite conscious of the spread of Tito's revisionist ideas within the Communist movement and the CPSU itself. He had already undertaken the beginnings of serious ideological struggle against revisionism in his last two theoretical works, **Marxism and Linguistics**, and **Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR**; both works, praised by Chairman Mao, have been re-published by Foreign Languages Press in Peking. The central issue therefore is that Khrushchev not only practised hegemony, itself a revisionist practise, but he also opposed Marxism-Leninism on all questions and tried to impose his modern revisionist theories over the world communist movement. Scott totally mystifies what Khrushchevite revisionism did, even though the Chinese Communists summarise his revisionist crimes very clearly. Scott does so in order to promote his national chauvinist theory: The "Russians" "hate" and "fear" China. Is this not in fact a subtle evocation of the "yellow peril" racist theory promoted by U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism alike? Furthermore, is not the assertion that China possessed the "experience", "strength", "prestige" and "courage" to "resist" not simply a rehash of national chauvinist ideology? After all, does not Brezhnev, as did Khrushchev, try to brow-beat countries and Parties with all kinds of puffed-up bragging about the "experience", "strength", "prestige" and "courage" of the CPSU? Is not the essential question whether or not a Communist Party adheres to Marxism-Leninism and opposes modern revisionism? After all, was it not the very small Marxist-Leninist Party of a very small country, People's Albania, which first stood up to the full blast of Khrushchev's revisionist attacks and state interference? Why doesn't Jack Scott mention the People's Republic of Albania and Enver Hoxha, as a Marxist-Leninist leader of a resolute proletarian party and courageous country, for having "experience", "strength", "prestige" and "courage"? The reason Scott doesn't mention this is because he himself is a chauvinist

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

and practises hegemonism in politics. Furthermore, like all revisionists, Scott has no faith in the masses as the makers of history, and splits rather than unites the revolutionary forces. No wonder then that this "friend" of China repeats every reactionary U.S. imperialist and modern revisionist gossip and lie against the Soviet Union, and against Comrade Stalin, and indistinguishably against People's China as well.

Let us now proceed to analyse the third portion of Scott's pamphlet, *Two Roads*. In this third section, called *China Stands Up*, Scott does three things: (1) he distorts the nature of Khrushchev's modern revisionism, and the history of the great polemic waged by Marxism-Leninism against modern revisionism; (2) he promotes his anarcho-syndicalist counter-revolutionary theories of utopian socialism in order to slander the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union during the period of Lenin and Stalin's leadership, and thus obscures the origin of modern revisionism; (3) he completely muddles up the theories and practise of social-imperialism with the theories and practise of socialism on questions of international politics.

Let us examine each of Scott's "contributions" in turn. Scott explains the period of vacillation in CPSU policy from 1953-56 as follows:

*"During these critical years the Moscow leadership had to play a cool hand. Unsure of themselves, not possessed of Stalin's capacity for deliberate, decisive and even ruthless action in times of crisis, the coming new leaders needed to avoid any wide-open dispute that might tend to undermine their position. Most of all, it was crucial for their purpose that they maintain apparently friendly relations with China. To this end, Moscow made some minor concessions on unsettled problems but would not retreat from the policy of 'joint-stock' companies, retention of Port Arthur as a naval base and continued penetration of Manchuria" (p.35)*

Here Scott rehearses imperialist psychologist explanations of history: Stalin was 'deliberate', 'decisive' and 'ruthless'; Khrushchev was 'unsure of himself'. Such is the degenerate thinking of the bourgeoisie parroted by Scott. We have already quoted Chairman Mao's clear definition of Marxist laws of class struggle: Imperialists make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again... till their doom; the people fight, fail, fight again, fail again, fight again... till their victory --

*"Classes struggle, some classes triumph, others are eliminated. Such is history, such is the history of civilization for thousands of years. To interpret history from this viewpoint is historical materialism; standing in opposition to this viewpoint is historical idealism." (Mao Tsetung, *Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle*, op.cit., p.428)*

Jack Scott's psychologist theory is one such viewpoint of historical idealism. With respect to the question of the revisionist restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, Chairman Mao, interpreting history from the viewpoint of historical materialism, says:

*"Socialist society covers a considerably long historical period. In the historical period of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration. We must recognise the protracted and complex nature of this struggle. We must heighten our vigilance. We must conduct socialist education. We must correctly understand and handle class contradictions and class struggle, distinguish the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy from those among the people, and handle them correctly. Otherwise a socialist country like ours will turn into its opposite and degenerate, and a capitalist restoration will take place. From now on we must remind ourselves of this every year, every month and every day so that we can retain a rather sober understanding of this problem and have a Marxist-Leninist line." (Mao Tsetung, *The Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (Documents)*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1969, pp.22-23)*

The difference between Chairman Mao's historical materialist outlook and Jack Scott's historical idealist outlook is clear. The restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union took place because the class struggle between the capitalist road and the socialist road, the only "two roads" during this epoch of world history, had been temporarily won by the bourgeoisie taking the capitalist road. The leader of the capitalist road clique was N.S. Khrushchev.

Furthermore, Jack Scott is not even correct on simple statement of facts. During the period mentioned by him, Port Arthur was turned over to China as were the former joint Soviet-Chinese companies. A "Soviet-Chinese communique on withdrawal of the Soviet armed forces from the jointly-used Chinese naval base of Port Arthur and the placing of the base at the full disposal of the Chinese People's Republic" was signed in October 1954. On May 24-26, 1955, as agreed in the communique, Soviet armed forces were withdrawn from Port Arthur. Not by coincidence, the same day Khrushchev arrived in Belgrade, Yugoslavia to grovel before the Tito revisionist clique. Also in October 1954, a "Soviet-Chinese communique on the transfer to the Chinese People's Republic of the Soviet share in the joint Soviet-Chinese companies" was signed, and the transactions completed in January 1955. (Supplement to *New Times*, No.42, October 16, 1954, pp.2-5) Scott's deception about these two facts thus constitutes another slander against People's China by suggesting China could not defend her socialist interests against the revisionists.

Scott continues with his historical idealist conceptions of history by stating:

*"(a) Not one of the heroes of 1956 had ever demonstrated he had the courage to disagree with Stalin while he was alive; and (b) all of them -- to a man -- had served as leading functionaries in party and state administration during most of the Stalin period, thereby sharing the blame for all the errors and deficiencies of the era." (p.36)*

Here Scott stands history on its head. According to this logic, Comrade Mao Tsetung and the Marxist-Leninists who make up the overwhelming majority of the Chinese Communist Party were to blame for the capitalist roaders Liu Shiao-chi and arch-

traitor Lin Biao. In Scott's metaphysical schema, there are only "strong" or "weak" personalities, there are no objective classes and objective class struggles. Because the capitalist roaders wormed their way into leading party and state posts is somehow the responsibility of the Marxist-Leninists who pursue a proletarian line. Such is the mechanistic logic of Jack Scott! Comrade Lenin clearly analysed the phenomenon of anti-proletarian elements who worm their way into the proletarian party, especially after it has seized state power:

*"The transition from capitalism to Communism represents an entire epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration." (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. XXVIII, p.235. Cited in *Ninth Party Congress Documents*, op.cit., p.8)*

Further, Lenin states:

*"... the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased ten fold by its overthrow (even if only in one country), and whose power lies not only in the strength of international capital, in the strength and durability of the international connections of the bourgeoisie, but also in the force of habit, in the strength of small production. For, unfortunately, small production is still very, very widespread in the world, and small production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale." (Ibid.)*

Lenin concluded, "For all these reasons the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential". Furthermore, he stated that "the new bourgeoisie" was "arising from among our Soviet government employees" (Ibid.). Thus there is no mystery to the rise of modern revisionism and the "new bourgeoisie" within the Soviet Union. After the death of Stalin, those who followed the capitalist road seized power. In China, Khrushchev's class brothers also tried to seize state power. In defining the nature of class struggle against Liu Shao-chi's bourgeois reactionary line, Chairman Mao said at the end of 1964 that: "The main target of the present movement is those Party persons in power taking the capitalist road" (Ibid., p.25) But it was not until the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, personally led by Chairman Mao, that the form, the method "to arouse the broad masses to expose our dark aspect openly, in an all-round way and from below" (Ibid., p.27) was developed. Scott's obsession with personalities, and his subjectivist, historical idealism, coincident with his delight in telling gossips and slanders, completely obscures the objective class basis for the struggle between revisionism and Marxism-Leninism. That is why he gets everything mixed up and wrong in his "analysis" of the Khrushchev clique and the protracted struggle of the Marxist-Leninists against the rise of modern revisionism.

For example, Scott completely distorts the essential position of the Chinese Communist Party in reaction to the attack by Khrushchev against Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956. Scott quotes portions of the Chinese Party statement out of context in order to promote his own anti-communist, anti-Stalin line. The essence of the Chinese Communist Party position, however, completely and utterly wipes out the whole "thesis" of Jack Scott's anti-communist line of "two roads". This is why he "ignores" the principal points made in the essay *More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*. Here are the key points:

*"The existence of the Soviet Union has shaken imperialist rule to its very foundations and brought unbounded hope, confidence and courage to all revolutionary movements of the workers and liberation movements of the oppressed nations..."*

*"The very fact of the advance of the Soviet Union is proof that the fundamental experience of the Soviet Union in revolution and construction is a great accomplishment, the first plan of victory of Marxism-Leninism in the history of mankind..."*

*"But as far as basic theory is concerned, the path of the October Revolution reflects the general laws of revolution and construction at a particular stage in the long course of human society. It is not only the road of the Soviet Union, but also the road which the proletariat of all countries must travel to gain victory. Precisely for this reason the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China stated in its political report to the 8th National Congress: 'Despite the fact that the revolution in our country has many characteristics of its own, Chinese Communists regard the cause for which they work as a continuation of the great October Revolution...' (More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, *People's Daily*, December 29, 1956)*

Nothing so completely and clearly demolished Jack Scott's reactionary revisionist line about "two roads" as this unequivocal statement of the Chinese Communist Party in opposition to the Khrushchev revisionist attack against Stalin. After deliberately distorting the Chinese position in 1956, Scott carries on in a most desultory manner totally confusing the history of the polemic against Khrushchevite revisionism, and obscuring the nature of Khrushchev's crimes. If Scott were not so obsessed with telling gossips and slanders, like some reactionary university professor, he could merely have summed up what the Chinese themselves said about Khrushchev's crimes after he was deposed by Brezhnev and Kosygin in 1964:

*"In the eleven past years, exploiting the prestige of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the first socialist country that had been built up under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, Khrushchov committed all the bad things he possibly could in contravention of the genuine will of the Soviet people. These bad things may be summed up as follows:*

1. On the pretext of "Combating the personality cult" and using the most scurrilous language, he railed at Stalin, the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people. In opposing Stalin, he opposed Marxism-Leninism. He tried at one stroke to write off all the great achievements of the Soviet people in the entire period under Stalin's leadership in order to defame the dictatorship of the proletariat, the socialist system, the great Soviet Communist Party, the great Soviet Union and the international communist movement. In so doing, Khrushchov provided the imperialists and the reactionaries of all countries with the dirtiest of weapons for their anti-Soviet and anti-Communist activities.

2. In open violation of the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960, he sought 'all-round co-operation' with U.S. imperialism and fallaciously maintained that the heads of the Soviet Union and the United States would 'decide the fate of humanity', constantly praising the chieftains of U.S. imperialism as 'having a sincere desire for peace'. Pursuing an adventurist policy at one moment, he transported guided missiles to Cuba and, pursuing a capitulationist policy at another, he docilely withdrew the missiles and bombers from Cuba on the order of the U.S. pirates. He accepted inspection by the U.S. fleet and even tried to sell out Cuba's sovereignty by agreeing, behind the Cuban government's back, to the 'inspection' of Cuba by the United Nations, which is under U.S. control. In so doing, Khrushchov brought a humiliating disgrace upon the great Soviet people unheard of in the forty years and more since the October Revolution.

3. To cater to the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail and prevent socialist China from building up her own nuclear strength for self-defence, he did not hesitate to damage the defence capabilities of the Soviet Union itself and concluded the so-called partial nuclear test ban treaty in collusion with the two imperialist powers of the United States and Britain. Facts have shown that this treaty is a pure swindle. In signing this treaty Khrushchov perversely tried to sell out the interests of the Soviet people, the people of all the socialist countries and all the peace-loving people of the world.

4. In the name of 'peaceful transition' he tried by every means to obstruct the revolutionary movements of the people of the capitalist countries, demanding that they take the so-called legal, parliamentary road. This erroneous line paralyses the revolutionary will of the proletariat and disarms the revolutionary people ideologically, causing serious setbacks to the cause of revolution in certain countries. It has made the Communist Parties in a number of capitalist countries lifeless social-democratic parties of a new type and caused them to degenerate into servile tools of the bourgeoisie.

5. Under the signboard of 'peaceful co-existence' he did his utmost to oppose and sabotage the national liberation movement and went so far as to work hand in glove with U.S. imperialism in suppressing the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations. He instructed the Soviet delegate at the United Nations to vote for the dispatch of forces of aggression to the Congo, which helped the U.S. imperialists to suppress the Congolese people, and he used Soviet transport facilities to move these so-called United Nations troops to the Congo. He actually opposed the revolutionary struggles of the Algerian people, describing the Algerian national liberation struggle as an 'internal affair' of France. He had the audacity to 'stand aloof' over the events in the Gulf of Ba' Bc engineered by U.S. imperialism against Viet Nam, and cudgelled his brains for ways to help the U.S. provocateurs get out of their predicament and to whitewash the criminal aggression of the U.S. pirates.

6. In blatant violation of the Statement of 1960, he spared no effort to reverse its verdict on the renegade Tito clique, describing Tito who had degenerated into a lackey of U.S. imperialism as a 'Marxist-Leninist' and Yugoslavia which had degenerated into a capitalist country as a 'socialist country'. Time and again he declared that he and the Tito clique had 'the same ideology' and were 'guided by the same theory', and expressed his desire to learn modestly from this renegade who had betrayed the interests of the Yugoslav people and sabotaged the international communist movement.

7. He regarded Albania, a socialist country, as his sworn enemy, devising every possible means to injure and undermine it, and only wishing he could devour it in one gulp. He brazenly broke off all economic and diplomatic relations with Albania, arbitrarily deprived it of its legitimate rights as a member state in the Warsaw Treaty Organization and in the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, and publicly called for the overthrow of its Party and state leadership.

8. He nourished an inveterate hatred for the Communist Party of China which upholds Marxism-Leninism and a revolutionary line, because the Chinese Communist Party was a great obstacle to his effort to press on with revisionism and capitulationism. He spread innumerable rumours and slanders against the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Tsetung, and resorted to every kind of baseness in his futile attempt to subvert socialist China. He perfidiously tore up several hundred agreements and contracts and arbitrarily withdrew more than one thousand Soviet experts working in China. He engineered border disputes between China and the Soviet Union and even conducted large-scale subversive activities in Sinkiang. He backed the reactionaries of India in their armed attacks on socialist China and, together with the United States, incited and helped them to perpetuate armed provocations against China by giving them military aid.

9. In flagrant violation of the principles guiding relations among the fraternal countries, he encroached upon their independence and sovereignty and willfully interfered in their internal affairs. In the name of 'mutual economic assistance', he opposed the independent development of the economies of fraternal countries and forced them to become a source of raw materials and an outlet for finished goods, thus reducing their industries to appendages. He bragged that these were all new theories and doctrines of his own invention, but in fact they were the jungle law of the capitalist world which he applied to relations among socialist countries, taking the Common Market of the monopoly capitalist blocs as his model.

10. In complete violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties, he resorted to all sorts of schemes to carry out subversive and disruptive activities against them. Not only did he use the sessions of the Central Committee and Congress of his own Party as well as the Congresses of some fraternal Parties to launch overt large-scale unbridled attacks on the fraternal Parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism, but in the case of many fraternal Parties he shamelessly bought over political degenerates, renegades and turncoats to support his revisionist line, to attack and even illegally expel Marxist-Leninists from these Parties, thus creating splits without considering the consequences.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

11. He wantonly violated the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation among fraternal Parties and, playing the 'patriarchal father Party' role, he willfully decided to convene an illegal international meeting of the fraternal Parties. In the notice dated July 30, 1964, he ordered that a meeting of the so-called drafting committee of the twenty-six fraternal Parties be held on December 15 this year, so as to create an open split in the international communist movement.

12. To cater to the needs of the imperialists and the domestic forces of capitalism, he pursued a series of revisionist policies leading back to capitalism. Under the signboard of the 'state of the whole people', he abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat; under the signboard of the 'party of the entire people', he altered the proletarian character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and divided the Party into an 'industrial' and an 'agricultural' Party in contravention of the Marxist-Leninist principle of Party organization. Under the signboard of 'full-scale communist construction', he tried in a thousand and one ways to switch back to the old path of capitalism: the world's first socialist state which the Soviet people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin had created by their sweat and blood. His blind direction of Soviet agriculture and industry wrought great havoc with the Soviet national economy and brought great difficulties to the life of the Soviet people. (Why Khrushchov Fell, editorial, *Red Flag*, Nos. 21-22, 1964, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1964, pp. 3-8)

Here in much less space than Scott devotes to plagiarising all the U.S. imperialists slanders and bogus theories, the Chinese Communist Party sets forth the whole criminal record of the Khrushchevite revisionist misdeeds. However, it is not in Scott's interest to promote the Chinese Communist Party analysis. After all, does he not promote the idea in his communalist circles that one should have a 'critical' attitude to People's China and a 'critical attitude' to Mao Tsetung Thought? Of course Scott's 'freedom of criticism' allows him to peddle all sorts of anti-China, anti-communist lies and slanders in the name of 'friendship' and even 'Marxism-Leninism'. Thus he totally distorts the role of Khrushchevite revisionism, and the history of the Marxist-Leninists who waged a tit-for-tat struggle against modern revisionism, a struggle which culminated in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in 1966, of which the present campaign against Lin Biao and Confucius is a continuation.

Now we shall examine how Scott uses the opportunity of "explaining" the so-called "Sino-Soviet dispute" to promote his anti-communist, anarcho-syndicalist attack against socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. He sub-titles his effort 'the roots of Soviet imperialism'. First of all, the Chinese Communist Party never speaks of 'Soviet imperialism'; this is the phrase used by the counter-revolutionary reactionaries like Chiang Kai-shek. China describes the imperialism practised by the Soviet Union today with the phrase devised by Lenin to describe the opportunist revisionists of the Second International who became outright "social imperialists" by supporting the finance capitalists of their "own" countries. He described the likes of Kautsky and other traitors to Marxism as "socialists in words, imperialists in deeds". Today, because Kautskyste type revisionists have taken over political power in the Soviet Union and have changed the country from socialism to imperialism, they label the Soviet Union a "social-imperialist country" — "socialist in words and imperialist in deeds". The phrase came in use after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. The theories and practise of the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique since that time have proved the scientific accuracy of the phrase "social-imperialist". Immediately following his inaccurate sub-title, Scott abuses his reader with yet another excursion into historical idealism. He says:

"China was probably correct in making the effort to strengthen unity in the socialist camp, and to effect a radical change in the disastrous course of action Moscow was bent on following. But the final outcome seems to have been a foregone conclusion. The weight of evidence tends to prove that a bureaucratic caste possessing special political and economic privileges had been in the process of formation in the Soviet Union for a number of years." (p. 40) With 'friends' like Jack Scott, one doesn't need enemies! "China was probably correct!" And, according to this 'friend', China's 'effort' was to 'strengthen unity! What an underhanded attack against Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought! For Jack Scott — a sideline pamphleteer and gossip, a man who spends much of his time splitting the ranks of the Marxist-Leninist forces in Canada — the whole tit-for-tat tortuous struggle of the Marxist-Leninists around the world, led by Comrade Mao Tsetung and the Chinese Communist Party, against the traitors of communism, the modern Khrushchevite revisionists, is dismissed with a fatalistic wave of the hand. Perhaps Scott's casual dismissal of this epochal struggle against the main enemy of the working class movement covers Jack Scott's memory of the fact that he himself was in a position to lead the workers' movement in Canada against modern revisionism but failed to take up that leadership, and thus liquidated the anti-revisionist upsurge in Vancouver, British Columbia in the 1964-70 period. Furthermore, since then he has persisted in splitting the ranks of Marxist-Leninists, carrying on all sorts of goings and slanders, and practising hegemony over young revolutionaries with "stories" about his years as a "worker", or "Communist", and his "friendship" with China. So he comforts himself with the euphoric thought that after all, the struggle against modern revisionism was a "foregone conclusion". Is this Marxism-Leninism? Is this an attitude coincident with friendship with People's China? Chairman Mao consistently opposed such "lazy" fatalism. He taught the Chinese Communist Party and international working class movement:

"Only where the broom reaches can political influence produce its full effect. Our broom is the Communist Party, the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army. Broom in hand, you must learn to sweep; don't lie in bed, fancying that a gust of wind will somehow rise and blow all the dust away. We Marxists are revolutionary realists and never indulge in idle dreams." (Mao Tsetung, *The Situation and Our Policy after the victory in*

*the War of Resistance against Japan*, August 13, 1945, *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, op. cit., p. 20)

Jack Scott did not take up Marxism-Leninism as his broom to sweep away the dust of the modern revisionists in Canada. When others did, he denounced them for using such clumsy out-worn implements as brooms, and spoke idly about the efficiency of modern vacuum cleaners. But he never got up out of his rocking chair. Now many years later, still stuck in his rocking chair, he writes attacks on China by belittling their great world-shaking sweeping-up of modern revisionism which culminated in the full-scale "spring cleaning" of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. These few sentences of Scott's cover a host of serious errors and crimes committed by him. Instead of modestly doing self-criticism and rectifying his opportunist ways, he pursues a reckless path to further degeneration by doing propaganda against communism and against China. — in order to belittle the fight against revisionism, and at the same time indulge in yet another attack against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The nature of this round of attack is particularly devious. He says that as early as 1919 'attacks' were being directed against the Commune policy of paying state officials the same wage as ordinary workers. Thus he gives the impression, as he tried to do with respect to Soviet foreign policy, that "degeneration" had set in the Soviet Union virtually right after the Great October Revolution. Then Scott says:

"But with the retreat to the New Economic Policy, and concessions to capitalist mores, pressures increased in favour of higher salaries. Initially some safeguard was maintained in that members of the ruling Bolshevik Party were limited to the salary of an average worker. Considerable sacrifice was demanded of those desiring party membership. By 1931 important changes in policy were becoming evident." (p. 40)

What these 'important changes' were Scott does not say. But he goes on immediately to quote from Stalin to the effect that wages between "skilled and unskilled labour, between heavy and light work" must be differentiated. Scott then wags his finger and says wages never had been equal, and that what Stalin was insidiously doing was promoting an increase in inequality:

"The proposal constituted a clear declaration that the workers, or at the very least an important and strategic section of the working people, could be motivated only by the hope and expectations of pecuniary gain, never by socialist principles and objectives. This was not just a tactical manoeuvre; it was a retreat from fundamental socialist principle." (p. 41)

Let us begin to sort out Jack Scott's hopeless muddle by saying that the rise of modern revisionism had nothing to do with the question of workers' wages. Scott's whole anarchist theory is based on his Lassallean misconception of political economy: the idea of "iron clod" law of wages and prices, a notion that there is only a certain fixed wage fund from which workers draw — either on a utopian basis of "equality" or a "capitalist" basis of "inequality", and so on. We shall deal with his bogus pro-Marxian economic theories in a minute. But first let us clarify what the central issue of class struggle was in the Soviet Union in 1925 towards the end of the New Economic Policy (NEP; instituted in 1921 by Lenin to avert total economic catastrophe). The central contradiction to solve at that time was the issue of the worker-peasant alliance. Stalin stood for the Leninist policy of building this alliance as the main base for building socialism. Of the four allies of the Russian proletariat (the advanced proletariat in the capitalist countries, the oppressed nations and colonies, the inter-imperialist rivalry, and the Russian peasants), only the Russian peasants in 1925 were in a position of decisively and practically assisting the proletariat. The chief obstacle in building the worker-peasant alliance was Trotskyism. Trotsky had no faith in the worker-peasant alliance, and instilled disbelief in the possibility of transforming NEP-Russia into a socialist Russia. Therefore, the central political task in the mid-1920's was to defeat Trotskyism as a trend in Russia, just as the main task before the October Revolution had been to defeat Menshevism. By 1928, the main political struggle had shifted between Marxism-Leninism and Bukharinism, or right-deviationism. The essence of this line was that it was impossible to organise the poor and middle peasants into co-operative farms, or to rapidly industrialise the economy, especially to electrify the countryside, in order to transform the economic base from Kulak, capitalist agriculture, to co-operative socialist agriculture based on large-scale modern industry. Scott completely dismisses these objective questions of class alignment of forces, and instead dwells upon utopian and idealist "principles". Scott implies that the Stakhanovite movement which grew up out of the fierce struggle waged in the USSR to revolutionize the relations of production in Soviet society, and acted as a powerful rallying force for the modern proletariat in overcoming all sorts of petty bourgeois defeatist lines, actually marked a "return" to capitalism. Scott says:

"When the Stakhanovite movement became popular later in the thirties, the stronger and more highly skilled could not only earn incomes far in excess of the average worker in industry and on the collective farms; in addition they were showered with honours, appointed to administrative posts in the state, and advanced to ranks of honour in the party." (p. 41)

Again this is a subjective, non-scientific analysis of classes. "Honours" for exemplary, self-sacrificing workers and peasants do not give rise to a class. Does China not honour its exemplary workers and peasants to inspire the masses with positive models? Yes, it does. What Scott is doing here is to promote an anarchist theory of "egalitarianism" that directly contradicts the objective laws of socialism. Lenin clarifies this issue in *The State and Revolution*. He cites Marx's observation that "equal rights" are still bourgeois rights, and presuppose inequality. Lenin says:

"But people are not alike: one is strong, another is weak; one is married, another is not; one has more children, another has less, and so on. And the conclusion Marx draws is:

"...with an equal performance of labour, and hence an equal share in the social consumption fund, one will in fact receive more than another, one will be richer than another, and so on. To avoid all these defects, right instead of being equal would

have to be unequal".

"Hence, the first phase of Communism cannot yet produce justice and equality: differences and unjust differences, in wealth will still exist, but the exploitation of man by man will have become impossible, because it will be impossible to seize the means of production, the factories, machines, land, etc., as private property. While smashing Lassalle's petty-bourgeois, confused phrases about 'equality and justice' in general, Marx shows the course of development of communist society, which is compelled to abolish at first only the 'injustice' of the means of production having been seized by the individuals, and which is unable at once to eliminate the other injustice, which consists in the distribution of articles of consumption 'according to the amount of labour performed' (and not according to needs)...."

"Marx not only most scrupulously takes account of the inevitable inequality of men, but he also takes into account the fact that the mere conversion of the means of production into the common property of the whole of society (commonly called 'Socialism') does not remove the defects of distribution and the inequality of 'bourgeois right' which continues to prevail as long as products are divided 'according to the amount of labour performed'. Continuing, Marx says:

"But these defects are inevitable in the first phase of communist society as it is when it has just emerged after prolonged birth pangs from capitalist society. Right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and its cultural development conditioned thereby."

"And so, in the first phase of communist society (usually called Socialism) 'bourgeois right' is not abolished in its entirety, but only in part, only in proportion to the economic revolution so far attained, i.e., only in respect of the masses of production. 'Bourgeois right' recognizes them as the private property of individuals. Socialism converts them into common property. To that extent — and to that extent alone — 'bourgeois right' disappears." (V.I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965, pp. 110-112)

All of Jack Scott's theories on the rise of capitalism in the Soviet Union during the 1920's and 1930's are based on his Lassallean petty bourgeois theories of 'equality' and 'fundamental socialist principles'. The fact is there was a danger of the restoration of capitalism in this period. We have already quoted Lenin's comments on the subject. Comrade Stalin also analysed this phenomenon:

"The social basis of the deviations is the fact that small-scale production predominates in our country, the fact that small-scale production gives rise to capitalist elements, the fact that our Party is surrounded by petty-bourgeois elemental forces, and, lastly, the fact that certain of our Party organisations have been infected by these elemental forces.

"There, in the main, lies the social basis of deviations. All these deviations are of a petty-bourgeois character.

"What is the Right deviation, which is the one chiefly in question here? In what direction does it tend to go? It tends towards adaptation to bourgeois ideology, towards adaptation of our policy to the tastes and requirements of the 'Soviet bourgeoisie'.

"What threat does the Right deviation hold out, if it should triumph in our Party? It would mean the ideological rout of our Party, a free rein for the capitalist elements, the growth of chances for the restoration of capitalism, or, as Lenin called it, for a 'return to capitalism'.

"Where is the tendency towards a Right deviation chiefly lodged? In our Soviet, economic, co-operative and trade-union apparatuses, and in the Party apparatuses as well, especially in its lower links in the countryside." (J. Stalin, *Industrialisation of the country and the Right deviation in the CPSU(B)*, November 19, 1928, *Works*, Vol. II, pp. 280-1)

During the sharp class struggle in the Soviet Union, culminating in the exposure of the anti-state activities of both the Right and 'Left' deviations, the Marxist-Leninist line of Comrade Stalin prevailed in the CPSU(B). During the early 1950's the economic base had recovered from the devastation of the war, and socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production had been in the main completed. During this period the 'Right' deviation, the bourgeois line, cropped up in the cultural superstructure. Stalin was conscious of this development, and as we stated earlier, had begun the necessary theoretical work to begin a motion against the 'Soviet' bourgeoisie. In 1928 Stalin saw the dangers of this class, and of bureaucracy. He called on the Soviet youth to organise against this class:

"The chief thing now is to start a broad tide of criticism from below against bureaucracy in general, against shortcomings in our work in particular. Only by organising two fold pressure — from above and from below — and only by shifting the principal stress to criticism from below, can we count on waging a successful struggle against bureaucracy and on rooting it out." (J. Stalin, *Speech delivered at the Eighth Congress of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League*, May 16, 1928, *Works*, Vol. II, op. cit., p. 77-8)

But Stalin never solved the historical problem of organising a mass criticism from below against the bourgeoisie who had seized power in the central superstructure after the economic base had been transformed. The negative example of the all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union after this class, politically expressed in Khrushchev's modern revisionist line, assisted the Marxist-Leninists, led by Comrade Mao Tsetung, to analyse this problem scientifically and find the form for overthrowing the capitalist roaders through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

Scott is simply wrong in his whole analysis of the rise of the new 'Soviet' bourgeoisie. He is too caught up in his utopian 'socialist principles' to analyse the phenomenon objectively. His subjectivism leads him to actually accuse the workers and peasants for giving rise to capitalism. He says, "The accumulation of personal wealth became possible once again." (p. 41) And as proof of this he cites Article 10 of the Soviet constitution which says: "The right of citizens to personal ownership of their incomes from work and of their savings... as

## CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

well as the right of inheritance of personal property of citizens, is protected by law." (p.41) This law is in perfect accord with socialist relations of production. As we have shown with Lenin's and Marx's analysis, what separates socialism from capitalism is that under socialism private individuals are not allowed the 'right' to own the means of production. If we were to follow Jack Scott's analysis, then we would have to agree with the imperialist pundits who claim that China has become 'moderate', and that 'capitalism' is being restored. The new Chinese state constitution "contains provisions regarding non-agricultural individual labourers and allowing People's Commune members to farm plots for their personal needs and engage in limited household sideline production." (Report on the Revision of the Constitution, by Chang Chun-chiao delivered on January 13, 1975 and adopted on January 17, 1975 at the First Session of the Fourth National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China) The 'rights' to 'inequality' still exist under socialism. The rights of citizens to 'personal ownership of their incomes from work and of their savings', as well as the right of Commune members to "Farm plots for their personal needs and engage in limited household sideline production", are both reflections of socialist 'inequality'. Unquestionably some workers will be wealthier than others, as will some peasants be wealthier than others. But what Khrushchev and the modern revisionists promote is qualitatively different from this. They promote the right to 'free' access to a capitalist market, and profit as a motive in production. Hence in both agriculture and industry socialist relations of production are turned into capitalist relations of production. This is the consequence, as we have already shown from the analysis the Chinese present of Khrushchev's bad deeds, of modern revisionist economic theories and practise. By promoting the theory of 'productive forces' as being decisive, they create conditions for turning socialist relations of production into capitalist relations of production. This is what happened when the Soviet capitalist roaders who had seized power in the cultural superstructure, moved in with their modern revisionist theories and seized state power. Thus Jack Scott is simply wrong in his views about the roots of social-imperialism. Social-imperialism arose from the 'Soviet' bourgeoisie, using their power after the death of Stalin. This explains the class basis for the rise of modern revisionism, and conversion of the Soviet Union into social-imperialism.

Let us now move on to examine how Jack Scott creates confusion as to the nature of Soviet social-imperialism, and its relation to the socialist policies of People's China. Scott does not make clear that in fact the policies of social-imperialism are opposite to those of socialism, that there are only two class outlooks contending in the world today, that of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. And in the era of imperialism all struggles against the few creditor 'Great Powers', reduced today to the two superpowers, the United States and Soviet Union, are objectively, independent of their will, on the side of proletarian revolution.

Scott obscures the alignment of class forces in the present era and proletarian-socialist world revolution and simply omits to present the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the four major contradictions in the world today which are: the contradiction between the oppressed nations on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other; the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist and revisionist countries; the contradiction between imperialist and social-imperialist countries and among the imperialist countries; and the contradiction between socialist countries and among the imperialist countries; and the contradiction between the socialist countries on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other.

Today the Third World is the main force in combatting colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism.

China is a developing socialist country belonging to the Third World. China's foreign policy comes under the discipline of these objective laws, and reflects the motivations and interests for world proletarian revolution of the proletarian class which exercises its dictatorship over China. The Soviet Union is under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the reactionary, dying class. The general line of this class is not "peaceful co-existence" as Scott says (p.48), but is a line of contending with U.S. imperialism for world hegemony, for access to and monopoly control over world markets and sources of raw materials. At the same time both the superpowers collude with one another to prevent revolution and national liberation. At present however contention between the superpowers is becoming more and more intense which is bound to lead to war some day. Either revolution prevents world war, or world war gives rise to revolution.

On the question of 'detente' Scott says that "detente means superpower collusion, collaboration, dividing the world into spheres of influence, defence of the status quo and unity in opposition to 'disturbers of the peace.' Each side recognizes the authority and sovereignty of the other in zones of power where intervention would be considered a direct attack on the power centre of one superpower by the other." (50) Scott misses the essential aspect of 'detente', which is that their 'collusion' merely covers up their contention, their fierce preparation for war, and frantic arms race in order to fight out a re-division of the world markets and raw materials. Neither superpower recognises the 'authority and sovereignty of the other'. They are continually trying to undermine each other, and their contention has spread to all corners of the globe, although the focus of their contention is Europe.

On the question of nuclear weapons, Scott fails to clarify the basic class difference between social-imperialism and socialism. For China nuclear weapons are for its defence. For the Soviet Union nuclear weapons are a means of colluding with U.S. imperialism to dominate the Third World and the advanced capitalist countries of the Second World, but most decisively they are used as a means of contending with U.S. imperialism for world hegemony. The present frantic arms race which the two superpowers try to hide under so-called 'arms limitation talks', and 'troop reduction' talks, is actually going on

in preparation for a third world war to re-divide the world. We have already quoted the Chinese analysis of how Khrushchev used nuclear weapons to justify his collusion with U.S. imperialism, and at the same time brandished them as instruments of contention with U.S. imperialism. Since that time the arms race has escalated many fold. The Soviet navy contends with the U.S. navy on all the major oceans and seas, particularly the Mediterranean Sea and Indian Ocean. In addition both countries have made preparations for so-called 'pre-emptive strikes' and 'massive retaliation' programmes. When Scott says "Soviet dependency on massive nuclear superiority cannot possibly advance the liberation struggles" (p.55), he is simply muddling up the nature of Soviet social-imperialism. Nuclear weapons for the superpowers are instruments to jointly suppress world revolution, but most decisively are instruments for contention with one another for world hegemony.

On the question of 'poor nations and foreign aid', Scott misses the basic point of revisionist, social-imperialist theory which is that the so-called worker-peasant alliance or 'international division of labour' is simply rehash of the U.S. imperialist theory of 'country and city' trade used to justify their post-war domination of the capitalist world. Central to imperialist theory is the idea of hegemony, of the plunder of raw materials and export of capital in order to extract the maximum rate of profit. That is the essence of Soviet social-imperialist policy with the Third World. Under the signboard of 'socialist aid', the Soviet Union practises exactly the same policies of domination and plunder as U.S. imperialism.

On the question of 'limited sovereignty' Scott very much obscures the opposite nature of social-imperialism to socialism. He says:

"It is clear that there are sharp differences of opinion between Peking and Moscow on relations between countries in the socialist camp, and on the question of the role of the CPSU in shaping and directing world communist opinion and policy. The CPSU have shown, on several occasions, that they will not hesitate to resort to invasion and occupation to ensure that decisions of the CPSU Congress are obeyed by all other parties in the socialist bloc countries." (p.57)

Actually there is no 'socialist camp' any longer, as the modern revisionists restored capitalism in the Soviet Union, and the other revisionist countries. Furthermore, the CPSU is not a communist party; it is a fascist party, the instrument of the dictatorship of the state monopoly bureaucratic class in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union did not invade Czechoslovakia in 1968 or support the fascist repression of the Polish workers' struggles in 1969 to 'ensure' some CPSU congress decisions are obeyed. They invaded these countries in order to assert Soviet social-imperialist domination over them when they resisted Soviet plunder of their industry and raw materials. To speak of 'difference of opinion' between socialist China and social-imperialist Soviet Union at this stage completely obscures the opposite nature of the two countries, the opposite nature of the two classes that have state power — the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union, the proletariat in China. Hegemonism is inherent in the nature of imperialism. Proletarian internationalism is the opposite of hegemonism. That is why Chairman Mao says China will never seek hegemony.

On the question of 'inter-party relations' Scott again obscures the main issue. He speaks as if the revisionist parties are 'communist'. The Chinese Communist Party has made it quite clear that the main struggle today is against modern revisionism. The Report to the Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China says, "We must unite with all genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties and organisations the world over, and carry the struggle against modern revisionism through to the end." (The Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (Documents), Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1973, p.29) In the Report on the Revision of the Party Constitution, Comrade Wang Hung-wen says: "Revisionism is an international bourgeois ideological trend." He quotes Chairman Mao, "The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie." Further: "Revisionism remains the main danger today." (Ibid., p.46-7) Thus there are no 'inter-party' relations between the revisionist parties and the Communist Party of China. China of course carries on inter-state relations with revisionist countries, and in fact makes a maximum effort to normalise inter-state relations between itself and both U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. But China only has "inter-party" relations with genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. As for the revisionist parties, they are nothing more than lifeless social-democratic parties and agencies for Soviet social-imperialist conspiracy, and intrigue to exercise hegemony over various countries.

The very last portion of his pamphlet is not consistent with the rest of it. Here Scott reverses himself on a number of key questions. For example, on page 20 he presented the theory that an external policy not in keeping with internal revolutionary aims will "Turn inward" and "deflect the nation from its original aims." At the very end of the pamphlet he says "Soviet foreign policy is a true reflection of the class divisions that have arisen internally." (p.60) The latter statement is more accurate, although he still refuses to recognize that modern revisionism in power means the bourgeoisie in power.

Another issue on which Scott seems to change his line in the end is the recognition that the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union exploits its 'own' working class as well as oppresses the small nations within the Soviet Union. This contradicts his earlier arguments that the development of Soviet social-imperialism reflected the inherent characteristics of the Russian 'nation' as an 'oppressor nation'. But then after seemingly amending his earlier wrong stands, Scott shifts back to his original "thesis". He concludes his pamphlet:

"It will no doubt be apparent to the reader of the foregoing survey that Sino-Russian relations, from the earliest times, have been marked by almost constant conflict, with but very brief interludes of friendship. Russia for long played the bully, and China the role of victim. But as of 1949 China stood up and the relationship has changed radically. Brezhnev and company appear no longer to have quite got this mes-

sage yet, but the relationship of world forces is changing so rapidly that the winds of change cannot for long pass Moscow by." (p.63)

Here we have a repetition in summary of Scott's wrong line. The Soviet Union from the time of the Great October Revolution to the rise of revisionism was the best of friends and comrade of the Chinese people and Chinese revolution. All the imperialists and Chinese feudalists and comprador capitalists did everything possible to break the unity between the Chinese people and the Soviet Union but they failed. The situation never changed drastically in 1949 the way Scott suggests. What happened in 1949 is that people under the leadership of the proletariat had taken power. Now the great friendship between the Chinese people and the Soviet Union could be formalised in close, fraternal inter-state relations based on proletarian internationalism. The drastic change which Scott is referring to, namely the split between the Soviet Union and People's China was imposed by the 'modern revisionists in the Soviet Union who want to convert China into a Soviet colony. To this end they have committed many crimes against China, including a number of aggressions against sovereign Chinese territory. Scott never mentions these acts of imperialist aggression committed by the modern revisionists against People's China, but the fact is these actions are part and parcel of Soviet social-imperialism to seek world hegemony. China however remains true to the principles of socialist foreign policy laid down by Stalin in 1939: "We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and we are ready to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war who attempt to violate the Soviet borders." Today China is the socialist country, and the Soviet Union is a social-imperialist country. China, like its great teacher, and path-finder, the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, also gives two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war who attempt to violate China's borders. Brezhnev and company have in fact long ago received this message. That is why on the one hand they are hungry to take a bite out of China, and on the other, are mortally afraid they themselves may get swallowed in the effort. Thus the Soviet social-imperialists are faced with the predicament of all reactionaries — "flowers fall off do as one may." Either war will give rise to revolution, or revolution will prevent war; in either case the international situation will develop in a direction favourable to the people, and the future of the world will be bright.

Scott's conclusion again misses the essence of contemporary world politics. It is the masses who make history, and the main trend in the world today is that countries want independence, nations want liberation, people want revolution. The genuine friends of People's China are fighting hard in their own countries to defeat the superpowers and make a contribution to the main trend of independence, liberation and revolution. Here in Canada, the masses of the Canadian people are struggling against their main enemy, U.S. imperialism and the Canadian monopoly capitalist class. The strongest ally of the Canadian people in this struggle are the oppressed countries of the Third World who are the main force in fighting imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. China is a developing socialist country belonging to the Third World, and is therefore a great friend and ally of the Canadian people. This is the objective basis for friendship between our two countries and two peoples. Jack Scott, however, does not contribute to the friendship between the Canadian and Chinese people in his pamphlet, *Two Roads*, because he denies the true nature of socialist China as the inheritor and fighter for the same road opened up by the Great October Socialist Revolution by Lenin and Stalin. To distort and deny this basic historical fact is to engage in opportunist, revisionist politics. And there can be no fight against imperialism, superpower politics and hegemonism without a fight against opportunist and modern revisionism, the main enemy of the working class and oppressed nations. The ordinary Canadian masses have great enthusiasm to fight against U.S. imperialism and the Canadian monopoly capitalists, and superpower politics. They also have great enthusiasm for friendship with the People's Republic of China, the socialist leader for the world's peoples. We have criticised Jack Scott's pamphlet in order to further advance the Canadian people's struggle against superpower politics, and advance the friendship between the Canadian and Chinese people. By opposing the opportunist, neo-revisionist line of Jack Scott's 'two road' theory, we are opposing imperialist and social-imperialist lines being spread among the Canadian revolutionary forces. Only by uniting the genuine Marxist-Leninists and isolating the sham ones, the real opportunists and splitters, can we advance the struggle against the main enemy, modern revisionism, and deepen and broaden the genuine friendship between the Canadian people and the People's Republic of China.

PCDN/OTL is edited by Pauline Easton. The other members of the editorial board are Richard Daly, who is Managing Editor and Robert Alexander, who is Assistant Managing Editor. PCDN/OTL is published by the Norman Bethune Institute, printed by People's Canada Publishing House, and distributed by National Publications Centre. Write to: NPC, P.O. Box 727, Adelaide St., Toronto, Ontario.

All Correspondence to CPC(M-L) should be addressed to: NATIONAL EXECUTIVE, CPC(M-L) P.O. Box 666, Station C Montreal, Quebec