

THE REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS IN COLONIAL-TYPE COUNTRIES

(A paper read by Bill Bland on behalf of the 'Communist League' at the Marxist-Leninist Seminar in London in July 1993)

THE MARXIST-LENINIST STRATEGY

THE AIM OF MARXIST-LENINISTS IS TO LEAD THE WORKING CLASS IN EACH COUNTRY TO ACCOMPLISH SOCIALIST REVOLUTIONS WHICH WILL ESTABLISH SOCIALIST, AND ULTIMATELY COMMUNIST, SOCIETIES.

The revolutionary process will differ somewhat in each country according to the specific conditions existing:

"The nationally peculiar and nationally specific features in each separate country must unfailingly be taken into account by the Comintern when drawing up guiding directives for the working-class movement of the country concerned".

(Josef V. Stalin: 'Notes on Contemporary Themes' (July 1927), in: 'Works', Volume 9; Moscow; 1954; p. 337).

In this paper I shall attempt to analyse the revolutionary process in colonial-type countries. I use the term 'colonial-type countries' to mean relatively underdeveloped countries which are dominated by one or another capitalist Great Power, which is usually an imperialist (i.e., monopoly capitalist) country.

A colonial type-country may be:

1) a colony, which is ruled directly by a Great Power;

or 2) a semi-colony, which is nominally independent but is in fact dominated by a Great Power.

A semi-colony which was formerly a colony is called a neo-colony.

A revolution in a colonial-type country which achieves the national liberation of the country is termed a national-democratic revolution. A revolution which achieves the political power of the working class is termed a socialist revolution.

The Role of the National Bourgeoisie

A key feature of the class structure of a colonial-type country is that the native capitalist class consists of two parts:

firstly, the comprador capitalist class or comprador bourgeoisie, which has close ties with the landlord class and whose exploitation is based primarily upon foreign trade, making them, like the landlord class, dependent upon the dominating Great Power; and

secondly the national capitalist class or national bourgeoisie, whose exploitation is based on the ownership of industrial enterprises and whose

economic advancement is held back by the dominating Great Power.

Stalin pointed out in May 1925 to the students of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East that the native bourgeoisie in some of these countries

" . . . is splitting up into two parts, a revolutionary part (the national bourgeoisie -- Ed.) . . . and a compromising part (the comprador bourgeoisie -- Ed.) . . ., of which the first is continuing the revolutionary struggle, whereas the second is entering a bloc with imperialism".

(Josef V. Stalin: 'The Political Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East' (May 1925), in: 'Works', Volume 7; Moscow; 1954; p. 147).

The 6th Congress of the Communist International, in September 1928, agreed that the native bourgeoisie in colonial-type countries

" . . . do not adopt a uniform attitude to imperialism. One part, more especially the commercial bourgeoisie, directly serves the interests of imperialist capital (the so-called comprador bourgeoisie). In general, they maintain, more or less consistently, an anti-national, imperialist point of view, directed against the whole nationalist movement, as do the feudal allies of imperialism and the more highly paid native officials. The other parts of the native bourgeoisie, especially those representing the interests of native industry, support the national movement".

(6th Congress of Communist International: Theses on the Revolutionary Movement in Colonial and Semi-Colonial Countries, (September 1928), in: Jane Degras (Ed.): 'The Communist International: 1919-1943: Documents', Volume 2; London; 1971; p. 538).

Therefore, in a colonial-type country the national bourgeoisie is a class objectively in favour of the national-democratic revolution but objectively opposed to the socialist revolution.

It follows that the class forces of a colonial-type country which are objectively in favour of the national-democratic revolution are wider and stronger than the classes objectively in favour of the socialist revolution.

The Marxist-Leninist strategy for the revolutionary process in a colonial-type country must be based on striving to mobilise the maximum class forces objectively possible for both the national-democratic and the socialist revolutions:

"It is possible to conquer the more powerful enemy . . . only by taking advantage of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this fail to understand even a grain of Marxism".

(Vladimir I. Lenin: '"Left-wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder' (April 1920), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 10; London; 1946; p. 112).

"The Communist Party of each country must unfailingly avail itself of even the smallest opportunity of gaining a mass ally for the proletariat, even if a temporary, vacillating, unstable and unreliable ally".

(Josef V. Stalin: 'Notes on Contemporary Themes' (July 1927), in: 'Works', Volume 9; Moscow; 1954; p. 337).

Thus the Marxist-Leninist strategy of the revolutionary process in colonial-type countries is to strive to carry through the process in two stages: firstly, the stage of national-democratic revolution and, secondly, the stage of socialist revolution. In the first stage, the strategy is for the Marxist-Leninist Party to ally itself with the national-bourgeoisie, to the extent that this class remains genuinely revolutionary:

"Temporary cooperation is permissible, and in certain circumstances even a temporary alliance, between the Communist Party and the national-revolutionary movement, provided that the latter is a genuine revolutionary movement, that it genuinely struggles against the ruling power, and that its representatives do not hamper the Communists in their work".

(6th Congress, Communist International: Theses on the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonial and Semi-Colonial Countries (September 1928), in: Jane Degras (Ed.): op. cit., Volume 2; p. 542).

The Transition to the Socialist Revolution

Such cooperation, such an alliance, is temporary because the aim of the Marxist-Leninist Party is to win for the working class the leading role in the revolutionary process in order to carry this through, with the minimum possible interruption, to the socialist revolution. This leadership of the revolutionary process can be won only by struggle with the national bourgeoisie. The Marxist-Leninist strategy is, as Stalin states, that

" . . . 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".

(Josef V. Stalin: 'Questions of the Chinese Revolution' (April 1927), in: 'Works', Volume 9; Moscow; 1954; p. 225).

"The bourgeois-democratic revolution, consistently pursued, will be transformed into the proletarian revolution in those colonies and semi-colonies where the proletariat acts as leader and exercises hegemony over the movement. . . .

In these (colonial-type -- Ed.) countries the main task is to organise the workers and peasants independently in the Communist Party of the proletariat . . . and emancipate them from the influence of the national bourgeoisie".

(6th Congress of Communist International: Programme of the Communist International (September 1928), in: Jane Degras (Ed.): op. cit., Volume 2; p. 507, 522).

If it becomes clear that the working class is winning the leadership of the national-democratic revolution, and so is attaining a position to transform the revolution into a socialist revolution, then the national bourgeoisie will inevitably desert the revolution and go over to the counter-revolution, preferring the retention of limited exploitation under colonial-type domination to the ending of exploitation under socialism. This, according to Stalin and the Communist International, was what occurred in Chiang Kai-shek's coup in China in 1927:

"The ECCI issued directives concerned with preparing the workers and

peasants for struggle against the (national -- Ed.) bourgeoisie and their armed forces. This was a few months before Chiang Kai-shek's coup. Subsequent events . . . confirmed the Comintern's predictions: a radical regrouping of classes occurred, the (national -- Ed.) bourgeoisie committed treachery and deserted to the enemy camp; the revolution . . . moved on to a new and higher stage".

(ECCI: Resolution on the Present Stage of the Chinese Revolution (July 1927), in: Jane Degras (Ed.): op. cit., Volume 2; p. 393).

"In the first period of the Chinese revolution, . . . the national bourgeoisie (not the compradors) sided with the revolution. . . .

Chiang Kai-shek's coup marks the desertion of the national bourgeoisie from the revolution".

(Josef V. Stalin: 'Questions of the Chinese Revolution' ((April 1927), in: 'Works', Volume 9; Moscow; 1954; p. 226, 229).

After the working class has gained the leadership of the revolution and has begun to transform the revolution into a socialist revolution, the Marxist-Leninist strategy is to bring about the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class:

"The revolution will be unable to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie, to maintain its victory and to push forward to the final victory of socialism unless . . . it creates a special organ in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat as its principal mainstay".

(Josef V. Stalin: 'The Foundations of Leninism' (April/May 1924), in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p. 112).

REVISIONIST STRATEGIES

The term 'revisionism' is applied to any ideology which, while presenting itself as Marxism-Leninism, in fact distorts it so as to serve the interests of a capitalist class.

Revisionism is of service to a capitalist class in an environment where Marxism-Leninism has won support, serving to divert potential Marxist-Leninists into political channels which serve the interests of the capitalist class.

In so far as the revolutionary process in colonial-type countries is concerned, there are two basic types of revisionist trend:

Firstly, types which serve the interests of imperialists and comprador capitalists, such as Trotskyism; and

secondly, types which serve the interests of national capitalists, such as Maoism.

Because the national capitalists of a colonial-type country need national-democratic revolution in order to develop their wealth and power free of imperialist shackles, this second type of revisionism appears to be 'more revolutionary' than the first type. In fact, its objective role is to seek to check the revolutionary process at the stage of national-democratic revolution and stop it from proceeding to the stage of socialist revolution.

TROTSKYISM

As we have said, Trotskyism is a type of revisionism which, in relation to the revolutionary process in colonial-type countries, serves the interests of imperialists and comprador capitalists.

Trotskyism rejects the Marxist-Leninist view that the national capitalist class can play a revolutionary role in relation to the national-democratic stage of the revolutionary process:

"The national bourgeoisie has been essentially an instrument of the compradors and imperialism".

(Leon Trotsky: 'The Chinese Revolution and the Theses of Comrade Stalin', in: 'Problems of the Chinese Revolution'; Ann Arbor (USA); 1967; p., 21).

It therefore rejects as 'counter-revolutionary opportunism' the Marxist-Leninist strategy of stages in the revolutionary process in colonial-type countries:

"The khvostist ('tailist' -- Ed.) theory of 'stages' or 'steps' repeatedly proclaimed by Stalin in recent times, has served as the motivation in principle for the opportunist tactic. . . .

Once we set out on this road, our policy must be immediately transformed from a revolutionary factor into a conservative one".
(Leon Trotsky: *ibid.*; p. 21).

Under slogans which boil down to 'socialism now', Trotskyism serves to assist the imperialists and comprador bourgeoisie by disrupting and weakening the potential objective forces of the national-democratic revolution.

MAOISM

Maoism or Chinese revisionism is the most influential of the types of revisionism which serve the interests of the national capitalist classes of colonial-type countries.

As have seen, the Chinese national bourgeoisie defected from the Chinese revolution in 1927:

"Chiang Kai-shek's coup marks the desertion of the national bourgeoisie from the revolution".

(Josef V. Stalin: 'Questions of the Chinese Revolution' (April 1927), in: 'Works', Volume 9; Moscow; 1954; p. 229).

After Mao Tse-tung and his supporters took over the leadership of the Communist Party of China at Tsunyi in January 1935, the Party's policy became one of striving to win back the national bourgeoisie into a united front with the Party:

"The (national -- Ed.) bourgeoisie . . . withdrew from the revolution . . . and turned into enemies of the people. . . .

In the present circumstances there is a possibility that the bourgeoisie will once again cooperate with us and join in the resistance to Japan, and the party of the proletariat should therefore not repel them but welcome them and revive the alliance with them".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'The Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan' (May 1937), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 1; Peking;

1964; p. 271, 272).

This programme naturally required the national bourgeoisie to be convinced that if they joined a united front with the Communist Party under its new Maoist leadership they would be secure from socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Mao accordingly strove to convince the national bourgeoisie of this:

"Capitalists should be encouraged to come into our anti-Japanese base areas and start enterprises here if they so desire. Private enterprise should be encouraged and state enterprise regarded as only one sector of the economy".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'On Policy' (December 1940), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 2; Peking; 1965; p. 447).

"Some people suspect that the Chinese Communists are opposed to . . . the growth of private capital and the protection of private property, but they are mistaken. . . .

We have too little of capitalism. . . . It will be necessary in the interests of social progress to facilitate the development of the private capitalist sector of the economy".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'On Coalition Government' (April 1945), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 3; Peking; 1965; p. 281, 283).

Maoism accepts the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the stages of the revolutionary process in colonial-type countries and the Marxist-Leninist concept:

"The Chinese revolution must go through two stages, first the democratic revolution, and second, the socialist revolution".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'On New Democracy' (January 1940), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 2; Peking; 1965; p. 341).

It also accepts the Marxist-Leninist concept that the national bourgeoisie can play a revolutionary role in the first (national-democratic) stage of the revolutionary process:

"The national bourgeoisie . . . is oppressed by imperialism and fettered by feudalism, and consequently is in contradiction with both of them. In this respect it constitutes one of the revolutionary forces".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party' (December 1939), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 2; Peking; 1965; p. 320).

However, Maoism rejects the Marxist-Leninist concept that the strategy of the Party should be directed towards the formation, with the minimum of delay, of a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. According to Maoism, in colonial-type countries the strategy should be directed towards the formation, as a 'transitional' form of state, of a 'new-democratic state', a state of the dictatorship of several classes:

"In present-day China, the bourgeois-democratic revolution is . . . one of a new special type. We call this type the new-democratic revolution and it is developing in all other colonial and semi-colonial countries as well as in China. . . .

The new-democratic revolution . . . results . . . in a dictatorship of the united front of all the revolutionary classes".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party'

(December 1939), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 2; Peking; 1965; p. 326, 327).

"The new-democratic republic will be . . . different from the socialist republic of the Soviet type under the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . . For a certain historical period, this form is not suitable for the revolutions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

. . .
Republics under the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes . . . is the transitional form of state to be adopted in the revolutions of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. . . . It is . . . an alliance of several revolutionary classes".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'On New Democracy' (January 1940), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 2; Peking' 1965; p. 350-51).

The classes which form this 'new-democratic state' comprise all the classes in Chinese society which have an objective interest in opposing Japanese imperialism, including th national bourgeoisie:

"The new democratic republic . . . will consist of the proletariat, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie and all those in the country who agree with the national and democratic revolution; it will be the alliance of these classes in the national and democratic revolution. The salient feature here is the inclusion of the bourgeoisie".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'The Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan' (May 1937), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 1; Peking; 1964; p. 271-72).

But, as we have seen, Marxism-Leninism holds that, in order to build and maintain a socialist society, a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary:

"The revolution will be unable to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie, to maintain its victory and to push forward to the final victory of socialism unless . . . it creates a special organ in the form, of the dictatorship of the proletariat as its principal mainstay".

(Josef V. Stalin: 'The Foundations of Leninism' (April/May 1924), in: 'Works', Volume 6; Moscow; 1953; p. 112).

But any transition from 'new democracy' -- the joint dictatorship of several classes, including the national bourgeoisie -- to a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat must, according to Marxism-Leninism, involve class struggle against the resistance of the national bourgeoisie.

Maoism, however, rejects this Marxist-Leninist view, holding that the contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working classs can be resolved peacefully:

"The contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class is one between exploiter and exploited and is by nature antagonistic. But in the concrete conditions of China, this antagonistic contradiction between the two classes, if properly handled, can be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and be resolved by peaceful means".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People' (February 1957), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 5; Peking; 1977; p.

386).

The 'correct handling' which can resolve these contradictions by peaceful means is

" . . . the policy of uniting with, criticising and educating the national bourgeoisie"
(Mao Tse-tung: *ibid.*; p. 386).

which Mao defines as a policy of the

" . . . ideological remoulding"
(Mao Tse-tung: *ibid.*; p. 403).

of the national bourgeoisie.

This is the 'theory' of the Soviet revisionist Nikolay Bukharin of the capitalists growing peacefully into socialism:

"According to Bukharin's theory of the capitalists' peaceful growth into socialism, . . . the irreconcilable antagonism of class interests between the exploiters and the exploited disappears, the exploiters grow into socialism".

(Josef V. Stalin: 'The Right Deviation in the CPSU (B)' (April 1929), in: 'Works', Volume 12; Moscow; 1955; p. 32).

On which 'theory' Stalin commented:

"There have been no cases in history where dying classes have voluntarily departed from the scene. There have been no cases in history where the dying bourgeoisie has not exerted all its remaining strength to preserve its existence".

(Josef V. Stalin: *ibid.*; p. 40).

If, therefore, something called 'socialism' was introduced peacefully in China, not against the opposition of but in cooperation with the Chinese national bourgeoisie, it must, according to Marxism-Leninism, be a spurious and not a real socialism.

Indeed, by September 1953, five years after the proclamation of the People's Republic of China in October 1949, Mao was equating 'socialism' with 'state capitalism':

"The transformation of capitalism into socialism is to be accomplished through state capitalism".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'The Only Road for the Transformation of Capitalist Industry and Commerce' (September 1953), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 5; Peking; 1977; p. 112).

"State capitalism . . . is to be put into practice gradually so as to attain socialist ownership by the whole people".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'On the Draft Constitution of the People's Republic of China' (June 1954), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 5; Peking; 1977; p. 143).

This state capitalism was composed of joint state-private enterprises, that is, enterprises jointly operated by state and private capital:

"The advanced form of state capitalism in China is called a joint state-private enterprise. This is the principal way through which the transition of capitalist industry and commerce into socialist enterprises is being effected. . . .

A joint state-private enterprise is one in which the state invests and to which it assigns personnel to share in management with the capitalists. . . .

A fixed rate of interest was paid by the state for the total investment of the capitalists in the joint state-private enterprises. . . . The interest is fixed at a rate of 5% per annum".

(Kuan Ta-Tung: 'The Socialist Transformation of Capitalist Industry and Commerce in China'; Peking; 1960; p. 75, 84, 86-87).

So, under Maoist 'socialism', as Mao himself admits, the working class continue to be exploited:

"In joint state-private industrial and commercial enterprises, capitalists still get a fixed rate of interest on their capital, that is to say, exploitation still exists".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People' (February 1957), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 5; Peking; 1977; p. 394).

The Chinese national capitalists not only had no objection to Mao's 'socialism', in which the state invested in their enterprises and guaranteed their profits, they welcomed it:

"Why were there increasing numbers of capitalists who petitioned of their own free will to have their enterprises changed over to joint state-private operation? . . . The statistics of 64 factories in various parts of China which had gone over to joint operation earlier than others revealed that their profits were increasing. . . . Taking their profit in 1950 as 100, it was . . . 306 in 1953. . . .

The capitalists paraded with the beating of cymbals and drums, while sending in their petitions for the change-over of their enterprises".

(Kuan Ta-tung: *ibid.*; p. 78-79, 84).

By 1954 Mao was claiming that

". . . socialism already exists in our country today".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'On the Draft Constitution of the People's Republic of China' (June 1954), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 5; Peking; 1977; p. 143).

"Socialist relations of production have been established".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'The Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People' (February 1957), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 5; Peking; 1977; p.394).

VARIANTS OF MAOISM

Since Maoism is a type of revisionism designed to serve the interests of the national bourgeoisie of China, variants of Maoism have arisen to serve the interests of the national bourgeoisies of other similar colonial-type countries. Examples of such variants of Maoism are Leduanism (Vietnamese revisionism) and Kimilsungism (Korean revisionism).

Leduanism

Leduanism, or Vietnamese revisionism, is named after Le Duan, who was General/First Secretary of the Vietnamese Workers' Party (now the Vietnamese Communist Party) from 1960 until his death in 1986.

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam was founded in northern Vietnam in September 1948 on the basis of Leduanism, and in July 1976 North and South Vietnam were unified into the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Leduanism follows Maoism in departing from Marxism-Leninism to put forward the strategy of working for the formation of a state which is a joint dictatorship of several classes, including the national bourgeoisie:

"Our Party guided the workers and peasants to establish a national united front with the bourgeoisie".

(Le Duan: 'Leninism and Vietnam's Revolution', in: 'On the Socialist Revolution in Vietnam', Volume 1; Hanoi; 1965; p. 34).

Leduanism also follows Maoism in putting forward the programme of the peaceful transition to 'socialism' through state capitalism, by the formation, in cooperation with the national capitalists, of joint state-private enterprises. Participation in these, according to Leduanism, remoulds the national capitalists ideologically into workers:

"The national bourgeoisie . . . are willing to accept socialist transformation, therefore our Party's policy is peacefully to transform capitalist trade and industry, gradually to transform capitalist ownership into socialist ownership, through State capitalism, and to transform the bourgeois from exploiters into genuine workers through ideological education and participation in productive labour".

(Le Duan: *ibid.*, Volume 2; p. 39).

Kimilsungism

Kimilsungism, or Korean revisionism, is named after Kim Il Sung, who has been General Secretary of the Korean Workers' Party since 1966. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea was founded in North Korea in September 1945 on the basis of Kimilsungism.

The DPRK is a state based on a joint dictatorship of several classes, including the national bourgeoisie:

"A Democratic People's Republic . . . must be built by forming a democratic united front . . . which embraces even the national capitalists".

(Kim Il Sung: 'On the Building of New Korea and the National United Front' (October 1948), in: 'Works', Volume 1; Pyongyang; 1980; p. 298).

"The individual entrepreneurs, traders and people of other social sections participate in government . . . and form a component part of the united front".

(Kim Il Sung: 'On the Immediate Tasks of the People's Power in Socialist Construction' (September 1957), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 2; Pyongyang; 1975; p. 37).

Kimilsungism rejects the Marxist-Leninist concept that the dictatorship

of the working class is essential to construct and maintain socialism:

"The establishment of the power of the proletarian dictatorship by force was followed as a last resort in some countries. . . . In the northern half (of Korea -- Ed.) . . . this was not necessary".
(Baik Bong: 'Kim Il Sung: Biography', Volume 2; Beirut; 1973; p. 176).

According to Kimilsungism, the joint dictatorship with the capitalist class can carry through not only the national-democratic revolution but also the socialist revolution:

"The entrepreneurs and traders of our country are fellow-travellers . . . not only in the carrying out of the democratic revolution but also in socialist construction".
(Kim Il Sung: 'On the Immediate Tasks of the People's Power in Socialist Construction' (September 1957), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 2; Pyongyang; 1975; p. 37).

"Uniting with the national capitalists in the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal democratic revolution made them . . . proceed to the socialist revolution".
('Socialist Transformation of Private Trade and Industry in Korea'; Pyongyang; 1977; p. 20).

Therefore, the contradiction between the national capitalist class and the working class can be resolved peacefully:

"Class struggle attendant on the socialist transformation of capitalist trade and industry was resolved mainly by means of persuasion and education, not by violence".
('Socialist Transformation . . . ' ; op. cit.; p. 26).

Kimilsungism rejects the Maoist strategy of forming state-capitalist (joint state-private) enterprises, in favour of the forming 'cooperatives' in conjunction with the national capitalists:

"Comrade Kim Il Sung held that . . . it was wholly unnecessary for the peaceful transformation of capitalist trade and industry to assume the form of state capitalism".
(Baik Bong: op. cit., Volume 2; p. 520).

"Our country was the first to transform capitalist traders and manufacturers along socialist lines by using the cooperative economy. This is an original experience".
('Socialist Transformation . . . ' , op. cit.; p. 28).

According to Kimilsungism, the mere act of joining a cooperative transforms a national capitalist into a 'socialist worker':

"By joining the producers' cooperatives, the entrepreneurs and traders . . . were transformed into socialist working people".
(Kim Il Sung: 'The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is the Banner of Freedom and Independence for Our People and a Powerful Weapon for Building Socialism and Communism' (September 1968), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 5; Pyongyang; 1975; p. 151).

The process of cooperativisation was carried out gradually:

"The fundamental requirement of the policy of transforming the capitalist traders and manufacturers on socialist lines . . . is to reorganise the capitalist economy gradually".
('Socialist Transformation . . . ' ; op. cit.; p. 23).

Of the forms of cooperative introduced into Korea, the second and third forms were open to national capitalists. The second form was one in which the income of members was related to the amount invested by them. It was

" . . . semi-socialist form in which . . . both socialist distribution according to work done and distribution according to the amount of investment were applied".
(Kim Han Gil: 'Modern History of Korea'; Pyongyang; 1979; p. 387).

The third form was defined as a 'fully socialist' form in which the income of members was related only to work performed (a definition which included managerial skill and responsibility) but not to the amount invested by them:

"The third form was a completely socialist form in which . . . only socialist distribution applied".
(Kim Han Gil: *ibid.*; p. 387).

National capitalists joining a cooperative could choose freely which form of distribution to adopt. They naturally exercised this choice in accordance with their interests:

"In transforming capitalist traders and manufacturers on socialist lines, our Party applied the voluntary principle to them. . . .

The important demand of the voluntary principle is . . . to strictly guard against coercive methods in cooperativisation and conduct this movement according to the free will of private traders and manufacturers.

The essential requirement of the voluntary principle is to make private traders and manufacturers . . . choose the forms of their own accord".
('Socialist Transformation . . . ' ; op. cit.; p. 31, 72).

"The voluntary principle and the principle of mutual interests were observed in the cooperative transformation of capitalist traders and industrialists".
(Baik Bong: op. cit., Volume 2; p. 520).

Thus, in accordance with their interests, they tended to choose the second form of cooperation, since those who did so received

" . . . reasonable dividends upon the investments".
('Socialist Transformation . . . ' ; op. cit.; p. 143).

"The second form was popular in the cooperation of capitalist trade and industry. It was a rational form which was readily acceptable to capitalists because it applied distribution according to the amount of investment".
(Kim Han Gil: op. cit.; p. 387).

"Entrepreneurs were gradually incorporated into the cooperative economy; here, in particular, the semi-socialist form of cooperative

economy was broadly applied".

(Kim Il Sung: Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the 4th Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea (September 1961), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 3; Pyongyang; 1976; p. 69).

National capitalists who chose the second form of cooperation were encouraged to pass to the higher, third form (in which the income of members was not related to investment):

"In accordance with the level of consciousness of the members and the economic condition of the cooperative, this (the second form of cooperation -- Ed.) was gradually developed into a higher form, that is, into a completely socialist economic form in which . . . they received dividends entirely according to their work".

(Baik Bong: op. cit., Volume 2; p. 521).

National capitalists were encouraged to choose to opt for this transition not only by the taking of managerial skill and responsibility into account in determining dividends 'according to work' -- as in the revisionist Soviet Union in the period which followed the 'economic reforms' of the 1960s -- but by the payment of additional compensation to those who opted for the transition:

"In such cases (of national capitalists opting for transition to the third form of cooperation -- Ed.) he (Kim Il Sung -- Ed.) saw to it that each cooperative member was paid due compensation for his contribution made to the means of production and resources".

(Baik Bong: op. cit., Volume 2; p. 521).

By August 1955 all former North Korean national capitalists had joined cooperatives:

"The ratio of private traders and industrialists who joined the cooperatives stood at . . . 100% by the end of August 1958".

('Socialist Transformation . . .'; op. cit.; p. 153).

so that Kim Il Sung could declare in September 1958:

"The socialist transformation of production relations has now been completed. . . . Thus, our society has become a socialist one free from exploitation".

(Kim Il Sung: 'Against Passivism and Conservatism in Socialist Construction' (September 1958), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 2; Pyongyang; 1975; p. 233).

By this time, according to Kimilsungism,

" . . . the private traders and manufacturers were reshaped into socialist working people".

(Kim Han Gil: op. cit.; p. 387).

Official Kimilsungist literature sometimes implies that by 1956 all the cooperatives which included national capitalists had passed to the third form, in which no dividends on investments were paid:

"Until 1956 there were two forms of producers' cooperatives.

The two forms of producers' cooperatives were represented by one lower

form, where a co-op member got his share according to the amount of investment and the other higher form, where the dividend was not paid according to the amount of investment".

('Socialist Transformation . . .'; op. cit.; p. 60).

but in fact a considerable proportion of such cooperatives continued to operate on the basis of the second form after 1956:

"In the first half of 1959 the cooperatives . . . of the second form held 38%".

('Socialist Transformation . . .'; op. cit.; p. 153).

Summary

It is clear that Maoism and its variants represent deviations from Marxism-Leninism, brands of revisionism which serve the interests of the capitalist classes of colonial-type countries.

It is, therefore, not surprising that, as the American diplomat Averell Harriman relates, Stalin should have denounced Maoism as revisionism:

"Stalin did not have much respect for Mao Tse-tung. During the war he spoke about him several times, and at one time he called him a 'margarine Communist'. That created a great deal of puzzlement in Washington. Some didn't know what he meant. It would be entirely clear to any dairy farmer what he meant -- a fake, not a real product".

(W. Averell Harriman: 'America and Russia in a Changing World: A Half Century of Personal Observation'; London; 1971; p. 54).

Mao himself confirms that Stalin considered him to be a revisionist:

"When we won the war, Stalin suspected that ours was a victory of the Tito type".

(Mao Tse-tung: 'On the Ten Major Relationships' (April 1956), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 5; Peking; 1977; p. 304).

But, as Engels was fond of saying, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. What is the situation of China, Vietnam and North Korea today?

Few national bourgeoisies of former colonial-type countries which won political power and independence in national-democratic revolutions have remained able to retain that independence against imperialist pressure -- pressure which is most obvious in such cases as Cuba, Libya, Iraq, and North Korea.

The most noticeable contradictions within the leaderships of these countries in recent years have been not between Marxist-Leninists and revisionists, but between 'conservative' revisionists who sought to retain the pseudo-socialist facade of state capitalism, and 'reformist' revisionists who sought to replace this by free enterprise capitalism. The pressure of international imperialism has, of course, been exerted in favour the latter and the abandonment of the 'socialist' facade.

For example, in China:

"When it comes to making money, anything goes in Teng Hsiao-Ping's new 'socialist market'. Its economy is more deregulated than Britain's was

in 1973. But Teng's China . . . is increasingly a country without faith or ideals. The only slogan is money, money, money, and people will go to almost any lengths to get rich. . . .

The gulf between rich and poor is widening and the income gap may soon be the biggest in the world. The government boasts that China is now a paradise for more than a million millionaires. The official 'China Digest' reported that the nouveaux riches were swamping newly opened golf clubs with applications for membership that cost at least \$30,000. . . .

'It is not really capitalism, it is gangsterism', complained an elderly Chinese who grew up under Mao. . . .

At the universities, . . . ideology has long since stopped being a fundamental motivation. Professors who taught Marxism-Leninism are now out of work, looking for jobs in the private sector, their departments closed down.

Some are so poor that they have to work in street stalls. . . .

The vast sprawling cities of Shanghai, Peking and Canton are changing by the day, almost by the minute. Foreigners have committed billions of dollars to Shanghai. . . .

Luxury joint-venture skyscraper hotels are rising out of Shanghai's slums. . . . Shanghai's nights have sprung to life in a blaze of neon.

. . .

Although most remain too poor for the perfumes and designer clothes on sale, yuppification has even brought back the fashion for pet dogs. One pekinese sold for more than \$13,000. . . .

Nothing symbolises the new capitalist face of the country better than the emergence of stock exchanges in Shanghai and Shenzhen. . . .

When Teng dies, his motherland will no longer be communist except in name. His legacy is a free economy".

('Sunday Times', 6 June 1993, Section 2; p. 1, 2).

And in Vietnam:

"During 1990 and early 1991 the Vietnamese leadership continued to try to implement the plan initiated by Nguyen Van Linh in 1986 to transform the country's centralised economy to a market-orientated system".

('Keesing's Record of World Events', Volumer 37; p. 38,638).

"The Vietnamese party . . . hopes to achieve. . . a planned switch to a market-driven economy. . . .

The peasants now lease their land and are free to buy inputs and sell produce at market prices. . . .

The second aspect of doi moi ('renovation' -- Ed.) consists of dismantling price controls . . . and eliminating subsidies for state industries. These are model steps to a market economy, applauded by the International Monetary Fund. . . .

Closures and job cuts are occurring, even though unemployment is already high. . . .

The third element of doi moi is the promotion of foreign investment through a law which compares with those of South-East Asia. . . .

In Ho Chi Minh city billboards praising communism are today dwarfed by those extolling the power of capitalism; for every mention of Marx or Lenin or even Ho Chi Minh, there are a score of advertisements for foreign companies. On top of a city centre office building, the name of Sony, the Japanese electronics company, jostles for space with Philips, the Dutch group. Nearby there are Citizen, the Japanese watch maker, Microsoft, the US software house, and Castrol, the British lubricant manufacturer. . . .

The biggest investors are the international oil groups. . . .

Vietnam has important attractions for foreign companies -- cheap and well-disciplined labour; an abundance of food for export, including rice and fish; mineral resources; and a potential mass-market of 65 million people. . . .

The government is pursuing free-market economic reforms, which envisage an important place for foreign investment. . . .

Since 1968 . . . foreign corporations are permitted to invest up to 100% in almost any field, have rights to repatriate profits and enjoy a host of tax-breaks and other incentives".

('Financial Times', 14 November 1991; p. 15, 17).

"In 1986 a new law on foreign investment was . . . passed.

This law is described by the specialist international press as 'one of the most liberal', even compared with other similar laws of countries with market economies".

(Overseas Trade Services: 'Country Profile: Vietnam'; February, 1992; p. 54).

"There has certainly been a resurgence of such social ills as prostitution and drug-taking".

(Economic Intelligence Unit: 'Country Report: Indochina', No. 1, 1993; p. 11).

"For one dollar, . . . Hyunh sells her body to tourists. Dressed in cotton trousers and a T-shirt, she looks no more than 12 as she sits under a hand-written sign outside a makeshift brothel. . . .

Rows of girls in deck-chairs, playing cards or reading comics, have set up identical booths along the promenade".

('Sunday Times', 21 June 1992; p. 22).

In North Korea:

The Constitution was amended in April 1992,

" . . . to remove mention of Marxism-Leninism and to replace it with references to Kim Il Sung's Juche ideology; . . . it also strengthened the hereditary principle by exalting the positions currently held by Kim Jong Il (Kim Il Sung's son -- Ed.). The new constitution also encouraged foreign investment and guaranteed the rights and profits of foreigners operating in North Korea".

('Keesing's Record of World Events', Volume 39; p. R73).

"On Oct. 5 (1992 -- Ed.) the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's Assembly approved North Korea's first law on foreign investment.

. . .

The new law permitted foreign investors to establish equity and contractual joint ventures within the country, and to set up and operate wholly foreign-owned enterprises in special economic zones. Foreign companies would be able to remit part of their profits abroad".

('Keesing's Record of World Events', Volume 38; p. 39,141-42).

It must be clear to any objective observer that those who believe that present-day China, Vietnam and North Korea are socialist countries led by Marxist-Leninist Parties are deceiving themselves.

CONCLUSION

Ninety-three years ago, in September 1900, Lenin wrote an article on the political situation in his country. He was writing about the situation in Russia at the beginning of the century, but what he says is only too applicable to the situation in Western Europe at the end of the century. (It must be remembered that Lenin uses the term 'social-democracy' to mean 'Marxism'):

"The principal feature of our movement . . . is its state of disunity and its primitive character. Local circles spring up and function independently of one another".
(Vladimir I. Lenin: Declaration by the Editorial Board of 'Iskra' (September 1900), in: 'Selected Works', Volume 2; London; 1944; p. 3-4),

All those who regard themselves as Marxist-Leninists will, no doubt, support Lenin's call for the formation of a Marxist-Leninist Party in each country. In Lenin's words:

"We Russian Social-Democrats must combine and direct all our efforts towards the formation of a strong party that will fight under the united banner of revolutionary Social-Democracy".
(Vladimir I. Lenin: *ibid.*, Volume 2; p. 5).

Unfortunately, however, some who claim to be Marxist-Leninists call for the creation of such parties by the unification of all who call themselves Marxist-Leninists, ignoring the fact that some of these embrace in fact one or other form of revisionism. Whatever short-lived monstrosities might emerge from such unifications, they would be nothing remotely resembling the Marxist-Leninist Parties which are so urgently needed. Whether those who are working for such unifications are conscious of it or not, such processes could only serve as temporary diversions from the historic task of building genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties free of all trends of revisionism. We must never forget that the socialist world and the international communist movement were destroyed -- however temporarily -- not by open counter-revolution, but by revisionism, by the lies of treacherous leaders who falsely posed as Marxist-Leninists.

Lenin's position was quite different, and I conclude by quoting from the same germinal article of 1900:

"To establish and consolidate the Party means establishing unity among all Russian Social-Democrats and . . . such unity cannot be brought about by . . . a meeting of representatives passing a resolution. Definite work must be done to bring it about. In the first place, it is necessary to bring about unity of ideas which will remove the differences of opinion and confusion that -- we will be frank -- reign among Russian Social-Democrats at the present time. . . .

Before we can unite, and in order that we may unite, we must first of all firmly and definitely draw the lines of demarcation. Otherwise, our unity will be merely a fictitious unity, which will conceal the prevailing confusion and prevent its complete elimination".
(Vladimir I. Lenin: *ibid.*, Volume 2; p. 6).