

50¢

**THE
MOYNIHAN-
KISSINGER
DOCTRINE
AND
THE
"THIRD
WORLD"**

Henry Winston

OTHER RECENT PAMPHLETS

STRATEGY FOR A PEOPLE'S ALTERNATIVE

A Critique of New Theories on the Working Class, Liberation Movements and Social Strata

Henry Winston

A critique of the "Open Letter" issued by the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People. Criticizes its confusion between immediate goals and the transition to socialism, its rejection of working class leadership based on Roger Garaudy's revisionism, its classless approach to Black liberation, its anti-Marxist confusion on state power and electoral policy, its anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, its rejection of international anti-imperialist solidarity and its neglect of the struggle for peaceful coexistence.

48 pages—80¢

IN THE HANDS OF CHILE'S HANGMEN

The Prison Experiences of Rodrigo Rojas, with Foreword by Volodia Teitelboim

A narrative, by the Editor of the Chilean Communist Party's newspaper, of 4 months of imprisonment and torture by the fascists, the inspiration and support of comrades and friends, the importance of unity and international support, the role of the USSR, how anti-fascist pressure finally won his release and enabled him to go abroad to continue the struggle.

64 pages—50¢

WORKING CLASS UNITY

The Role of Communists in the Chicago Federation of Labor, 1919-1923

Phil Bart

Formative period of the Communist Party, ideological struggles, birth of the Party in Chicago, the labor movement in Chicago; activity and leadership of Communists in militant strikes, in organizing the unorganized, in rank-and-file struggles for unity of all workers and against class collaborationism and racism; effects of the Russian Revolution, ruling-class repression, united-front relations between Communists and progressive union leaders in Chicago in the years following World War I.

32 pages—40¢

At bookstores or order from

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

205 West 19 Street • 9th Floor • New York, N. Y. 10011

Orders must be prepaid (no stamps). Add 20¢ postage on orders under \$2.00. New York purchasers include sales tax.

WRITE FOR COMPLETE CATALOG

POLITICAL AFFAIRS REPRINTS

SENATE BILL 1. A Legislative Chamber of Horrors

John Abt

Analysis of the "criminal law reform" legislation now pending: shows how it is in reality a bill for massive political repression.

12 pages—15¢

THE HERITAGE OF SEN KATAYAMA

Karl G. Yoneda

A short biography of the Japanese-American Marxist-Leninist leader and labor organizer and participant in the founding of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

24 pages—25¢

At bookstores or order from

POLITICAL AFFAIRS REPRINTS

23 West 26 Street • New York, N.Y. 10010
or from New Outlook Publishers

17970
12

THE MOYNIHAN-KISSINGER DOCTRINE AND THE "THIRD WORLD"

HENRY WINSTON



NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

1975

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

HENRY WINSTON, National Chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A. since 1966, was born in Mississippi in 1911. His grandfather was a slave. At the age of 19 he joined the Young Communist League and entered the struggles of the unemployed in New York City. In the 1930s he was a leader of the YCL. He participated in the National Hunger March to Washington in 1932, aided the defense of the Scottsboro Boys, and took part in other major struggles. During World War II he served in the Army engineers and received an honorable discharge. Over the years he has held a variety of leading posts in the Communist Party. In 1956 he began an 8-year prison sentence under a Smith Act frameup. While in prison he became blind as a result of deliberate neglect of his health by the prison authorities. World-wide protests brought about his release in 1961. During the attempted frameup of Angela Davis he gave special attention to organizing the movement which led to her acquittal. Henry Winston is the author of numerous books, articles and pamphlets. His *Strategy for a Black Agenda: A Critique of New Theories of Liberation in the United States and Africa*, was published in 1973 by International Publishers. He also authored *Strategy for a People's Alternative: A Critique of New Theories on the Working Class, Liberation Movements and Social Strata*, published earlier this year by New Outlook Publishers.

Cover design by Stefanie Perez

ISBN 0-87898-116-0



Published by

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

205 West 19 Street • 9th Floor • New York, NY 10011

October 1975



PRINTED
IN
U.S.A.

PART I:

**THE MOYNIHAN-KISSINGER DOCTRINE
AND THE "THIRD WORLD"**

If one searches out the particular significance of the Ford-Rockefeller-Kissinger appointment of Daniel P. Moynihan—the favorite sociologist of three previous presidents (one Republican, two Democrats)—as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, one must conclude that it lies in the following: The Administration is not only stepping up the application of the racist, ruling class philosophy of the domestic Moynihan Report internally but internationally as well.

Moynihan was selected to intensify the attack on what U.S. imperialism calls the "tyranny" in the U.N. of the "new majority"—the "third world" countries and the socialist camp—at the same time that Secretary of Defense Schlesinger is reactivating the Pentagon's nuclear first-strike policy against the Soviet Union. These steps demonstrate that the enemies of detente and peaceful coexistence conceive of this genocidal nuclear doctrine and the Moynihan doctrine as integral aspects of one policy.

The revival of Moynihanism and the nuclear first-strike strategy reveals that the struggle to make detente and peaceful coexistence irreversible has merged at a new level with the struggle to make decolonization and social progress irreversible.

During the '60s, the Moynihan Report came up with an "analysis" of the condition of Black people in the U.S. that placed the blame for their intensifying problems not on the oppressor but the victims. The reasons for inequality in jobs, housing, education, etc., were—according to this report—not to be found in the class and racist structure of U.S. state monopoly capitalism but within the Black community. Now, casting according to type,

the Administration has selected Moynihan to project an international counterpart of the racist concepts in his report: i.e., to blame the widening economic gap between many of the underdeveloped and less-developed nations and the imperialist nations not on U.S. and world imperialism but on its victims.

In 1964, on the eve of U.S. imperialism's escalation of its "pacification" program in Vietnam, Lyndon B. Johnson appointed Moynihan, then Assistant Secretary of Labor, as head of a committee to develop a program for "pacification" of the Black masses, who refused to interpret the legal gains of the civil rights struggles as an end, but rather as a new starting point in their long fight for the *substance* of equality.

This committee produced "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action," which came to be known as the Moynihan Report. As its tactic, this report conceded that the lot of Black Americans had consisted of slavery followed by discrimination. But this belated official recognition of a 300-year history of oppression was accorded not to point up the government's obligation for a national program to wipe out inequality—but instead to project new, more subtle racist rationalizations for the government's persistent refusal to take affirmative action.

The report achieved its goal by obscuring the fundamental fact that the extension of Black inequality from the past into the present is directly connected with capitalism, with the racist policies of monopoly and its two-party domination of the electoral process. Instead, the report contended that the source of inequality lies in the Black "family structure."

By its racist interpretation of the Black condition (including the manipulation of statistics), the report was invaluable to the monopolists in their aim of reversing the gains of the civil rights struggles rather than carrying out economic and social measures against racism and inequality.

Having absolved monopoly of responsibility for Black inequality, the report sought to divert the growing demand for national action against racism and poverty by a call for "action" that would be turned against the Black community:

A national effort towards the problems of Negro America must be directed toward the question of the family structure.

In developing its racist theme that the solution of the Black condition lies not in an anti-monopoly struggle but within the Black "family structure," the Moynihan Report stated:

At the heart of the deterioration of the fabric of Negro society is the deterioration of the Negro family. It is the fundamental source of the weakness of the Negro community at the present time. Three centuries of injustice have brought about deep-seated structural distortions in the life of the Negro American. . . . The cycle can be broken only if these distortions are set right. In a word, a national effort toward the problems of Negro Americans must be directed toward the question of the family structure.

By picturing the Black condition of inequality as arising within the Black "family structure," this report identified the *results* of oppression as the *cause* of oppression. Thus, it runs head on into the fact that Black family life—despite the "distortions" caused by 200 years on the auction blocks of Northern slave traders and Southern slave owners, followed by more than 100 years of racist economic, social and political pressures of genocidal proportions—has shown a matchless capacity for survival through struggle!

Among its numerous contributions to racism, the Moynihan Report labeled the Black community a "tangle of pathologies." (This is a phrase Moynihan took over from the writings of Dr. Kenneth Clark. Clark used it in an anti-racist sense, but because the phrase has no scientific *class* content Moynihan was able to twist Clark's intent into its opposite.)

Now, courtesy of Moynihan, we have yet another racist stereotype at large in the land, aimed at covering up the fact that the "tangle" of institutionalized racism generated by monopoly is the source of inequality.

A Coordinated Reappearance

It is hardly coincidental that before Moynihan was named U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., a widespread and apparently coordinated campaign to reactivate his racist sociology was underway. The meaning of this move can be fully appreciated only if one remembers that when the Moynihan Report originally appeared it received immediate condemnation from the Black liberation movements and its allies. As a result, its presence was camouflaged, at

least in "respectable" circles, for almost a decade.

Now the report's philosophy appears more and more openly in the mass media and in the writings of the journalistic, academic and political supporters of monopoly in both its parties—including their "liberal" circles. This phenomenon undoubtedly bolsters those currents in the Democratic and Republican parties competing for the favors and even the presidential candidacy of George Wallace.

In this connection, *Fortune* magazine in its "Special Bicentennial Issue" (April, 1975), carried several articles by both "liberal" and conservative writers reflecting the Moynihan thesis. This was especially evident in the way these articles interpreted the facts and figures showing the widening gap between white and Black income over the past decade.

Among the articles dealing with the present status of Black people, the one by Juan Cameron—"Black America: Still Waiting for Full Membership"—emerges as an example of the "liberal" revival of the Moynihan doctrine. (Even its title reflects one facet of the "tangle" of lies monopoly propagates about Black people: Black Americans are not "waiting" for anything; they are fighting for everything they are entitled to!)

In large type on the opening page the following editorial comment appears:

(The) . . . achievements (of Black Americans) are still clouded, however, by widespread discrimination—and the seemingly *unsolvable* plight of the poor. (Emphasis added—H.W.)

For the brief period of '65 to '69, "black income was drawing somewhat closer to average white income," states Cameron—ignoring the fact that even this temporary advance was brought about only by the strength of the civil rights struggles.

On one hand Cameron makes it appear that this short-lived narrowing of the gap between Black and white income applied to Black people as a whole instead of only a small minority. However, he points out that even from '65 to '69 the "gap was widening *within* the black community." (Emphasis in the original.)

He puts the blame for this on the Black masses, describing

the income gap as "between the able and less able"—covering up the fact that monopoly responded to massive pressure from Black people as a whole with limited advancement for only a tiny percentage. With this coverup, Cameron buttresses his thesis of the seemingly "unsolvable plight of the poor" in still another way.

In true "liberal" fashion, Cameron appears to make a relatively frank admission about the condition of Black people only to go on to another "tangle" of lies. For instance, he concedes that "Blacks were hit harder than whites by the 1970 recession." He then adds, "Whites haven't done very well either, thanks to recession and roaring inflation."

But far from admitting that Blacks have been hit even harder by "roaring inflation" than whites, Cameron asserts they have found a way to beat it:

According to one recent study, blacks living on welfare can afford more than twice as much in the way of goods and services as welfare families could in 1947.

According to Cameron, neither massive unemployment, "roaring inflation," nor the omnipresent barriers of racism are the cause of the income gap. Echoing Moynihan, he claims, "One continuing drag on black income, and perhaps the most important, is family instability."

Cameron then proceeds to help monopoly put even more bolts on the door leading to the allegedly "free" and "open" society. He suggests no programs to counter the current depression-scale unemployment (in fact, this is a subject he doesn't even mention). Instead he encourages monopoly in its drive to cut back on welfare—as a stimulus to Blacks to go out and get jobs! He states:

It would not seem beyond the political imagination to draw up a welfare program that encouraged work and stable families. . .

Cameron goes on to speak of "white attitudes"—but hides the fact that these "attitudes" are fostered by the racist monopolists' control of government, institutions and media. Further, he tries to make these "attitudes" appear acceptable instead of racist by stating, "To whites it seems only rational to be wary of school integration in a city like New York. . ."

While he seems to concede a possible need for change in these

"attitudes," he consigns the task of bringing this about to "time":
"White attitudes will no doubt continue to change over time. . ."

But "time" can be used to advance either the interests of the masses or the monopolists and Cameron, in true Moynihan style, attempts to place it in the service of the latter—by putting the responsibility for overcoming racist "attitudes" on its victims:

. . . *the crux of the problem lies somewhere in the ghetto . . .*
somewhere in . . . the tangle of pathologies there. (Emphasis added—H.W.)

This racist concept is aimed not only at the doubly and triply oppressed Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Asian and Native American Indian peoples. That its real purpose is to divide the oppressed and exploited of *all* colors, to divert them from a united struggle for an alternative to their plight, is confirmed when Cameron states:

Unfortunately, nobody knows how to work any dramatic improvement in such an underclass, *whatever the racial makeup*. (Emphasis added—H.W.)

In this article Cameron is writing directly for the ruling class, at whose center are the top 500 national and trans-national corporations for which *Fortune* magazine serves as a virtual house organ. This is why he can openly acknowledge that for monopolists the masses of workers—"whatever the racial makeup"—are an "underclass."

This admission exposes the indivisibility of capitalism and racism. It reveals that racist and class oppression are interconnected features of monopoly rule, and that racist doctrine and practices are inherent in capitalism's drive for profits and super-profits.

Racism and anti-communism, monopoly's twin weapons, have a special function in the present era of the general crisis of capitalism and the rise of the world system of socialism—when the world revolutionary process, composed of the socialist camp, the working classes of the capitalist countries and the national liberation movements, is on the ascendancy. Its aim is to divide the working class—"the underclass, whatever its racial makeup"—and to separate the international working class and the liberation movements from their allies and most advanced contingents: the working

classes in power in the socialist countries, from Moscow to Berlin, from Hanoi to Havana.

Daniel Bell, Gerald Ford and Moynihanism

Another article in this issue of *Fortune* is "The Revolution of Rising Entitlements," by Daniel Bell, whose previous writings hailed the presumed advent of a "post-industrial society" in which a managerial and technocratic elite would displace both corporate monopoly and the working class.

Now Bell has found yet another way to assist the monopolists in their impossible task of preventing the working class from displacing them: he joins those who are adapting the Moynihan doctrine to the current crisis of U.S. and world imperialism.

Bell warns *Fortune's* corporate readers that,

. . . the promise of equality has been transformed into a revolution of rising "entitlements"—claims on government to implement an array of newly defined and vastly expanded social rights.

He then goes on to state that,

. . . demands, furthermore, are now defined as rights.

Clearly, the demand for equality now goes far beyond equal opportunity, or protection against unfair hazards. Too many Americans who got that protection still came out losers. What is now being demanded is equality of results—an equal *outcome* for all. (Emphasis in the original.)

To argue directly against enforcement of equal opportunity measures would expose Bell's racist aims too blatantly. So he disguises his objectives in the pseudo-radical concept of utopian equalitarianism—equality of "result" for *individuals*.

Science has, of course, long since proven that all races are equal. But because individuals of whatever racial or national group have varying capacities, "equality of result" on an individual basis is an obvious impossibility. When Bell substitutes *individual* "equality of result" for that of an entire group, he is injecting a false issue to perpetuate a system with built-in *inequality* for Blacks and all oppressed minorities.

A comparison between this view and the Moynihan Report exposes their racist identity. The Moynihan Report is simply more

blatant in stating the same concept:

The members of one group almost invariably end up well to the fore, and another far to the rear.

Thus Moynihan and Bell concur in the racist view that inequality is inherent in Black people. (Bell has the insolence to speak of "protection against unfair hazards." As he well knows, Black people have never gotten a single shred of "protection" from monopoly against the "unfair hazards" of racism!)

That President Ford's staff of writers and advisers is well steeped in the Moynihan-Bell doctrine is confirmed in the introduction to *Fortune's* "Special Bicentennial Issue," when managing editor Robert Lubar writes,

Daniel Bell sees the possibility of a political crisis developing as government is more and more drawn into the role of satisfying, not just public needs, but multitudinous private "wants" as well. A similar concern is very much on the mind of President Gerald Ford.

To illustrate this point, he cites the following statement from an interview in the same issue with the President:

... by the year 2000, 50 percent of the people will be living off the other 50 percent.

In this remark, Ford asserts that, on one hand, monopoly will have no jobs for 50 percent of the people while, on the other, it aims at drastically cutting back on social services.

Imposing this perspective on the people would obviously require reactionary measures. And since monopoly will try to maintain its power by any means necessary, this could include steps in a pro-fascist direction. But every day brings fresh evidence that the masses will not submit to this!

Speaking of desegregation in the same interview, Ford said:

Raising expectation is a serious matter. When you set a timetable or a goal you do raise expectations.

The monopolists, in other words, have no "timetable" for ending segregation. Their "timetable" calls for maintaining it forever!

In another interview—"marking the approach of his first anniversary as the nation's only appointed President," as *The New York Times'* James M. Naughton put it—Ford himself demon-

strated how the circle closes from the "liberal" Bell to the ultra-right:

QUESTION: . . . What is your personal view about (George Wallace's) campaign philosophy, approach, and is there a dime's worth of difference between you and him?

THE PRESIDENT: I think we have a good many similarities. (*The New York Times*, July 25, 1975.)

Daniel Bell and "Rising Entitlements"

Although Moynihan himself does not deal directly with the question of "rising entitlements" as it applies to white as well as non-white masses, Daniel Bell does—and in so doing extends racist, anti-working class Moynihanism into yet another area.

Basing himself on the premise that the people's demands cannot be met, Bell assists the ruling class in its aim of containing "the revolution of rising entitlements." Ignoring the massive need for jobs, the relationship between inflation and corporate profits and the gigantic military expenditures, he claims that "every imaginable anti-inflationary policy impinges on the welfare of some major interest group." In reality, of course, an "anti-inflationary policy" would "impinge" on the "welfare" of only one "major interest group"—the tiny minority of monopolists.

Social programs also "impinge" on the "welfare" of the monopolists—and Bell assists the ruling class in developing a rationale for cutting back on them. Stating that social programs can be financed only through higher taxes or economic growth, he asserts,

. . . paradoxically, economic growth may be the source of a distinctive "contradiction" of capitalism—a contradiction that may prove to be its undoing. For growth has become inextricably linked with inflation, and it seems unlikely that any democratic society can abolish inflation without disastrous political consequences.

Obviously, Daniel Bell equates "democracy" with continuing monopoly domination of the nation's social, economic and political life.

Bell speaks ominously of the "dilemma associated with economic growth and inflation." Should an attempt be made to break out

of the allegedly insoluble "contradiction" between economic growth and more inflation, or the further slowing of economic growth and the escalation of unemployment, Bell foresees only "danger."

Bell has indeed presented the "dilemma" confronting the ruling class. But a different "dilemma" confronts the people: the "dilemma" created by monopoly's control of both the economy and government.

A massive independent people's alternative to the two parties of the ruling class would most certainly result in "undoing" monopoly's stranglehold. Bell reveals monopoly's fear of such a formation when he warns that "one third of the electorate now designates itself as 'independent.'"

Far from bringing the "disastrous political consequences" Bell predicts, an anti-monopoly alternative is the only way to block still greater onslaughts against the people's rights and living standards. Bell inadvertently confirms this when he states:

. . . it has become increasingly clear in recent years that the revolution of rising entitlement may become unmanageable. . . If this process is not reversed, it will work to undermine the legitimacy of our society.

When Bell asserts that this "process" must be "reversed," he is pointing in the direction of pro-fascist measures. Only through mass struggle for an independent alternative can the people prevent this drastic "reversal" of their rights. Without such a struggle to "undermine" the "legitimacy" of monopoly's control of government, it is impossible to combat unemployment, inflation, poverty and racism.

Contrary to Bell, "economic growth" is crucial to meet the vast needs of the people. *Only the monopolies profit from production that diverts from instead of helps to meet the people's expanding needs.*

When the Bells and Moynihans distort this issue—which is at the heart of the crisis facing the people—their aim is "undoing" the people's struggle against the intensifying disaster synonymous with monopoly rule.

The source of escalating inflation, taxes, unemployment, poverty and racist oppression is the class and profit aims of U.S. im-

perialism, based on exploitation and national oppression, domestically and internationally. Inherent in capitalism, these factors are aggravated by monopoly control and militarization of the economy.

The advance of socialism and working class and national liberation struggles culminated in U.S. imperialism's defeat in Indochina and the end of the 500 year-old Portuguese empire in Africa. But the Moynihan doctrine reflects U.S. imperialism's resistance to accepting detente and the independence struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America as irreversible.

The U.S. imperialists began to impose the disastrous burden of non-economic growth on the people with the cold war. They escalated it with their intervention in Korea, Indochina and Latin America, with their support of Israeli aggression in the Mideast, and with NATO armaments directed against socialism and the liberation movements. Now Moynihanism aims at expanding non-economic growth as a dominant feature of U.S. monopoly capitalism.

The cost of diverting the major part of the U.S. economy to non-economic production has already been incalculable in terms of lives and the living standards of the peoples of the world and the U.S. Now the Moynihan doctrine would impose on the U.S. the permanent disaster of an economy geared to expanding armaments and to subsidizing economic and political intervention against the world socialist and liberation struggles.

Bell claims that inequality, inflation and unemployment are "inextricably linked" with democracy. On the contrary, they are "inextricably linked" with monopoly, while the struggle to meet the people's needs is inextricably bound up with the fight to expand democracy against the new combination of racist ultra-rightists within the two parties—who aim at a neo-fascist "answer" to the demands of the oppressed and exploited.

"Putting the Cuffs On"

The relationship of Moynihanism to the increased aggressiveness of the most racist and reactionary forces in the country is confirmed in yet another article in *Fortune's* "Special Bicentennial Issue," titled "Putting the Cuffs on Capitalism," by Walter Guzzardi, Jr.

Predictably, the article reflects monopoly's concern with "putting

the cuffs" on the millions of oppressed and exploited searching for a way to take monopoly's "cuffs" off the industries that determine this country's economic life.

Only socialism can put an end to the contradictions of capitalism. But a struggle to "cuff" monopoly, a fight for a program of nationalization, would begin to curb inflation and expand economic growth and jobs. This would open up new possibilities for strengthening democracy—for making the struggle for an economic solution, for equality and peace, irreversible. It is such a perspective that "troubles" *Fortune* magazine: "The troublesome prospect," writes Guzzardi, "is that government will continue ceaselessly to expand its frontiers." Guzzardi knows very well that government has absolutely no plans to "expand its frontiers"—i.e., provide the jobs, social services, etc. the people demand. What is so "troublesome" to him is that the growing strength of the people's movements, unless ruthlessly checked, may force certain concessions from government. He states:

Alan Greenspan, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, says that "capitalism is in crisis." Greenspan fears that we may now stand at "the point of *discontinuity*." (Emphasis added—H.W.)

To understand what Greenspan means by the "point of discontinuity," one must know more about his credentials than Guzzardi tells us: Greenspan is a protege of Ayn Rand, a long-time ideologue of an American type of fascism.

In using this phrase, Greenspan subtly reveals that there are currents in Wall Street and Washington who fear that the continuation of bourgeois democracy is an obstacle to monopoly's class interests and should be *discontinued*. His presence in Washington is in fact symbolic of those currents pushing for an historic "discontinuity" with bourgeois democracy, for an ultra-right, even a fascist, solution to the crisis of capitalism.

Guzzardi then tries to win "liberal" sentiment for Greenspan's views by exploiting the "liberals'" fear of the masses and their demands:

A somewhat similar concern is shared by Otto Eckstein, a former member of the Council, who is a Democrat and a liberal. He argues that the capitalist system these days is being rocked by ever greater waves of change, rolling in faster and faster. Eckstein

points out that the system is still groping for ways to accommodate consumerism and environmentalism . . . which have come crashing down heavily on it in the last few years. And while it is groping, the system is being overtaken by still another movement, which Eckstein now sees gathering force . . . a movement "to change the distributions of wealth and income." (Emphasis added—H.W.)

Guzzardi then adds:

Such sequences of rapid change are putting the capitalist system to its hardest test and, Eckstein fears, they may "hasten the day when the individual foundation of the society is gone."

Of course, "individual foundation" is merely a euphemism for monopoly. As Eckstein and Guzzardi know, even if it once existed for a minority, the so-called "individual foundation of the society" has long since been replaced by state monopoly capitalism.

As for a movement "gathering force" to change the "distributions of wealth and income," certainly it is! Tens of millions are seeking an alternative to the two-party syndrome for support to the policies of state monopoly capitalism. Via these policies, monopoly appropriates a greater and greater proportion of the wealth produced by the working class. Then it uses taxes and inflation as "distributions" methods, i.e., to take back more and more of the small amount that goes into the workers' pay envelopes. This is the "distributions" system by which imperialism subsidizes its aggression against the people's movements for liberation and economic and social progress.

Liberals who express alarm at anti-monopoly movements have been pulled within the orbit of those reactivating Moynihanism. This doctrine in all its variants feeds the pro-fascist Greenspans and all anti-labor, racist forces trying to move the country in an ultra-right direction. These forces aim to make 1976 the year of "discontinuity," the time for moving closer to their goal of doing away with the people's rights and "entitlements."

In the same *Fortune* article, Guzzardi not only castigates as a threat to the system any measure that would even slightly alleviate the people's dire conditions. He also greets another proposal to bring still more of the "distributions of wealth" back to monopoly.

A certain Felix Rohatyn, Guzzardi reports, has "suggested a new

Reconstruction Finance Corporation," which would use government funds to assist private corporate capital. Rohatyn, a partner in Lazard Freres, international bankers, and a director of ITT and several other giant corporations, is presently on the board of "Big Mac," the so-called Municipal Assistance Corporation through which the bankers create crises in order to seize more and more "distributions of wealth" from the people of New York City.

After endorsing this added way of "distributing" profits to monopoly, Guzzardi complains that,

The fastest-growing segment of spending nowadays is transfer payments—money that the government spends, but for which it receives no return in goods or services, such as Social Security and welfare payments. *Representing a movement of resources from the productive to the non-productive sectors of the economy*, these payments reached \$117 billion last year. (Emphasis added —H.W.)

This *Fortune* writer attacks the woefully inadequate funds going for social services, but does not mention the transfer of *thousands of billions* over the past couple of decades from the productive sector to the non-productive armaments and aggression sector. This continuing upward spiral of redistribution of resources from the productive to the non-productive sector is paralleled by another monopoly-induced spiral: unemployment and poverty for increasing masses of people.

However, Guzzardi is not unaware of these millions. In fact, he expresses *Fortune's* "compassion" for the poor when he writes:

. . . (a) young economist, Richard Zeckhauser, points out that regulations are especially hard on the poor—housing standards, for example. "The poor are forced to buy higher quality at the expense of convenience and space," he says . . . Zeckhauser also points out that by subsidizing nursing homes for the elderly . . . "the government is providing the elderly with incentives to move to situations more expensive to society . . ." And when the government subsidizes day-care centers . . . it produces a comparably undesirable result.

This article ominously spells out all the social measures monopoly is trying to cut back on, measures affecting the employed, those shut out of the economy and the retired.

And the article's pro-fascist direction is clearly revealed when it states:

The free enterprise system . . . carries with it some *penalties* . . . unemployment among them. If we are not willing to suffer the *penalties*, then we cannot have free enterprise. (Emphasis added—H.W.)

Of course, the monopolists are not among the "we" who "suffer the penalties." The "we" refers to the masses of the people, particularly the doubly and triply oppressed minorities.

Monopoly's View of the "Class Gap"

The threat of still greater economic, social and political "penalties" comes not only from the openly racist, rightist forces of the two major parties, but also from a "liberal" direction.

Take, for instance, *The Real America*, a book by Benjamin J. Wattenberg, a founder and co-chairman of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority. Wattenberg also served as an aide and writer for President Johnson, and as an aide to Senators Hubert Humphrey and Henry Jackson (whose image is being "liberalized").

Like Moynihan, Bell, Guzzardi, etc., Wattenberg believes that the onus for their condition lies on the masses, especially Blacks, and not the system. Consequently, the masses, particularly the most oppressed sections, must "suffer the penalties." Wattenberg writes:

A movement for middle-class whites to be fair to middle-class blacks has a chance; the appeal for middle-class whites to play Lord and Lady Bountiful to lower class blacks is neither a happy nor productive relationship for either group. (*The Real America*, by Benjamin J. Wattenberg. Doubleday, New York. 1974. Page 151.)

No "appeal" was ever made by Black people for middle-class whites to play "Lord and Lady Bountiful" to them! On the contrary, Black people have fought against patronization in every form!

But Wattenberg is demagogic as well as crudely racist, which becomes apparent if one notes that middle-class whites are in no position to play "Lord and Lady Bountiful" to anyone, even to themselves! Their own situation is daily becoming more precarious, and to prevent it from becoming a full-scale disaster the middle-

class must become part of a great anti-monopoly struggle based on labor and the oppressed peoples.

Wattenberg also asserts,

As blacks have moved in massive numbers into the middle class, they are moving (with resistance) into white neighborhoods, moving (with resistance) into white schools, moving (with resistance) into white jobs. Given these facts, is it still *useful* (let alone valid) to incant again the old stereotype of black poverty? (Ibid., page 151. Emphasis added—H.W.)

"Useful" only to monopoly, this fantasy of "massive numbers" of Blacks moving into middle-class status is designed to cover up the increase in unemployment, poverty and discrimination, and to conceal its source.

Closing his book on a note that carries echoes of both George Wallace and Daniel Moynihan, Wattenberg states that "the only rational solution to the race problem . . . (will) occur as the *class* gap narrows." (Emphasis added—H.W.) This is, of course, an outlook that neither Black nor white masses will find encouraging; it is obvious that the "class gap" between monopoly and the masses of whatever color is increasing.

Clearly, in its current and even more racist, anti-labor variations, Moynihanism is monopoly's call for the victims of the system to "suffer the penalties" ever more sharply. Instead of "pie in the sky," today's ideologists for U.S. monopoly offer the oppressed and exploited a new version of gradualism, i.e., their condition will improve under capitalism when "the class gap narrows"!

Moynihan and the "New Majority"

A decade after the Moynihan Report provided the updated racist stereotypes required by monopoly for its domestic strategy, a sequel appeared: an article by Daniel P. Moynihan in *Commentary*, March 1975, which adapted the original Moynihan doctrine to the world scene.

The appearance of the new "Moynihan Report" coincides with the massive reactivation of the original doctrine by government agencies, political figures in both parties, and the media. Supported by the writings of respectable academic circles, this doctrine is now winning acceptance from many who have avoided identification

with the more crudely put racism of the Jensens and Shockleys.

Confirmation of the relationship between reactivation of the Moynihan Report internally and its extension internationally can be found in Moynihan's nomination as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. less than a month after publication of his *Commentary* article.

In giving his views on how the crisis of U.S. and world imperialism should be confronted, Moynihan began by stating:

If one were to characterize the discomfiture and distress with which Americans responded to the events of the 29th General Assembly of the United Nations in 1974, some measure would have to be attributed to the discovery that a vast majority of the nations of the world feel there are claims which can be made on the wealth of individual nations that are both considerable and threatening--in any event threatening to countries such as the United States which regularly finds itself in a minority (often a minority of one or two or at most a half-dozen) in an assembly of 138 members.

The tyranny of the U.N.'s "new majority" has accordingly been deplored . . .

Having defined his fears of the "tyranny" of a "vast majority" over a tiny imperialist minority, Moynihan proceeded to adapt to the "third world" some of the domestic concepts he projected ten years ago.

In his original report, Moynihan denied the Black minority's rightful claim to political and economic equality in the U.S. by naming the Black community, not state monopoly capitalism, as the source of inequality.

Now Moynihan denies the "third world" nations' rightful claim to political and economic equality by disavowing U.S. and world imperialism's responsibility for their present inequality. Although Moynihan admits that colonialism existed prior to political independence, he places the blame for continuing inequality not on imperialism and neo-colonialism, but on its victims in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The leadership of the newly independent nations (comprising the largest part of the "new majority") shared a common ideology, according to Moynihan, in the first phase of independence. He states:

. . . it may be argued that what happened in the early 1970s is that for the first time the world felt the impact of what for lack of a better term I shall call the British revolution . . . To a quite astonishing degree [the independent states] were ideologically uniform, having fashioned their politics in terms derived from the general corpus of British socialist opinion as it developed in the period roughly 1890-1950.

In a footnote Moynihan acknowledges that,

The term British revolution is open to objection as seeming to exclude the influence of continental socialism on the new nations, and indeed *a good case could be made for calling the phenomenon I am trying to describe the revolution of the Second International*. But the term British can be justified by the fact that of the 87 states to have joined the U.N. since its founding, more than half—47—had been part of the British empire. (Emphasis added—H.W.)

Although factually only 18 of these 87 states were "part of the British empire," it is not just Moynihan's statistical method that is of interest but his political strategy, which meshes with the Maoists' great power chauvinist strategy.

Whatever the differences in the Maoists' goals and those of U.S. imperialism, both conceive of anti-Sovietism as central to their respective strategies. Consequently, both Maoism and imperialism aim at undermining the growing unity between the national liberation movements, the working classes in the advanced capitalist countries, and the socialist camp.

Thus, both Moynihan and the Maoists falsify the liberation process, the latter under cover of left rhetoric. The Maoists proclaim, with patronizing flattery, that the "third world" liberation struggles, unrelated to the world revolutionary process at whose center is the Soviet Union and the socialist camp, account for the collapse of the colonial empires. Moynihan deletes both the liberation struggles and the socialist camp as factors in the "third world" countries' achieving independence. Instead he says that "a third of the nations of the world owe their existence to a statute of Westminster."

In this same vein, Moynihan credits the achievement of independence to the "influence" of the Second International. Of course, wherever that ideology has played a role it has been as a force

countering the revolutionary process.

Superficially, there appears to be a contradiction between Moynihan's endorsement of the influence of what he calls "British socialism" (or the "revolution of the Second International") in the newly independent countries and his attack on the "tyranny" of the "new majority." However, the explanation for this lies in the great changes in the emerging nations since they achieved independence in the late fifties, marking the beginning of the end for the empires in which European imperialism predominated. Since that time U.S. imperialism has made advances in the "third world" at the expense of the "third world" countries and of British, French, German and Japanese neo-colonialist interests.

In this way the Moynihan doctrine reflects U.S. imperialism's response, along with its NATO cohorts and competitors, to the profound changes in the underdeveloped countries since the early sixties. Now imperialism is increasingly faced with a "third world" leadership more and more directly influenced by the struggles of the masses.

The Moynihan doctrine is aimed at stemming the tide of these new developments. Especially is it directed against the new level of unity between the socialist camp and the African, Asian and Latin American liberation movements. What U.S. imperialism views as the "tyranny" of the "new majority" is in reality the liberating force of this unity.

Let "Bygones Be Bygones"?

Only Moynihan's boundless chauvinism could lead him to believe that he projects any credibility when he writes,

As the 20th century wore on and the issue of independence arose with respect to these specific peoples and places, it was most often the socialists who became the principal *political* sponsors of independence. It was a Labour government which in 1947 granted independence to India and formally commenced the vast, peaceful revolution that followed. (Emphasis in the original.)

With this interpretation, Moynihan arrogantly erases the long history of the liberation struggles, replacing it with a portrait in which British imperialism and its right wing social democratic administrators benignly "grant" independence to former colonies,

At the same time, he fails to mention, let alone explain, the status of the so-called Republic of South Africa which was part of the British Empire. When British imperialism "granted" independence to its colonies it simultaneously initiated policies, with the help of U.S. and West German imperialism, that economically and militarily reinforced the apartheid, fascist South African regime.

Moynihan also omits mention of U.S. imperialism's partnership with Britain in the continuing suppression of the Black majority in Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), and of NATO's role in supporting, for a quarter century, fascist Portugal's war against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau, accompanied by a decade of U.S. genocidal aggression in Indochina.

Wondering why those in the "third world" who were influenced by "British socialism" had lost political ground, Moynihan says:

Now it is possible to imagine a country, or collection of countries, with a background similar to that of the British colonies, attaining independence *and then letting bygones be bygones.* (Emphasis added—H.W.)

Moynihan attributes the "third world's" refusal to let "bygones be bygones" to the following:

On the edges of the movement there were those who saw the future not just in terms of redistribution, but of *something ominously close to looting.* In any event, *the past was by no means to be judged over and done with. There were scores to be settled. Internally and internationally.* (Emphasis added—H.W.)

Thus, Moynihan inadvertently exposes the very essence of the role imperialism assigns to right social democracy, whether in its classical form in the capitalist countries of Europe and North America, or in bourgeois nationalist variants in the "third world."

At this writing the unprecedented dimensions of the onslaught of right social democracy from Western Europe and the United States converges with U.S. and West European imperialist strategy in Portugal. The activities of this combined operation, reinforced with every imaginable variety of ideological, economic and political subversion through the CIA and other agencies, is only too reminiscent of the conspiracy that brought tragedy to Chile. The aim of these conspirators is to destabilize the unity of the Portuguese revolutionary forces, to reverse the struggles of those determined

that the past is "by no means judged to be over and done with."

Unlike the right social democrats, the Communists and all progressive forces in Portugal, in and out of the army, have "judged" that the past will *not* be "over and done with" until all the old "scores" are "settled": i.e., when foreign and domestic monopoly capital, the source of fascism, poverty and exploitation, have been eliminated.

The events in Angola and Mozambique most clearly show the meaning of the Moynihan doctrine for the "third world." When the underdeveloped countries act to end neo-colonial looting of their lands and labor, it is the victims of the looting, not the looters, who are to be charged with "tyranny" in the U.N.

It is evident that accusations of the "tyranny" of the "new majority" are among U.S. imperialism's latest methods for "containing" those who refuse to accept the dictates of the Moynihan doctrine. This doctrine expresses in the sharpest way the U.S. aim to reestablish a pre-independence situation in new forms—the tyranny of the imperialist minority, with a lineup of neo-colonialist powers headed by the U.S.

The Veil Is Lifted

Moynihan's presentation in the pro-Zionist *Commentary* of U.S. imperialism's "third world" policies is veiled in certain ambiguities, the meaning made more difficult to follow by the use of such terms as "British socialism" and the "revolution of the Second International." In a followup article in *The Atlantic* (May 1975), the veil is lifted. Moynihan informs his readers that the U.S. will resort to every form of interventionist pressure, political, economic and other, against those nations trying to move away from old policies, i.e., policies that were set by forces willing to let "bygones be bygones" after formal independence was won.

In *The Atlantic* Moynihan writes:

I believe the legacy of those brave beginnings persists, and that it is still the best hope we have that the world at large will not enter that dark totalitarian night we in the older democracies so very much feared at the time the new nations made their appearance.

The "legacy" that U.S. imperialism is doing all in its power to

perpetuate is one that includes Lumumba's assassination, the Sharpsville massacre, the overthrow of Nkrumah, and more recently Cabral's assassination, and the murder of Allende and democracy in Chile. A current addition to this "legacy" is the mounting from Zaire, Lumumba's homeland, of armed intervention supported by Washington and Peking against Angola's independence.

By carrying on this "legacy," imperialism aims to maintain the "revolution of the Second International"—a "revolution" spearheaded by such as Mario Soares in Portugal and Holden Roberto in Angola.

A Holden Roberto, for instance, proves his willingness to let "bygones be bygones" by accepting the continued domination of the transnational corporations, while a Mario Soares accepts monopoly domination under slogans especially adapted for the European mainland.

The Moynihan doctrine attempts to hold back the future which belongs to those for whom the neo-colonial past is "by no means" over and done with when formal independence has been attained.

In contrast to 15 or 20 years ago, these forces in the "third world" countries are no longer "on the edges" of the movements to gain the *substance* of liberation. At the same time "third world" struggles are spiraling to ever higher levels internationally, first of all because of the solidarity of the advancing world socialist system. The day is past when imperialism can consign liberation struggles to the "edges" of world politics!

Today, with ever greater clarity, the "third world" peoples view their struggles as part of the world anti-imperialist process—a process whose dynamics have been transformed by the Soviet Union and the community of socialist nations (one of them flourishing only 90 miles from the center of world racism and imperialism!). It is the pivotal contradiction between the advancing socialist system and declining capitalism (and the people's perception of this contradiction) that accelerates the liberation struggles, merging them at new levels with the international class struggle.

It is in the context of this new phase of the world revolutionary process and the prospects it opens for countries fighting to break out of 500 years of colonial and neo-colonial oppression that the significance of the Moynihan doctrine must be estimated, domes-

tically and internationally.

Moynihan and "Radical Discontinuity"

Moynihan's views on India are especially significant at this time when the U.S. is supporting the rightist offensive in India as well as Portugal, in parallel operations that reveal the relationship between imperialism's intensified efforts to expand its penetration of the "third world" and its anti-Communist, anti-Soviet strategy.

In his *Commentary* article Moynihan quotes remarks made about the capitalist powers at the World Food Conference in Rome in 1974 by the Indian Food Minister. The Indian Minister said:

It is obvious that the developed nations can be held responsible for their [the developing nations'] present plight. Developed nations, therefore, have a duty to help them. Whatever help is rendered to them now should not be regarded as charity but deferred compensation for what has been done to them in the past by the developed countries.

Expressing his extreme concern about these comments, Moynihan states:

The U.N. General Assembly pursued this theme with notable persistence . . . the General Assembly solemnly adopted a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States which accords to each state the right to freely exercise full permanent sovereignty over its wealth and natural resources, to regulate and exercise authority over foreign investments, and to nationalize, expropriate, or transfer ownership of foreign property pretty much at will.

One hundred and twenty nations voted for this Charter, with six against—the United States, Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom. "Explaining" why the U.S. voted against this Charter of Economic Rights for the majority of the world's population, Moynihan says:

What was being asserted was a radical *discontinuity* with the original, essentially liberal vision of the United Nations . . . (Emphasis added—H.W.)

Again the word "discontinuity" crops up! Previously noted was its use by Arthur Greenspan, chairman of President Ford's Council of Economic Advisers, and a disciple of neo-fascist Ayn Rand. Greenspan expressed the views of those in the ruling class who feel

bourgeois democracy has become an obstacle domestically and are pushing for its "discontinuity," i.e., an ultra-rightist or even fascist solution to the general crisis of capitalism. It is no accident that Moynihan extends this concept internationally, pressing for a *discontinuity* of democratic and social progress in the "third world" and elsewhere.

The Moynihan doctrine reveals imperialism's desperate fantasies for making the final quarter of the 20th century a kind of modernized version of the final quarter of the 19th century. At that time U.S. capitalism had betrayed the democratic advances of post-Civil War Reconstruction and was expanding capitalist development across the continent as the basis for the corporate domination that was to follow. In this same period the European powers completed the first colonial redivision of the greater part of the globe, while the U.S. fulfilled its "manifest destiny" with a war to win its "share" of empire in Cuba and the Philippines.

But the last quarter of this century is many light years away from the last quarter of the previous one! In this coming 25 years there will be ever greater acceleration of the process of the general crisis and decline of capitalism and the final stages in the struggle for the world transition to liberation and socialism.

Of this perspective for liberation and socialism Moynihan says:

The great darkness could yet consume us. The potential for absorption of these ["third world"] states into the totalitarian camp is there and will continue to be there. This is perhaps especially true where one-party states have been established, but even where multi-party democracy flourishes the tug of the "socialist countries," to use the U.N. term, persists.

Moynihan's use of "totalitarian camp" as a synonym for "socialist camp" is, of course, merely another of imperialism's vain efforts to prevent "third world" countries from recognizing that escape from the "great darkness" of neo-colonialism, from "absorption" into new forms of subjugation, is realizable because of the anti-imperialist solidarity of the Soviet Union and the socialist community.

Moynihan goes on to say:

The outcome [for "third world" countries] will almost certainly turn on whether or not these nations, individually and in groups, succeed in establishing sufficiently productive economies.

To achieve "sufficiently productive economies," Moynihan warns these countries that they must avoid "internal political influence from the totalitarian camp." Speaking of India, he states:

... economic incompetence on its part and diplomatic blunders on ours have led to increasing dependence on Soviet support which in the space of three years has brought about an open electoral alliance between the Congress party and the Moscow-oriented Communists, an alliance we would have thought worth fighting a war to prevent decades ago, but which we scarcely notice today.

Moynihan is forced to acknowledge that the *National Herald*, which he describes as "the Nehru family newspaper," had the following to say about his views:

Mr. Moynihan may be justified in some of his criticism of the state of the Indian economy, but what he is trying to sell is the capitalist system which can only impoverish India's millions further.

Certainly one can heartily agree with the *National Herald's* description of what Moynihan is "trying to sell!" As the *Herald* implies, Moynihan makes his hypocritical "criticism" of India's economy, arrogantly attributing it to "incompetence," only to perpetuate the Indian monopolists and landlords linked to imperialism who block formation of a "sufficiently productive economy."

As for Moynihan's assertion that "we scarcely notice today" what "we would have thought worth fighting a war to prevent two decades ago," there's been no decline in the imperialists' affinity for war nor oversights in their efforts to "prevent" liberation and social progress. However, the Vietnam lesson has encouraged them to conduct wars with an increasingly varied arsenal of weapons, as in Chile, Portugal and India—where Moynihan has helped the U.S. mount a massive campaign against Indira Gandhi's government as it tries to move decisively in the interests of the masses.

Moynihan becomes more specific as to what he has in mind for India's economy when he states:

... international liberalism and its processes have enormous recent achievements to their credit. It is time for the United States to start saying so.

One example is the multinational corporation which, combining modern management with liberal trade policies, is arguably

the most creative international institution of the 20th century.

Apparently Moynihan thinks that by sprinkling his article with indulgent references to "British socialism" and the "revolution of the Second International," he can get away with lauding "multinational corporations," when the very words have become synonymous with neo-colonialism! It is ironic that he equates "productive economies" with capitalism at a time when even the most obviously conservative ideologues of U.S. monopoly have long since retired the phrase "people's capitalism."

What kind of "productive" and "creative" prospect is Moynihan holding out for the "third world" nations when he tells them to tie their future to capitalism? How "productive" is a system that in the U.S., even in its ascendant stage, could develop its productive capacity only by reinforcing wage labor with chattel slavery?

And how "creative" is this system in its present stage of decline? What do its multinational corporations "create" except ever greater inequality and poverty for the majority of the earth's population?

How productive for "third world" countries is a system whose multinational corporations have never operated anywhere near productive capacity except in war time? What "creative" solution does U.S. imperialism offer the "third world" when at home its economy is geared to the non-productive pile-up of armaments and profits for monopoly, and oppression, unemployment and inflation for the people?

"Impact of Multinational Corporations"

Moynihan's assignment as the multinational corporations' chief U.N. spokesman is an extension of earlier steps taken by the U.S. against the U.N. majority's efforts to deal with neo-colonialist intervention in the underdeveloped countries.

For instance, in 1974 the U.N. issued a report on the multinational corporations' role in the "third world." Titled, "The Impact of Multinational Corporations on Development and on International Relations," the report stated:

Most countries are concerned about the ownership and control of key economic sectors by foreign enterprises, the excessive cost to the domestic economy which their operations may entail, the extent to which they may encroach upon political sovereignty

and their possible adverse influence on socio-cultural values.

The report also stated that the operations of the multinational corporations conflicted with the "political and social choices" of countries that "may opt for different . . . models of development *which leave little or no room for the participation of multinational corporations as they are currently organized.*" (Emphasis added—H.W.)

A lengthy challenge to the report was made by Senator Jacob K. Javits, representing the U.S. in the group preparing the document. Javits, expressing the interchangeable relationship between the U.S. government and the transnational corporations, rejected the report because of what he called its "bias in favor of governmental as opposed to private decision making," and because it "assumes that the central problem is a conflict between the economic power of the multinational corporations and the political power of the host governments . . ."

After disputing the "implicit (assumption) of the report" that "government involvement is preferable to private initiative," he expressed fear that "greater political control" by developing nations would lead to,

. . . a suffocating surveillance of multinational corporation activities by the host country government and discrimination against the multinational corporations compared with indigenous private enterprise.

Thus, Javits reveals that a central aim of U.S. imperialism is to intensify its control of "third world" countries. His challenge to the U.N. report also further exposes the underlying reasons for Moynihan's onslaught against the "tyranny" of the "new majority" and portrayal of the multinational corporations as the "creative" alternative to "totalitarianism."

Javits also attacks the report because (in his view),

. . . (it) rather vaguely charges, without substantiation, that multinational corporations, being close to domestic groups favoring foreign investment, can "rally against groups advocating social reforms."

A more open expression of U.S. imperialism's interventionist doctrine, of its frenzied efforts to "rally against groups advocating social reforms," from Chile to Angola to Portugal, would be hard to come by!

PART II:

MAOISM, THE MOYNIHAN-KISSINGER DOCTRINE AND THE "THIRD WORLD"

Evidence of the contradiction between the Maoists' "revolutionary" rhetoric and the reality of their support to imperialism and its multinational corporations continues to multiply. In fact, one need only look beyond the rhetoric to find that Maoist "third world" policies cannot be distinguished from those of Moynihan and Javits.

Take just one example: On July 28, 1975 the Chinese Mission to the U.N. issued a press release attacking the Soviet message to the 12th Session of the Assembly of the Organization of African Unity in Uganda. The Maoists lashed out at the Soviet statement for,

. . . saying that "the sovereignty of developing countries over their natural resources" . . . "depends on the capacity of their industries for utilizing these resources."

(Before continuing with the release, it should be noted that the "quotation" in it does not appear in the Soviet document to which the Maoists attribute it. Despite this, the concept in the "quote," as we shall see, by no means runs counter to Soviet internationalist policy.)

The Maoist release then asserts:

If African countries with backward industries accept this fallacy of the Soviet revisionists, they will have no sovereign rights over their natural resources but place themselves at the mercy of superpower wanton plunder.

The release adds:

But it is this superpower which has opposed the reasonable demand of developing countries, including those in Africa, for higher raw material prices . . .

By analyzing these statements one can see how the Maoists' "two superpowers" concept assists imperialism. In order to isolate the "third world" from its socialist allies the Maoists aim their fire not at imperialism but at the socialist camp. Through these

efforts at splitting the world anti-imperialist struggle they weaken "third world" bargaining power with the multinational corporations in setting prices and terms of trade.

The question of setting prices on the sale of raw materials (as well as determining what is to be imported and at what price) is indeed a decisive starting point for the former colonies in their relations with the multinational corporations.

Although the Maoists ostensibly call for higher prices for these countries, their position actually assists the imperialists who scream that prices are too high. Maoist policy has this effect because it separates prices from the conditions necessary for "third world" countries to end neo-colonial dictation of terms.

By contrast, the policy of the Soviet Union, the socialist camp and the world's Communist and Workers Parties strengthens the fight for higher raw material prices by recognizing that "the sovereignty of developing nations over their natural resources" does indeed depend on "the capacity of their industries for utilizing these resources."

The Maoist fallacies denying this assist only the neo-colonialists who would like to reestablish "sovereign rights" over the "third world's" resources and peoples. The Maoist concepts aid the imperialists in their efforts to block industrial and technological development in the former colonies in order to keep them dependent on the mammoth corporate consumers of raw materials. Only by a many-sided development of industry and agriculture can these countries escape from the "creative" coercion demanded by Moynihan and Javits.

The Maoists' anti-Soviet slander cannot conceal the socialist camp's role in fundamentally accelerating the African, Asian and Latin American struggles against the unequal terms imperialism imposes. One could say that the Marxist-Leninist policies of the Soviet Union and the socialist community in relation to the "third world" are an extension of the principles first applied by Karl Marx in the workers' struggle with capitalists over the terms of sale, i.e., for the price of their labor power. This is what Marx saw as the starting point in the class struggle to end wage slavery.

At the same time he emphasized that working class liberation could not be won if the struggle was limited to terms of sale of

labor power. At best this economic struggle could only blunt the downward spiral of conditions under capitalism.

Applied to the "third world," this means that the struggle for terms of sale can be meaningful only if there is world unity behind policies guaranteeing that underdeveloped countries will move as rapidly as possible toward processing their own materials. Only by having more to sell than raw materials can these nations begin to escape the downward pressure from imperialism. The development of industry and agriculture is a prerequisite for their gaining the substance of independence.

However, it is wrong to conclude that economic development *in itself* will lead to socialism, or even that it could overcome the growing inequality between the "third world" countries, most of whom are still within the capitalist orbit, and the developed imperialist centers in the U.S., Western Europe and Japan.

But one would never know this from Maoism, which obliterates the class essence of the national liberation struggles in both its aspects. In this era of world transition to socialism, anti-imperialist unity of the newly independent countries with the socialist camp is an historic necessity. At the same time, "third world" policies must strengthen the internal struggle for socialism economically, socially and politically.

In most of the "third world" countries, especially those south of the Sahara and north of the apartheid South African regime, capitalism is not an internal dominant characteristic. It is there mainly as a foreign presence, as international capital. What dominates is pre-capitalist formations, which are subject to exploitation by international capital and internal forces linked to neo-colonialism.

Even the U.N. report on "The Impact of Multinational Corporations on Development and on International Relations" recognizes what Maoism denies: the possibility for "third world" countries to make "political and social choices" for "models of development" along non-capitalist paths.

In its opposition to the struggle for such "political and social choices," Maoism reinforces imperialism's economic, political and military opposition to the "third world" peoples' sovereign right to exercise "political and social choices" that could help them

break out of capitalism's orbit and accelerate emergence of working class and mass power, instead of enhancing the positions of internal exploiters and international monopolists.

But along with imperialism, Maoism aims at turning the exploiters in the cities and villages into a new bourgeoisie, national betrayers who would subordinate "third world" sovereignty to imperialism's global anti-Soviet strategy.

Therefore, the question of the underdeveloped countries' sovereignty is inseparable from the struggle for peaceful coexistence: the right to choose their own path without intervention from the U.S. and world imperialism.

Maoist "Neutrality" in the Class Struggle

In the "third world" countries the class struggle revolves around the question of capitalist or non-capitalist orientation; specifically, as to whether the state or private sector will be the basis for economic development. In this struggle the Maoists line up on the side of internal reaction and the multinational corporations, hiding their betrayal of liberation and socialism behind a mask of "neutrality" on this pivotal issue.

This counterrevolutionary "neutrality" is revealed in an article in *Peking Review*, No. 2 (January 10, 1975) that attempts to distort decisions made by the U.N. General Assembly in April, 1974, to help the newly independent countries overcome imperialist domination. But according to the Maoist article, these decisions "firmly upheld the following principle":

The right of every country to exercise effective control over its natural resources, including nationalization and transfer of ownership to its nationals.

According to Marxism-Leninism, the principle that must be "firmly upheld" is public, not private, ownership of property. Yet the Maoists would have us believe there is no choice between nationalization and "transfer of ownership to . . . nationals," i.e., those forces with ties to world imperialism.

But how does one strengthen an underdeveloped country's ability to "exercise effective control over its natural resources," and its total economic development, by remaining "neutral" on the *central* question in the fight for sovereignty and social progress? Ironically,

this Maoist "neutrality," in reality an invitation to multinational corporations to continue dominating "third world" economies, is a modernized version of the old "Open Door" policy!

To cover their accommodation to neo-colonialist strategy on the crucial issue of the "third world" countries' economic and social orientation, the Maoists assert:

The African people's anti-imperialist struggle has reached a new level with the spearhead of their struggle for economic independence directed more and more against the superpowers' policy of plunder and hegemonism. (Ibid.)

It is certainly true that the struggles of the peoples of Africa are reaching a new level, despite the Maoists' disruptive role: Maoist rhetoric cannot conceal Maoist support to the "hegemonism" of U.S. imperialism's multinational corporations.

The logic of the Maoists' "neutrality" on nationalization versus "transfer of ownership to . . . nationals" is seen in their support to U.S. imperialism's fascist puppets in Chile. The Chilean junta, in accord with the Maoist formula, has completed "transfer of ownership to . . . nationals." The industries and resources nationalized by Allende's Popular Unity government are now returned to the hands of the Chilean monopolists and landowners tied to U.S. imperialism, or are again directly under control of multinational corporations.

Appreciation of Maoist assistance to U.S. imperialism was expressed recently in the New York *Daily News* by its editor, Michael O'Neal. After a visit to China, he wrote:

China has moved in the last few years to ally itself with the United States in a surprising new balance of power. *It has even made a wrenching adjustment in its ideology to further its pragmatic national interests.* (*Daily News*, July 18, 1975.) (Emphasis added—H.W.)

The "wrenching adjustment" the *Daily News* welcomes is merely the Maoists' substitution of great power chauvinist aims for Marxist-Leninist principles. This "wrenching adjustment" not only works against the interests of the "third world" peoples; it simultaneously jeopardizes China's *real* "national interests," previous socialist gains made inside the country, with vast material assistance from the Soviet Union.

Maoism's course has indeed led China to "ally itself with the United States," including the Kissinger-Moynihan strategy against the "tyranny" of the U.N.'s "new majority."

Especially is this "alliance" directed against the democratic forces from Angola to Portugal who do not remain "neutral," but advocate the state sector as the starting point for preventing domination in new forms by the multinational corporations and as the foundation for economic and social progress.

Whether or not the state sector in "third world" countries promotes the non-capitalist path, this form of ownership offers the best opportunity for overcoming neo-colonialism and defending national sovereignty. This in turn creates the conditions for advancing democracy, and for new levels of struggle toward a non-capitalist path and socialist development.

Diversity, Unity and the OAU

After attacking the Soviet Union's advocacy of industrial development to enable "third world" countries to control their own resources, the July 28, 1975 release from the Chinese Mission goes on to assert:

The "document" also shows that the Soviet revisionists are used to sowing discord and breaking up African unity. Everybody knows that the first aim in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity is to promote *integration* and solidarity among African countries. The OAU has been making every endeavor to safeguard and strengthen solidarity and integration which is the source of strength in Africa. After inciting the Angolan people to fight among themselves, the Soviet revisionists with ulterior motives classify the OAU into "progressive member states" and "non-progressive member states" in the "document." (Emphasis added—H.W.)

Again the "document" referred to is the Soviet message to the OAU, and again no such remarks are to be found in it.

Nevertheless, it is certainly true that there is considerable variation in the orientation of the states comprising the OAU. And the Maoist attempts to obscure the combination of diversity and unity within the OAU have a very specific purpose: Behind their usual "revolutionary" rhetoric, the Maoists parallel imperialism's

(especially U.S. imperialism's) maneuvers to introduce on the African continent a facsimile of the now bankrupt strategy imposed for so many years on the Organization of American States (OAS).

In its policy toward the OAS, the U.S. rejected diversity of membership in order to keep out Cuba. This was the springboard for the U.S. economic blockade of Cuba and for U.S. intervention in Cuba, Guatemala, Brazil, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Chile, etc., in the name of opposition to "communism" and "Soviet penetration."

It is this same imperialist approach that Maoism supports in denying the right to diversity in the OAU. But to oppose this right is to reject the necessity for a *united front* against imperialism on the African continent!

Along with imperialism, Maoism is intensifying ideological, political and economic warfare against the *key* element in the OAU's principle of unity based on diversity: some, not all. African states have revolutionary, anti-capitalist orientations; the unity of these diverse states is what Moynihan attacks as the "tyranny" of the "new majority."

As for the Maoist claim that the Soviet Union is "inciting the Angolan people to fight among themselves," the facts prove the reverse. U.S. imperialism and the Maoists, together with Lumumba's assassins, are carrying on a military attempt to repeat what was done in the Congo during Lumumba's time.

The U.S.-Zaire-Maoist intervention, supported by apartheid South Africa, against the unity of the Angola liberation movement aims to replace Portuguese colonialism with even more powerful forms of colonialist penetration. Thus, under the guise of opposing "communism" and "Soviet influence," Maoism has joined with the imperialists in military attacks against the right to diversity (the choice of political and social orientation) for African states.

U.S.-Maoist complicity in Angola is confirmed in an article in *Foreign Affairs* (April 1975), issued by the Council on Foreign Relations, a "think tank" for U.S. imperialism. The article, "Report from Angola," states:

Recently, MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of

Angola] President Neto said, "After we are freed from Portuguese colonialism, we must be liberated from that of our neighbors and brothers." He was referring primarily to President Mobutu, who is the most heavily involved and strongest *outside* influence on Angola today. (Emphasis added—H.W.)

But the "Report" soon contradicts itself, revealing that the "most heavily involved and strongest outside influence in Angola" is the U.S.:

The United States first became involved in the liberation movement in the early sixties by supporting Holden Roberto on a covert basis. . . The main U.S. interests in Angola are political—to encourage a friendly government in a large and potentially powerful African country—and economic—to preserve American business interests. Particularly important are the interests of Gulf Oil, the fourth-largest oil company in the United States, which has exclusive rights over Cabindan oil. In terms of trade, the United States is the principal importer of Angolan goods, even ahead of Portugal, and the third-largest exporter to Angola.

The "Report" then comments on the Maoists as partners of the U.S. in support of Holden Roberto, son-in-law of Mobutu:

It seems that by backing Roberto, the most Western-leaning of the leaders, the Chinese decided to sacrifice some ideological purity for political payoffs. . .

This "sacrifice" of "ideological purity," i.e., betrayal of Marxist-Leninist principles, is but the latest in the long Maoist record of "sacrifice," not only of the interests of African and other "third world" peoples, but of the peoples of China as well.

The armed intervention in Angola, of which the Maoists are a component, also threatens Mozambique's and Guinea Bissau's newly-won independence. It parallels on the African continent the drive against the revolutionary process in Portugal.

Integration, Solidarity and Maoism

The Maoists, accusing the USSR of "sowing discord and breaking up African unity," assert that the "first aim" of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) is "to promote *integration* and *solidarity* among African states." (Emphasis added—H.W.)

When the Maoists speak of "integration," it is not to adapt this concept to the present stage in the African nations' struggle for sovereignty and socio-economic progress. Maoist rhetoric about "integration" and "solidarity" is designed to undermine OAU anti-imperialist unity, the historic prerequisite for further advances in cooperation among the member states.

The Maoists equate "integration" and "solidarity," but there is a fundamental distinction between the two concepts. The Soviet Union and all the world Communist and progressive forces are united in solidarity with the African liberation struggles.

But how is it possible to "integrate" states with different socio-economic orientations? Clearly, the Maoist idea of "integration" fits into imperialism's strategy to deny the right of self-determination, of genuine national development, to OAU members, and of "integrating" these countries into new forms of colonialism. By substituting "integration" for *joint action*, Maoism is calling upon the African states to bypass anti-imperialist solidarity for a "great leap" into neo-colonialism and self-defeat.

Integration among non-socialist nations can mean only the subjugation of the weaker states by the stronger. The right of self-determination is the basis for diversity within unity in the OAS. The contradiction between Maoism and this principle can be seen in the U.S.-Maoist effort to duplicate in Africa what the U.S. did in Latin America through the OAS. U.S. imperialism and the Maoists are trying to undermine anti-imperialist solidarity in the OAU by denying member states the right to choose their own social system. The U.S.-Maoist intervention in Angola, for example, is an attempt to forestall even the possibility of Angola or other African countries choosing a non-capitalist path.

The weaponry to support this Zaire-based intervention is flown in from U.S. stocks in the Federal Republic of Germany, U.S. imperialism's most powerful ally in NATO and the European Economic Community. In this light the Maoists' support to the EEC, or the Common Market, takes on added significance. It reveals the dimensions of their involvement with imperialism's strategy against the three currents of the world revolutionary process: the African, Asian and Latin American liberation movements; the working classes and oppressed minorities in the capitalist countries; and the Soviet Union and the socialist camp.

There is a direct connection between the Maoists' support of NATO and involvement in the Common Market, and the Maoists' attempt to "integrate" the OAU member states. This is a connection that exposes Maoism's special link with those U.S. and West German monopolists most opposed to detente and peaceful coexistence.

Maoism's Other Face

The Maoists' adjustment to events often results in rapid changes in the form of their betrayal of class and national liberation. Until the recent events in Chile, Portugal and Angola, Maoism usually appeared as the "left" face of right social democracy. But in Africa and Portugal, as well as in its support to the Chilean junta, Maoism now appears openly on the right. It is in fact even more closely linked than right social democracy with the most aggressive mobilization of fascist violence against the Portuguese revolutionary process.

And in its *triangular entente* with U.S. and West German imperialism, Maoism appears more and more brazenly to the right of right social democracy in the Federal Republic of Germany. Not only did the Maoists attack the Helsinki Conference on European Security, the greatest single step toward defeating those who would reverse the process of detente and escalate instead of end the armaments race. In addition, Mao Tse-tung placed his personal imprimatur on Franz Josef Strauss and all the conservative and fascist forces opposed to the Helsinki agreement, of which the FRG's right social democratic government was a signer.

Both Strauss and Mao Tse-tung aim at intensifying the anti-democratic, anti-Soviet direction of NATO and the EEC. At the same time they want to use the EEC to weaken the other Western European states as rivals to Bonn and Washington, while these states continue to further imperialist goals in Europe and the "third world."

The U.S. is anxious to avoid appearing in its true role as senior and directing partner in the triangular relationship with the Maoists and the most reactionary FRG monopolists. And Maoist propaganda provides this cover for U.S. imperialism, helping it to appear as either an innocent bystander or superpower "op-

ponent" of the Maoists.

Much Maoist propaganda is now directed to moving the EEC and NATO into positions that correspond more effectively to the most aggressive sectors of U.S. and FRG monopoly. This represents not only a direct threat to the socialist camp and the "third world," but to the independence of Western European countries. The concept on which this propaganda is based was expressed by Teng Hsiao-ping, who spoke for the Maoist regime at the Sixth Special Session of the U.N., April 1974. He said that the contemporary world,

. . . actually consists of the three sides, the three worlds, which are mutually tied in and mutually contradictory. The USA and the USSR constitute the first world. The developing countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions comprise the third world. The developed countries that are between the above-mentioned worlds constitute the second world.

In its "theory" of a "first," "second" and "third" world, Maoism has added yet another dimension to its betrayal of the international working classes and the national liberation struggles.

The Maoists' linking of the USSR and the USA in a "first world" is a significant example of their "wrenching adjustment" away from Marxist-Leninist principles. (Every U.N. member knows these two states are in the forefront of opposite international alignments!)

Shortly before the October Revolution, Lenin wrote:

The abolition of capitalism and its vestiges, and the establishment of the fundamentals of the communist order comprise the content of the new era of world history that has set in. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Progress Publishers, Moscow. Page 392.)

He then said:

Any direct or indirect, witting or unwitting evasion of these questions inevitably turns into a defense of the interests of the bourgeoisie, the interests of capital, the interests of the exploiters. (*Ibid.*, page 393.)

Maoism's portrayal of the strongest single socialist state and the strongest single capitalist state as members of the same camp is a "direct" and "witting" "evasion" of the world's true class division. Because of its "direct" and "witting" "evasion" of "the

content of the new era of world history" i.e., the pivotal contradiction between advancing socialism and declining capitalism in the era of world transition to socialism, Maoism "*inevitably turns into a defense of the interests of the bourgeoisie, the interests of capital, the interests of the exploiters.*"

Although the Maoists use the phrase "third world" as if it were a scientific characterization, it is actually a shorthand reference for countries that, despite diverse backgrounds and social orientations, have been the victims of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

As for the Maoists' "second world," allegedly composed of all the developed capitalist countries except the U.S., this represents another "witting" "evasion" of international divisions. In reality this "second world" is the neo-colonialist camp headed by the U.S. and comprised of all the EEC and NATO states, plus Israel on Africa's northern flank, apartheid South Africa, Japan and Brazil, the imperialist aspirant on the South American continent. These are the "allies" Maoism offers the "third world!"

This Maoist "theory" of the era in which we live contradicts the scientific analysis and guide to struggle expressed by Lenin:

We cannot know how rapidly and how successfully the various historical movements in a given epoch will develop, but we can and do know *which class* stands at the hub of one epoch or another, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in that epoch, etc. . . . only a knowledge of the basic features of a given epoch can serve as the foundation for an understanding of the specific features of one country or another. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, Page 145). (Emphasis in the original.)

The Maoist concept of a "first," "second" and "third" world is designed to separate the newly independent countries from the class standing at the "hub" of the world revolutionary process: the contingents of the international working class in power in the Soviet Union and the socialist camp.

In linking the USA with the USSR, Maoism aims in particular at deceiving the "third world" peoples. According to its "first world" "theory," the U.S. is unconnected with the social, economic and military aggression involving the EEC and NATO countries, Japan, Israel, South Africa and Brazil against the "third world."

It is difficult to imagine anything more fraudulent than this "theory," when the U.S. is the dominant force, the decision-making center, in the "second world" Maoism portrays as the "ally" of the peoples struggling to emerge from neo-colonialism. By separating the U.S. from the so-called "second world," Maoism assists the imperialists (particularly the most reactionary U.S. and FRG sectors) who assign the EEC a special role in "solving" the intensified general crisis of capitalism through neo-colonialist expansion.

Pattern of U.S. Investments Abroad

U.S. imperialism's economic, political and military weight within the so-called "second world" enables the U.S. to shape the decisions through which the plunder of the "third world" is maintained.

For example, in 1972 U.S. corporations invested almost three and one half billion dollars abroad, and repatriated almost ten and a half billion in profits. U.S. multinational corporations are now investing \$25 abroad for every \$100 invested at home. Significantly, 80 percent of these foreign investments are in the developed capitalist countries, predominantly the EEC countries of the fictional "second world" from which the Maoists exclude the U.S.!

This investment pattern is further proof that U.S. and world imperialism continues to accelerate economic, political, technological and military development in the advanced capitalist countries while perpetuating the underdevelopment of the "third world" which it considers on the periphery.

This pattern of investments in the Common Market by U.S. multinational corporations reveals the nature of inter-imperialist rivalries and the uneven development of capitalism, accentuated by the scientific and technological revolution and the general crisis of capitalism. These factors account for U.S. imperialism's efforts to dominate not only the underdeveloped countries still within the capitalist orbit, but also to intensify its domination of the developed capitalist sectors.

The triangular entente between Peking, Washington and Bonn not only threatens the "third world" and the working classes in the capitalist countries, but also sharpens the contradictions within NATO—whose interests are increasingly subordinated to the U.S.

via its special relations with the FRG, the most powerful EEC member, and its support from Maoism. This is how the U.S., though not a Common Market member, can largely determine West European policies.

However, class adhesion between the U.S. and all EEC members overshadows rivalries in protecting their common interests against the working classes, the liberation movements and the socialist camp. And it is in this connection that Maoism is particularly valuable to imperialism.

Maoism, as a partner in the triangular entente, aims to weaken anti-imperialist unity through its support to imperialism's military arm, NATO, and its economic weapon, the EEC.

The Maoists joined, for instance, with the British Conservative Party and the right wing of the Labor Party against the Labor Party's left wing and all progressive forces in a massive campaign to bring England into the EEC. A typical example of the Maoists' rationale for supporting EEC appears in the July 1975 *Broadsheet*, issued by the China Policy Study Group, Maoist supporters in England. *Broadsheet* stated:

The E.E.C. is positive politically, as a measure in favour of self-reliance and to avoid dependence on one or both super-powers.

Here the Maoists apply to an openly imperialist organization the same "self-reliance" rhetoric they have used for more than a decade to undermine anti-imperialist unity by attempting to separate the national liberation struggles from the socialist camp.

In what way does the EEC represent a "measure in favour of self-reliance?" For the working classes and masses to identify their interests with the EEC is to "rely" on the organization through which the U.S. and Bonn mobilize capitalism's economic and military resources against the world revolutionary process. "Reliance" on EEC means subservience to the multinational corporations dominating the lives of the masses in both the developed and underdeveloped capitalist countries. True self-reliance for the anti-imperialist forces means the united struggles of the working classes and the national liberation movements with the socialist camp.

Continuing, *Broadsheet* states:

In future, it will be necessary to oppose U.S. hegemony over the

E.E.C. while avoiding a one-sided anti-U.S. line which could benefit the other superpower.

It is now impossible for any second-world country to continue in the old way . . . On a European level, a step can be taken in the direction of a more balanced economic structure. This does not solve the long-term problem, but in any case we do not pin our hopes on capitalism as a lasting solution . . .

Here the Maoists outdo even the most aggressively class collaborationist policies of right social democracy! They betray the present struggle against U.S. and world imperialism with a promise to "oppose U.S. hegemony over the E.E.C." sometime in the future, justifying this betrayal in the name of "avoiding a one-sided anti-U.S. line which could benefit the other superpower." Thus, Maoism's anti-Soviet, great power chauvinism has become open "one-sided" support to the hegemony of U.S. imperialism both in Europe and the "third world."

The EEC, NATO and other U.S.-dominated agencies of imperialism assign the task of continued penetration of the "third world" to the multinational corporations. The Maoists want us to believe they will join the struggle against the multinational corporations sometime "in future" since they claim that "we do not pin our hopes on capitalism as a lasting solution." For the present, however, their policies inform us that they "do not pin" their hopes on the anti-imperialist struggle, but on the Kissinger-Moynihan strategy designed to consolidate imperialism's economic and military domination over "third world" countries.

"Get Tough and Do Things"

Also among those whose "hopes" are "pinned" on more sophisticated forms of economic penetration of the underdeveloped countries is ITT. For example, the October 1975 *Foreign Affairs* reveals:

Faced with the prospect of Chilean copper nationalization in the late 1960s, Anaconda relied on the local political defense of forming an alliance with the conservative elite in the host country—to no avail. Kennecott, on the other hand, worked out a sophisticated external defense *based on transnational market and credit networks*, so that when nationalization occurred the Chilean government would jeopardize its standing with credit institutions on several continents if it failed to provide adequate

compensation. *In situations of rising nationalism, the latter strategy may be the safer for a corporation.* In retrospect, Harold Geneen, president of IIT, has argued that: "The answer may be a multinational approach. By this I mean the Germans, the Swiss, the World Bank, and others share in the investment. Then six countries are involved, not one. If something goes wrong, the countries can get tough and do things." (Emphasis added—H.W.)

Far from having "changed," as the Maoists would have us believe, U.S. imperialism is simply attempting to adjust its operations: in the "face of rising nationalism," it wants to avoid acting alone against the underdeveloped countries, as it did in Vietnam and Chile. Via the "multinational approach," including the EEC, U.S. imperialism plans to make sure that if "something goes wrong," the other countries that "share in the investment" will also "get tough and do things."

The "multinational approach" means action through such organizations as the EEC, on which Kissinger, Moynihan, IIT and Mao see eye to eye, backed by transnational governmental and institutional coalitions. In this way U.S. imperialism hopes to reinforce its domination over both the capitalist centers and "third world" countries still in the capitalist orbit.

As Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party, USA, points out,

The ominous nature of the web being spun by U.S. imperialism is now emerging into the full light of day. Kissinger spins the shuttleweave, Moynihan baits the trap with sugary poison at the United Nations, while the godfather of all the corporate spiders directs the spinning from behind the seal of the Vice Presidency of the United States.

Hall continues:

The web is designed to trap both the underdeveloped countries and the people of the United States.

What is the basic essence of the U.S. proposals? They are all without exception geared to using U.S. taxpayers' dollars to help the U.S. corporations expand their exploitation and domination of the underdeveloped countries. (*Daily World*, September 5, 1975.)

At the Seventh Special Session of the U.N., Kissinger proposed

"several courses of action," all of which, as *Foreign Affairs* makes clear, originated in U.S. imperialism's most reactionary circles. Each of Kissinger's proposals is part of the U.S. effort to strengthen the EEC and NATO, while perfecting even more sophisticated transnational agencies.

Continuing, Kissinger went on to assert,

. . . The United States will support a major expansion of the World Bank's International Finance Corporation—the *investment banker with the broadest experience in supporting private enterprise in developing countries*. (Emphasis added—H.W.)

Kissinger then notified the U.N. that the underdeveloped countries' "access" to monopoly's technology and capital would depend on their submission to "one of the most effective engines of development—the transnational enterprise." He said:

Transnational enterprises have been powerful instruments of modernization both in the industrial nations—where they conduct most of their operations—and in the developing countries, where there is often no substitute for their ability to marshal capital, management, skills, technology and initiative.

Kissinger, with his blatant assertion that the "management," "skills" and "initiative" are to remain under transnational control, revealed that his "new" proposals are simply updated versions of imperialism's old "engines" of domination. He made it clear that underdeveloped "host" countries have no rights that the transnational corporations are bound to respect, including the right of self-determination guaranteed by the U.N. charter.

Attempting to outlaw opposition to U.S. plans, Kissinger declared that even "the controversy over" the transnational corporations' "role and conduct is itself an obstacle to development." "Development," according to the Kissinger-Moynihan proposals, would be "managed" as follows: U.S. and world imperialism would aim to create a national bourgeoisie in each country to assist the transnational corporations in suppressing "the controversy over their role and conduct" in plundering the "third world."

Puerto Rican Prototype of "Modernization"

As an example of what "powerful instruments of modernization" the "transnational enterprises" have been, one need look no further

than Puerto Rico, which U.S. imperialism projects as the prototype for "development" of the entire "third world." "Managed" and "modernized" by U.S. imperialism, Puerto Rico remains a colony, its economy converted into a super-profit branch of the transnational corporations. For the Puerto Rican people this has meant unemployment and poverty on the scale of economic genocide. Not since the days when British colonialism in Ireland led to famine and the migration of millions has such a huge proportion of a people been forced to leave its own country in search of work.

'The Puerto Ricans' crisis of existence, whether in Puerto Rico or in U.S. ghettos, is the outcome of decades of control by U.S. monopoly's "most effective engines of development."

On August 19, 1975 the Economic Development Administration of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico placed a full page ad in *The New York Times*, featuring Pierre A. Rinfret, president of Rinfret-Boston Associates, Inc., and "one of the nation's most influential business economists." Hailing Puerto Rico as his "standard for judging investment opportunities in the world," Rinfret rhapsodized:

There are things about Puerto Rico which delight me and reinforce my faith in the vibrancy and dynamism of the free enterprise system.

The base, the key, the faith of Puerto Rico is that the private sector can do more to develop the Commonwealth than can government. You will have to admit that sets Puerto Rico apart from most, if not all, countries of the free world. The political leaders of Puerto Rico believe in free enterprise.

They have placed their faith and their future in the free enterprise system.

What does *not* "delight" Rinfret and other monopoly spokesmen about Puerto Rico is the mounting liberation struggles—vibrant testimony that the Puerto Rican people place "their faith and their future" in the fight to oust the "free enterprise system" of the transnational corporations and their national bourgeois enforcers.

That the Kissinger-Moynihan proposals for "modernization" and "development" mean profits for the neo-colonialists and misery for the people is confirmed when Rinfret, as a come-on to investors, states: "When the worldwide recession of 1974-75 hit, it hit Puerto

Rico harder than most." As a result, as the ad puts it, "The people of Puerto Rico need work."

In addition to masses of unemployed, the transnational corporations are offered such other benefits of neo-colonialist "modernization" as "100% exemption from all local taxes," no federal taxes, and a rebate of "up to 25% of your labor costs for the first two years of operation."

"An Unfriendly Act"

When a resolution to discuss Puerto Rican self-determination was presented in the U.N., only days before Kissinger's address to the Seventh Special Session, the representative from Maoist China did not participate in the voting. This non-participation followed a warning from the U.S. representative that his government would consider those voting for the resolution guilty of "an unfriendly act." Obviously, the Maoists who had voted with the U.S. in the U.N. Human Rights Commission against an investigation of the fascist atrocities in Chile would not join in an "unfriendly act" against U.S. imperialism!

Further, one should remember that in the months before the Kissinger-Moynihan proposals were presented to the U.N., the Maoists tried to camouflage the nature of the transnational corporations' demands behind a barrage of anti-Soviet propaganda. At the same time their "neutral" stand on nationalization versus private ownership was designed to undermine "third world" struggles for independence and a non-capitalist path.

However, the mounting fight against the transnational corporations reflected in the Lima Conference of Non-aligned Countries in August, 1975 and in the U.N. special session the following month, have forced the Maoists to make tactical adjustments. Now they are placing a certain rhetorical emphasis on nationalization. But they are accompanying this with intensified efforts to disrupt anti-imperialist unity within the underdeveloped countries, i.e., stepped-up attempts to split these countries from their world allies.

This nullifies even the Maoist rhetoric about nationalization, since only anti-imperialist unity can guarantee that nationalization strengthens an underdeveloped country's sovereignty and economy, rather than solidifying the presence of capital linked to the trans-

national corporations. Thus, whatever their form, Maoist policies support Kissinger in his dictates against "controversy" over the "role and conduct" of the multinational corporations.

Detente, Militarization and Maoism

In the company of the most racist, aggressive sectors of imperialism from Johannesburg to Washington, from Bonn to Tel Aviv, the Maoists ceaselessly oppose the struggle for detente and disarmament.

For example, the July 28, 1975 press release from the U.N. Mission of the People's Republic of China states:

"Detente" and "disarmament" are always on their lips, untire-
somesly chanted, on whatever occasions. Now the Soviet revision-
ists again want to insert this stuff into the African Summit
Conference by way of this "special document," saying that "with-
out the deepening of the process of world detente it is difficult
to talk seriously about problems of the development of the Third
World and establishment of equitable economic relations," and
that the work on disarmament "has no mere importance." One
must ask: when the African peoples are waging a fierce struggle
against colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism, is it possible
for the young African countries to disarm?

It is hardly worth mentioning that this Maoist "quote" from the
"special document" (the Soviet greeting to the OAU) does not
appear in the document itself. What is important is the Maoists'
allegation that the USSR's struggle for detente and an end to the
imperialist-imposed arms race is a call for "young African countries
to disarm."

However, none of the Maoists' endless variations on their anti-
Soviet theme can hide the Soviet Union's record of all-round soli-
darity with "third world" countries. As is well known throughout
the world, the USSR and the socialist camp have been up front
in supplying arms and material to the liberation movements.

While they falsely accuse the USSR of telling the African coun-
tries to disarm, the Maoists not only engage in military intervention
in the former Portuguese colonies with the U.S., NATO and South
Africa. They also encourage the U.S. and NATO to expand mili-
tary bases in Africa, Asia and Latin America. In addition, they

have joined U.S. Defense Secretary Schlesinger and the Pentagon in calling for Japanese remilitarization.

That Maoist opposition to detente, peaceful coexistence and disarmament affects all the class and national liberation struggles is revealed in countless ways. For instance, the money spent annually on the armaments buildup now exceeds the combined incomes of most of the African, Asian and Latin American countries. Those most vulnerable to the consequences of the arms race—increasing unemployment, inflation and poverty, and the widening gap between the underdeveloped and the capitalist countries—are the masses in both the "third world" and the capitalist centers. This is why Maoist opposition to detente and peaceful coexistence makes it the single greatest source of support to the enemies of sovereignty, development and social progress in the "third world."

The Maoists deny the revolutionary connection between the struggle for peaceful coexistence and liberation from neo-colonialism. Instead they call upon the imperialists to expand their economic, political and military operations (of which the transnational corporations are an integral part) in Europe and the "third world" in the name of countering "Soviet expansion."

Yet even bourgeois ideologists will at times acknowledge what Maoist "revolutionaries" persistently deny: the imperialists' motivation for perpetuating the arms race is not "defense against Soviet expansion," but fear that peace and a slowdown in the armaments race would enable the socialist countries to greatly intensify both their internal development and their support to industrial and social advance in the "third world."

That the motivation of those who support the armaments race, with its risk of nuclear disaster, is indeed something other than fear of "Soviet expansion" is revealed in an October 1974 *Foreign Affairs* article:

Most national security policies in today's world are designed not merely to insure the physical survival of individuals within national boundaries, but to assure some minimal expected level of economic *welfare* . . . and a degree of national political *status*. (Emphasis in the original.) Indeed, some national security policies actually *increase the risks to physical survival* in order to insure greater certainty in the enjoyment of economic

welfare, political status and national autonomy. (Emphasis added
-H.W.)

Here we have an admission that the imperialist and Maoist efforts to heat up the armaments race, even though it increases "the risks to physical survival," has nothing to do with "national security" or the masses' "economic welfare" in either the capitalist centers or the "third world." Instead the imperialists aim "to insure greater security" for their continued plunder of the underdeveloped countries, while the Maoists aim at advancing their great power chauvinist goals.

The struggle for peaceful coexistence between the capitalist and socialist countries, and between capitalist and underdeveloped countries, is not only a realizable goal. It is an indivisible part of "third world" struggles for liberation from neo-colonialism. It is, in fact, the starting point for overcoming the widening gap between the underdeveloped countries and the capitalist centers.

The significance "third world" countries attach to the struggle for peaceful coexistence was demonstrated at the Conference of Non-aligned Nations in Lima, Peru in August 1975, which called for:

. . . [strengthening] the coordination and joint actions of the non-aligned countries in order to ensure international peace and security, to eliminate causes of tension, to dismantle military bases, to create peace zones, to encourage total and general disarmament and to strengthen the United Nations.

The Maoists' opposition to peaceful coexistence, detente and disarmament belies the rhetorical "support" they gave the Lima Conference. The position taken by Maoist China's spokesman, Li Chiang, at the U.N. Special Session in September 1975 clashed with the Lima Declaration's call to "eliminate causes of tension" and "encourage total and general disarmament."

Li Chiang, by contrast, declared, "The current international situation is characterized by greater disorder under heaven, and the situation is excellent." Exactly what is it in the "situation" that the Maoists consider "excellent"? Li explains:

. . . the rivalry between the superpowers for world hegemony is becoming ever more acute and extending to every corner of the world . . . aggravating tensions and speeding up their arms

expansion and war preparations, thus causing greater intranquility in Europe and other parts of the world. *The intensifying contention between the superpowers is bound to lead to war some day. This is independent of man's will.* (Emphasis added—H.W.)

In order to allege that events are determined "independent of man's will," the Maoists must conceal the difference between socialism and capitalism. In reality, of course, events are determined in the class struggle, in the mobilization of the "will" of opposing classes.

In obscuring socialism's inherent identity with peaceful goals and the contrasting nature of capitalism, Li attempts to hide the source of the armaments race and the war danger. Further, by linking the USSR with the U.S., Li tries to deny that the unity of the world's anti-imperialist forces can prevent world war. Instead he claims war is inevitable—"independent of man's will."

Li then goes on to say,

As things stand now, there is no "irreversible process of detente" at all, but instead the growing danger of a new world war.

Naturally, Li neglects to mention that the "growing danger of a new world war" has not occurred "independent" of Maoism. On the contrary, the Maoists' "will" has been directed toward disrupting the world forces capable of making peaceful coexistence irreversible. For example, instead of calling upon the peoples of the world to exert their "will" to end the war danger, which would involve nuclear holocaust, Li calls for the following:

The people of all countries must get prepared. However, whether war gives rise to revolution or revolution prevents war, in the end it is the increasingly awakening people of the world . . . and not the one or two superpowers, that determine the destiny of mankind.

What Li projects for the world is the same "solution" a U.S. officer advocated in Vietnam: he wanted to "save" a South Vietnamese village by destroying it. And Li's remarks, like those of the U.S. officer, cannot be interpreted as a momentary rhetorical aberration. Li was expressing official Maoist policy adopted at the Ninth Convention of the Communist Party of China, which stated:

As for the question of world war, there are only two possibil-

itics: either war will cause revolution, or revolution will avert war.

But this "theory" neither advances the struggle for revolution nor helps to avert war! On the contrary, it is designed to demobilize the fight for peace by instilling, in the name of "revolution," an acceptance of the Maoist prediction that war cannot be averted!

The assertion that "war will cause revolution" is *alien* to Marxism-Leninism's scientific, humanist principles. The experience of two world wars has confirmed that the struggle for peace is inseparable from the struggle for class and national liberation. During World War I the October Revolution was led by those who had fought most uncompromisingly against the war. The socialist advances after World War II were also achieved under the leadership of those who had fought relentlessly to prevent war. And these advances would have been incalculably greater if the struggle to prevent fascist aggression through collective security had not been sabotaged by anti-Soviet forces in the West whose role is paralleled today by right social democrats and Maoists under "left" phrases.

As for the second of Maoism's "two possibilities," to claim that "revolution will avert war" is to narrow and disrupt instead of advance the unity of those increasingly vast numbers of people who see that the war danger, racism, repression and the economic crisis demand great anti-monopoly formations.

To say that "war will cause revolution" or that "revolution will avert war" is to betray Marxist-Leninist principles. For example, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935 had this to say on the struggle for peace:

Any concession to . . . those elements who desire the outbreak of war, even though they mask their opportunism by revolutionary phrases, can only isolate us from the masses. Moreover, we already know by experience that all those who, within the ranks of the working class movement, exalted imperialist war as a means of paving the way to revolution have in the long run inevitably severed their connections with the working class and are today in the camp of fascism. (*VII Congress of the Communist International*. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1939. Page 417.)

Maoism not only exalts war "as a means of paving the way

to revolution." It has also become a major *instigator* of world war, operating as an advance contingent in imperialism's anti-Soviet, neo-colonialist strategy. Thus, Maoist treason exceeds even that of the "revolutionaries" in Hitler's time who made concessions to the forces that wanted war.

Today, on the issue of war or peace, there is a chilling similarity between the "thought of Mao" and Hitler's thoughts. Like Hitler, the Maoists aim at inculcating massive acceptance of the idea that war is inevitable. Like Hitler, the Maoists couple this strategy with the big lie of a Soviet "threat." In fact, the Maoists describe the country that saved the world from Hitler fascism in the same way the Nazis did to prepare the way for fascism and war.

Speaking of the Soviet "enemy," Hitler said:

Our moral concepts are diametrically opposed to those of Soviet Russia . . . National-Socialism has saved Germany and, probably, Europe from the greatest catastrophe of all time . . . National-Socialism cannot call upon its German fellow countrymen, the adherents of National-Socialism, to support a system which in our own country we consider our most mortal enemy. (Quoted in *VII Congress of the Communist International*, Page 401.)

It is time to consider the meaning of Maoist "moral conceptions" that portray the first land of socialism as the "mortal enemy." And it is time to realize that such "moral conceptions" could plunge the world into a catastrophe indescribably greater than that in Hitler's time. Mao himself revealed the logic of his "moral conceptions" at the meeting in Moscow of the Communist and Workers Parties in 1957, when he said:

Is it possible to estimate the number of human victims a future war could cause? Yes, it is, it will perhaps be one-third of the 2,700 million population of the whole world, that is, only 900 million people. . . I argued over the issue with Nehru. In this respect he is more pessimistic than I am. I am told that if one-half of mankind were destroyed, there would still remain the other half, but then imperialism would be completely wiped out and only socialism would remain all over the world, and that within half a century or a full century the population will once again increase even more than by half as much again.

After Mao's views were met with shocked repudiation by the Communist and Workers Parties, the Maoists accelerated their

struggle against those in the Communist Party of China who remained true to Marxism-Leninism. In this way they prepared for an open break with socialist principles in China and on a world scale.

Over the years the Soviet Union has continued to respond to Mao's "moral conceptions." For example:

... has anyone asked the Chinese people who are being doomed to death in advance about whether they agree to be the firewood in the furnace of a nuclear missile war; have they empowered the leadership of the People's Republic of China to issue their burial certificates in advance?

Another question also arises. If, according to the Chinese leaders' forecasts, roughly one-half of the population of such a big country as China is destroyed in a thermonuclear war, how many men will die in countries whose populations do not run to hundreds of millions but to tens or to simply millions of people? It is, after all, quite obvious that many countries and peoples would find themselves entirely within that half of mankind which the Chinese leaders are prepared to scrap from the human race. Who then has given the Chinese leaders the right to make free with these people's destinies or to speak on their behalf?

Who has given the Chinese leaders the right to denigrate the ultimate goal of the international working class movement—the triumph of labor over capital—by making assertions that the way to it runs through world thermonuclear war and that it is worth sacrificing one-half of the globe's population in order to build a higher civilization on the corpses and ruins? This conception has nothing in common with Marxist-Leninist doctrine. We oppose this bestial conception. We have carried on and are carrying on a tireless struggle for the triumph of Marxist-Leninist ideas, for the emancipation of the peoples from all exploitation and oppression, and for the triumph of labor over capital, with the use of methods which are worthy of the great humanistic ideals of socialism and communism. (Soviet Government statement, *Pravda*, August 21, 1963.)

"Second World," "Second Arrowhead"

The direct connection between Mao's speech at the 1957 Moscow meeting and the Maoists' current policies is revealed both

in Li Chiang's address to the September 1975 session of the U.N. and in Mao's special relationship with Franz Josef Strauss.

Li Chiang urges the "people of all countries" not to fight for peace, but to "get prepared" for war against the Soviet "superpower." Strauss, who speaks for the same German monopolists that helped put Hitler in power, also demands intensified anti-Soviet preparations. He says that the U.S. should make Europe a "second arrowhead of NATO." (*Herausforderung und Antwort*, by Franz Josef Strauss, Stuttgart, 1968. Page 174.)

The identity of the Maoists' "second world" strategy with Strauss' "second arrowhead" seals the anti-Soviet alliance between the ultra-rightists and the ultra-"revolutionary" Maoists. Thus, according to the latest "thought of Mao," power comes not "out of the barrel of a gun" but out of nuclear "arrowheads" carrying the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

When the Maoists assert that revolution is the only way to avert war, they are telling the masses to stand aside and let the imperialists decide the question of war or peace. Since they attempt to place this matter in the hands of imperialism, it is only logical that they consider it inevitable. But not only do the Maoists declare that war is bound to come. They exalt it as in the interests of humanity by saying "war gives rise to revolution." By proclaiming the "revolutionary" value of war, the Maoists seek to disrupt the world struggle for detente and peaceful coexistence, which can make the international struggles for class and national liberation irreversible.

The Maoists are escalating their opposition to peaceful coexistence when it is more than ever bound up with averting nuclear disaster, and with turning back the imperialists' attempts to deal with the crisis of capitalism at the expense of the peoples of the capitalist centers and underdeveloped countries.

The indivisible struggle for peace, liberation and social progress can be won only by countering the Maoists' divisive concepts. Anti-imperialist unity can and must be forged on a vastly greater scale than during the war in Indochina, when the heroic peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia triumphed over U.S. aggression with the support of the socialist camp, the "third world" and the masses in the U.S. and other capitalist countries.

From the very start of U.S. intervention in Vietnam, Maoist China and its disciples in the U.S. and elsewhere ranged themselves with reaction in endless attacks on the mounting peace movements. During this period of more than a decade of U.S. escalation in Vietnam, Maoism escalated its assaults against those fighting for anti-imperialist unity with the Indochinese peoples, camouflaging its disruption behind rhetoric about "Soviet revisionism."

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries took the lead in providing material support to the Indochinese liberation struggles, while at the same time tirelessly forging unity with the movements to end the aggression and to enforce the Indochinese peoples' right to self-determination, which is synonymous with the right to peaceful coexistence.

Maoism, indifferent to the human and material consequences of prolonged aggression, countered this worldwide solidarity with its "self-reliance" and "protracted guerilla war" slogans, each designed for a particular purpose: the "protracted guerilla war" theme was used to disguise the Maoists' complicity in protracting U.S. aggression by rejecting joint anti-imperialist action, while the substitution of "self-reliance" for solidarity was the cover for trying to split the Asian, African and Latin American liberation struggle from the socialist camp and the international working classes.

"Self-Reliance," Solidarity and the "Third World"

My purpose in reviewing the Maoists' treason during the war in Indochina is not only for understanding the past. Rather it is to examine how these same Maoist policies affect the present.

For example, the Maoists' "two superpowers" rhetoric, their renewed calls for "self-reliance" and virulent opposition to peaceful coexistence are synchronized with the post-Vietnam strategy of the U.S. and its NATO and Japanese imperialist partners to recoup and expand control over the "third world." As expressed in the Moynihan-Kissinger doctrine, the main role in carrying out this greatly intensified offensive against the underdeveloped countries has been assigned to the transnational corporations. It is in this context that the Maoists prescribe "self-reliance" as the solution for the "third world."

Taken only at face value, the Maoists' "self-reliance" slogan demonstrates their colossal arrogance. Imagine, preaching "self-reliance" to the Vietnamese and other "third world" peoples who have survived the ravages of centuries of colonialism only because of their boundless capacity for "self-reliance!"

Now we are living in an era in which the new socialist system has brought class and national liberation to a great part of the earth, an era in which proletarian internationalism between the socialist camp, the international working class and the liberation struggles is decisive. For the Maoists to talk of "self-reliance" while opposing the reciprocal reliance of anti-imperialist solidarity is to betray the cause of class and national liberation. True self-reliance—the self-action of each contingent in the world revolutionary process—is the basis for united action against imperialism. But to proclaim self-reliance as a *substitute* for solidarity is to yield to imperialist domination by attempting to undermine the struggle against it.

No wonder *The New York Times*, the leading ideological organ of U.S. imperialism, has taken such a liking to Maoism. "... Mao is the greatest social revolutionary in history," writes *Times* Associate Editor Tom Wicker. "He knows the only revolution is permanent revolution—against the society revolution creates, as much as against the one it overthrows." (*A Time To Die*, by Tom Wicker. Quadrangle-NYT Book Co., N.Y., 1975. Page 256.)

It is worth noting that the *Times* didn't nominate Mao as "the greatest social revolutionary in history" until he turned against revolutionary principles. Now Mao has found his place among imperialism's favorites—just as has Moynihan, monopoly's favorite sociologist.

Maoist-Style "Self-Reliance" and Reparations

How does Maoist-style "self-reliance" apply, for example, to the present situation of the Vietnamese people?

At this time, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam is demanding that the U.S., whose destruction of Vietnam is unparalleled, live up to its pledge of reparations under the Paris Agreements. The U.S. is not only violating this pledge, but has

placed an embargo on U.S. trade with both the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. It has also vetoed membership for both in the U.N.

The Vietnamese get no support from Maoist China in their demand for reparations. Further, the Maoists undermine the fight to end the embargo by their ceaseless opposition to detente, i.e., peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial trade. Although both the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam have declared their readiness to enter into normal trade and diplomatic relations with the U.S., the Maoists tell them and the other peoples of the "third world" that it is not possible to "indulge in detente with colonialists."

For 15 years the Maoists have also done all they could to disrupt solidarity with Cuba's struggle against the U.S. embargo. This too has been carried out in the name of "self-reliance" and opposition to detente.

One must ask: in what way do these Maoist actions assist the underdeveloped nations in their struggle for sovereignty, equitable access to world trade, and all-round development free from the dictates of the transnational corporations?

The answer to that question is coming with increasing frequency from the "third world" peoples themselves. For example, the Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean, meeting in Havana in June 1975, issued a document, "Latin America in The Struggle Against Imperialism, For National Independence, Democracy, People's Welfare, Peace and Socialism," which declared:

This Conference energetically condemns the foreign policy of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, which flirts with Yankee imperialism, defends its presence in Asia and in Europe, justifies NATO, stimulates West-German imperialism and revanchism, attacks and slanders the USSR with the same viciousness of the worst spokesmen of international reaction, fosters the aggressive militarism of the world bourgeoisie against it, promotes the insane policy of cold war against the heroic Soviet people, and in Latin America has its most ominous expression in the shameless connivance with the Chilean military junta to which it gives political support over the blood of thousands of Communists, Socialists, and other patriots murdered

by the brutal repression of the fascist tyranny. The Chinese leadership also fosters everywhere groups of pseudo-revolutionaries who, from a false radicalism, divide the Left, attack the Communist Parties, obstruct progressive processes and frequently act as enemy agents within the revolutionary movement.

To confront this policy of treason against unity, solidarity and the best traditions of the world revolutionary movement is a duty for all the Communist Parties of Latin America.

The Maoists' Claim to "Third World" Status

The Maoists try to make it appear that their exhortations to the underdeveloped countries have a special legitimacy because they claim for China a place in the "third world." Quite aside from the fact that Maoist policies put China on a collision course with "third world" interests, this claim is based on fiction.

The distinguishing feature of "third world" countries is that they have been colonized but have never been colonizers. Their underdevelopment has resulted primarily from the domination of external exploiters and oppressors. This gives their claim for redress from the colonizers a unique and unchallengeable validity. It makes their cause a central issue in the U.N. and in the world anti-imperialist struggles.

Maoists pretend that like the "third world" nations China was colonized but was never a colonizer. In reality, China colonized and oppressed peoples (within and beyond its borders) over longer periods in history than any other country, and remained a colonizer right up into modern times.

At the same time it is true that in the late 19th century the expanding capitalist empires seized enclaves in China, humiliating and plundering the country. But it is also true that each successive Han Chinese ruling class accepted this state of affairs and shared control with external oppressors. This is the way the Han rulers maintained their domination over the many peoples of China through successive historical periods. Maoist great power chauvinist goals have their roots in the past.

Today the Maoist military-bureaucratic regime has temporarily defeated working class power and revived Han chauvinism in order to maintain control in China and advance its greater power chauvinist goals beyond its borders. And to accomplish this it is giving

its support to the U.S., the world's leading neo-colonialist power.

Thus, the dual nature of China's history contradicts the common experience of the "third world" countries as the victims of colonialism but never themselves colonialists. That the Maoists deny the colonializing aspects of their history is in itself an indictment of their great power chauvinism. An example is the thousand-year Vietnamese resistance to Chinese domination. In fabricating a fictional past they place themselves in the company of the most racist, aggressive sectors of U.S. and world imperialism who pretend they have never been colonizers.

Moreover, in their special relationship with Franz Josef Strauss the Maoists support the West German monopolists who cover up German imperialism's crimes, including those of Hitlerism. They do so in order to advance, even at the risk of nuclear disaster, their current aims: restoring monopoly capitalism in that area of the former German state that is now the German Democratic Republic.

Unlike the Maoists, the Marxist-Leninist leaders of the GDR and the USSR have acknowledged the racism and chauvinism of the German and Russian empires. They abolished the sources of racism and oppression when the peoples of Russia abolished the Russian empire and when monopoly capitalism was abolished in a part of the former German empire.

Socialist Versus Capitalist Development

When the Maoists speak of "two superpowers" and "the new Czars in the Kremlin," their attack is not only against the Soviet Union. The stratagem this rhetoric expresses is of particular danger to the "third world" peoples. Seeking to isolate the "third world" from the socialist camp, the Maoists promote disruption of the anti-imperialist solidarity which the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America rightfully expect from all who claim to be on the side of liberation, particularly at a time when neo-colonialism is mounting a renewed offensive against them.

Those who rant about "the new Czars in the Kremlin" do so in an attempt to construe the Soviet Union's unprecedented socialist development as the basis for placing it in the same category as the developed capitalist centers.

The capitalist countries' development is, of course, based on centuries-long plunder of most of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Now capitalism seeks at one pole to maintain development in and domination through its own centers, and at the other pole to perpetuate underdevelopment and superexploitation in the "third world." At the same time the counterpart to this occurs within the capitalist countries in the contradiction between increasing impoverishment of the masses and monopoly's enrichment.

The Maoists' ever more virulent anti-Soviet rhetoric aims to obscure the most significant new feature in the world today: the basic class, social and economic differences accounting for the rapid development of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, as compared to the methods of capitalist development.

In equating socialist and capitalist development, the Maoists assist the neo-colonialist efforts to divert attention from the struggles of the underdeveloped countries. These countries, supported by the socialist camp, demand that the imperialist plunderers relinquish some of what they've stolen for centuries to help overcome the economic backwardness for which they are responsible.

The underdeveloped countries are struggling for a "new international order," an end to dependence on neo-colonialism and for rapid "third world" development. Anti-imperialist unity, which Maoism would undermine, is the precondition for this "new international order." Only such unity can compel the U.S. and its partners to take at least minimum steps toward equitable relations with the underdeveloped countries. Nothing short of socialism can bring a full solution for "third world" countries, but every advance in the direction of equality and social progress speeds the day of that full solution.

Maoist deception can never obscure the fact that after the October Revolution the former Czarist Russian nation, led by the Communist Party, established a new proletarian international order: the working class in power in the formerly oppressor nation voluntarily reversed what had been the relationship between imperialist Russia and the oppressed nations in the Czarist empire. For an extended transitional period the new Soviet government, guided by Leninist internationalism, decreed preferential economic and social action for these underdeveloped nations. As a result the gap

was wiped out between the social and economic development of Russia and the Central Asian and other formerly oppressed peoples in the USSR. This was the starting point from which the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp have become a world system in which all the nations are equal participants, standing in solidarity with all anti-imperialist forces in this era of transition to world socialism.

Of the meaning of socialist development to the "third world," the Conference of Latin American and Caribbean Communist Parties stated:

... the Soviet Union and Cuba—just to mention two different experiences in regard to extension and geographic location—have given the example of progressive economic development, in spite of external aggressions, blockade and the attempt to maintain technological backwardness with which more than half a century ago they attempted to stifle newly born socialism; means used even today in the attempts to stop revolutionary Cuba. There is not one single case of successful economic and social development in the countries of Asia, Africa or Latin America among those which have tried to accomplish it through the traditional ways of capitalist development.

DAILY WORLD

Continuing the Daily Worker, founded 1924

- Daily news of the people's movements
- Life in the socialist countries
- Viewpoints of the Communist Party

Published 5 times a week, including weekend edition
with **World Magazine**

15 cents weekdays; 25 cents for weekend edition

Subscription rates:

1 year—daily _____	\$20.00	1 year—weekend only _____	\$8.00
6 months—daily _____	\$12.00	3 months—weekend only _____	\$2.00

DAILY WORLD

205 West 19 Street • 9th Floor • New York, NY 10011

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Monthly theoretical journal of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Analysis and discussion of important issues of today from the
viewpoint of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Subscription rates:

1 year _____	\$10.00	6 months _____	\$5.00
2 Years _____	\$19.00	Single copies _____	\$1.00

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

23 West 26 Street • New York, NY 10010

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

**Monthly theoretical and information journal of the
Communist and Workers' Parties**

50¢ per copy Subscriptions: 1 year \$5.00; 2 years \$9.00

North American edition distributed in the United States by:

IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS

320 West Ohio Street • Chicago, IL 60610

NEW OUTLOOK pamphlets can be obtained at the following bookstores:

BALTIMORE

New Era Book Shop, 408 Park Ave.

BOSTON (CAMBRIDGE)

Center for Marxist Education, 550 Massachusetts Ave., 2nd floor

BUFFALO

The People's Bookstore, 9 W. Northrup Pl.

CHICAGO

Guild Bookstore, 1188 W. Webster St.

Modern Book Store, 2220 N. Broadway

CLEVELAND

The Book Mark, 10011 Euclid Ave.

DETROIT

Global Books, 4418 2nd Ave.

LONG BEACH, CA

The International Book Shop, 4120 E. Anaheim St.

LOS ANGELES

Progressive Bookshop, 1506 W. 7th St.

MEMPHIS

Community Bookshop, 1907 Madison Ave.

MILWAUKEE

Solidarity Bookshop & Center, 2921 W. Clybourn St.

MINNEAPOLIS

Bookways, 1929 Chicago Ave., Suite 1

NEWARK

People's Book Store, 83 Halsey St.

NEW HAVEN

New World Bookstore, 37 Howe St.

NEW YORK

Benjamin J. Davis Bookshop, 2717 8th Ave., near 145 St.

Jefferson Bookshop, 100 E. 16 St., near Union Square East

PHILADELPHIA

W.E.B. Du Bois Bookstore, 2247 N. Broad St.

PITTSBURGH

Carsethers & Foster Book Center, 217 $\frac{1}{2}$ Atwood St.

ST. LOUIS

W.E.B. Du Bois Bookstore, 4426 Olive St.

SAN ANTONIO

All Points of View, P.O. Box 321, San Antonio, TX 78292

SAN FRANCISCO

The Book Center, 172 Turk St.

SAN JOSE

Bread & Roses Bookshop, 136 S. 1st St.

SEATTLE

Co-op Books, 710 Stewart St.

S. CHARLESTON, WV

The Book Mine, P.O. Box 8715, S. Charleston, WV 25303

TUCSON, AZ

Campana Books, 601 S. 5th Ave.

WASHINGTON

Claudia Jones Bookstore, 2327 18th St., N.W.

NEW from INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

THE CRISIS OF U.S. CAPITALISM AND THE FIGHT-BACK

by GUS HALL

Report by the General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. to the Party's 21st National Convention in Chicago, June 26-30, 1975. Presents the current analysis and policies of the CPUSA on major world and domestic developments. Discusses the crises of U.S. and world capitalism, new victories over imperialism, domestic trends and mass movements, the working class and the Communist Party.

96 pages, paper—\$1.00

At bookstores or order from

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 Park Avenue South • New York, N.Y. 10016

Add 25¢ postage for each book;

New York residents also include sales tax.

WRITE FOR COMPLETE CATALOG