



**In Defense of the  
Revolutionary  
Foreign Policy  
of the  
People's Republic  
of China**

**(An Exposure of Toufahn's Opportunism)**

**by former members and supporters  
of Toufahn Organization**

---

Boxholder  
P. O. Box 5478  
Chicago, Illinois  
60680 U.S.A.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface .....	1
Opportunism subscribes to any formula .....	2
<i>Toufahn</i> opportunists and the strategic concept of the three worlds .....	5
<i>Toufahn</i> defends "gang of four" .....	8
<i>Toufahn's</i> revisionist style of work .....	10
Explanatory note .....	13
The concept of three worlds .....	14
Rise of the third world .....	17
Motives for third world struggle .....	24
The United States and the EEC .....	26
Relations between second and third world countries .....	28
Soviet Union: Dictatorship of a Hitler type .....	31
Revival of Munich policy .....	34
Appeasement forces in the U.S. ....	37
China follows a Leninist policy .....	38
Necessary compromises .....	40
Revisionist distortions .....	41
A perspective of the coming war .....	42
Our international tasks .....	43
Targets of revolution in Iran .....	43
Iranian government's foreign policy .....	44

## PREFACE

This pamphlet, "In Defense of the Revolutionary Foreign Policy of the People's Republic of China (An Exposure of *Toufahn's* Opportunism)," which is now being made available to the Iranian Marxist-Leninist movement and all the revolutionaries of our country is in fact the last paper that was submitted by us to the leadership of *Toufahn* in mid-1976. It was written after many years of struggle on the question of the international situation and the foreign policy of the People's Republic of China.

This struggle dates back to the early part of 1971 when the People's Republic of China opened up diplomatic relations with a number of countries, including Iran. At that time, influenced by revisionist propaganda and the objections that were raised by certain bourgeois nationalist forces against such relations, *Toufahn's* leadership voiced criticism for the simple reason that it was opposed to such relations despite its double-talk of support.

In the article "Shah and the People's Republic of China," (*Toufahn* no. 45), they expressed dismay at the fact that Ashraf\* Pahlavi had been invited to China to prepare for diplomatic relations, and under the pretext that she "has no official position in the Iranian Government," what they really did was to champion the "suppressed right" of Premier Hoveyda! For these radical democrats how and by whom these relations were established was more important than for the People's Republic of China to emerge as a powerful force in the international arena and break the *cordón sanitaire* which was imposed for over twenty years by imperialism

\*Sister of the Shah. She played a direct role in the CIA coup of 1953.

and its lackeys.

In addition to the above article, the leadership of *Toufahn* sent a confidential letter of protest to the Government of the People's Republic of China. At that time we criticized their unprincipled action.

At the time we believed that this stand of the leadership was merely an error that emanated from a formalistic and shallow view of how international relations are carried out between countries. But as time went by, it became obvious that it was not merely a transitory error, but the beginnings of an opportunist trend which developed as the international situation changed.

↑ in the last few years this trend found eclectic expression in the organ and other documents of this organization, now it is a complete line which in different ways, overtly and covertly, attacks Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought.

### OPPORTUNISM SUBSCRIBES TO ANY FORMULA

Lenin says: "... it is difficult to catch an opportunist with a formula.. An opportunist will readily put his name to any formula and as readily abandon it, because opportunism means precisely a lack of definite and firm principles." (*What Is To Be Done?*) The opportunists of *Toufahn* are no exception to this rule. The leadership of this organization has taken numerous contradictory positions in the past few years. Here we only review a few of them.

In the not too distant past, the leadership of *Toufahn* correctly subscribed to the view that the third world is strongly resisting the two superpowers:

"The Soviet-U.S. contention is the cause of world intransquillity... it has met with strong resistance from the third world and has caused resentment on the part of Japan and Western European countries." (*Toufahn* no. 73, p. 3)

Later, in another issue of *Toufahn* they wrote the following about the struggle of the third world:

"... Some third world countries which were fed up with the uninterrupted maneuvers of the fleets and spy ships of great powers in their territorial waters, and were resentful of the continuing plunder of their sea resources by the imperialists rose up to defend their rights and called for an urgent convening of an international conference to establish a more equitable law of the seas." (*Toufahn* no. 86, p. 3)

But today they avoid these correct views with the same care that a thief avoids the place where he has committed a theft.

Nowadays, due to their political retrogression, they hush up the question of third world struggles, label it as illusory and describe the third world concept as unscientific.

Moreover, in the past they regarded People's China as a third world country. For instance, in the same above-mentioned article they write:

"The united and powerful front of China and other third world countries finally broke up the united stand of the Soviet Union and the United States." (*ibid.*)

But today, they suddenly make an about-face and write:

"We cannot subscribe to the view that regards the People's Republic of China along with South Korea, Iran, Indonesia, etc., as a 'developing' or 'third world' country." ("For the Unity of Thought and Action" \*\* no. 19, p. 16)

Until recently, they spoke of second world unity and its united struggle against the two superpowers and considered such unity as a factor in the struggle against superpower hegemonism and a blow to their policies of control and interference. For example, in the article "Britain's Entry Into the Common Market," here is how they endorsed the unity of European countries:

"With the relative strengthening of the common Market countries and the weakening of U.S. imperialism, the trend has become increasingly evident in which these countries strengthen their 'union' politically so as to jointly oppose the power politics of U.S. imperialism and domination and control by the two overlords---the United States and the Soviet Union...."

"The admission of Britain and other countries into the Common Market will mean further development of the economic and then the defence and diplomatic union of West European countries against the superpowers' control and interference. This is another harsh blow to the tottering hegemony of U.S. imperialism in Western Europe and has further isolated it." (*Toufahn*, fifth year, p. 9)

But today, when Western Europe is increasingly coming under attack by the two superpowers, particularly the Soviet social-fascists, they don a "left" uniform with a Soviet lining and cover up the Soviet threat of aggression by quoting Lenin and engaging in idle talk. They even go so far as to defend the Soviet's European plan by saying:

"The unity of imperialist Europe, supposing such a unity can be realized at all, is a reactionary unity, detrimental to the proletariat

\*\*This is the name of *Toufahn's* internal publication. From here on we shall refer to it as "internal publication."

and all the working people of Europe and the world." (Internal publication no. 18, p. 3)

Here, under the guise of "defending" the interests of the proletariat, and by dragging the "proletariat and all the working people of Europe and the world" into the picture, what these people are after is to cover up superpower hegemonism against which the collective unity of Europe is directed.

At a time when the Soviet Union, in one way or the other, is trying to keep European countries off-guard so as to smash them one by one and finally bring all of Europe under its domination, can the slogan, "countries of Europe, disperse!" have any other meaning but a call to the Soviet Union to invade? No. The proletariat of Europe knows the Europe of trusts, and will continue to struggle against them so as to realize socialism. However, at a time when the danger of Soviet military aggression against Europe is becoming more and more serious, it will never follow the new Tzars' slogan of "countries of Europe, disperse!"

But *Toufahn's* political flip-flops do not end here. Sometimes the leadership of *Toufahn* speaks of the decline of U.S. imperialism and the rapid decline of its hegemony in the West and the world:

"The course of development and prospects of West-European Common Market indicates the rapid decline of U.S. imperialist hegemony in the Western world." (*Toufahn*, fifth year, p.9)

Or,  
"...U.S. imperialism started to go downhill after its defeat in the war of aggression in Korea. It has openly admitted that it is increasingly on the decline: it could not but pull out of Vietnam." (*Toufahn*, no. 73, p.3)

Or,  
"The deepening dollar crisis reflects the rapid decline of the 'dollar empire,' the United States." (*Toufahn*, no. 61, p.4)

But a moment later, with a righteous look on their faces they preach:  
"U.S. imperialism is a 'superpower' and superpower has a meaning; it is not a declining power." (Internal publication no. 19, p.13)

How strange! So, a superpower cannot be a declining power, but at the same time can be a power that is declining rapidly?! "What kind of a loathsome figure and nauseous sight is that!"

They also have a confused view of the same third world struggle which they were supporting up until yesterday. In answering one of our letters, they write:

"You are of the opinion that the steps which the OPEC member-

states take should be supported as a whole. But such support on the part of our organization or that of any other Iranian revolutionary force is tantamount to supporting the Shah, especially at a time when he is portraying himself as an anti-imperialist fighter and leader of OPEC member-states by doing propaganda works at home and particularly abroad." (Internal publication no. 19, p.17)

In deriding such vulgar, quasi-arguments Lenin wrote:  
"This is something like the caricature of the Russian Marxists which the Narodniks drew in 1894-95. They argued: if the Marxists believe that capitalism is inevitable, that it is progressive, then they ought to open a tavern and begin to implant capitalism!" (Collected Works, Vol. 22, p.270)

Now the opportunists of *Toufahn* draw such a caricature of Iranian Marxists. But these opportunists are in fact "mere brawlers, who by dint of repeating year after year the same set of stereotyped declamations against the government of the day, have sneaked into the reputation of revolutionists of the first water." (Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France*) However, by repeating such declamations about the Shah and his propaganda, they cannot relieve themselves of the disturbing question of third world struggles in general and the OPEC in particular.

From what has been outlined one should not conclude that these examples are isolated, without any connection. In fact, what connects them is the rotten line of conciliation towards and backing down from the necessary, all-round struggle against Soviet social-imperialism.

It is this opportunist line which compels *Toufahn* to subscribe to different formulas and abandon them just as easily and aim its attacks against the glorious Communist Party of China which particularly emphasizes the grave danger of the aggressive and expansionist Soviet social-imperialism. And finally, it is this opportunist line which drives them into opposition against the struggles of the third world countries and the collective resistance of the second world countries which is directed against superpower hegemonism and the threat of Soviet military aggression in particular.

### TOUFANH OPPORTUNISTS AND THE STRATEGIC CONCEPT OF THREE WORLDS

Comrade Mao Tsetung made a penetrating analysis of all the basic contradictions of our time and the division and realignment of all the political forces in the world and advanced his strategic concept of the three worlds and thus, in the international class struggle,

answered the question of who are our friends and who are our enemies. This concept provides orientation for the workers and oppressed peoples and nations in their fight in the realm of international class struggle.

Comrade Mao Tse Tung pointed out that the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, which belong to the first world, are the biggest exploiters and oppressors of the contemporary era and the source of a new world war. The developed countries of the second world oppress and exploit the third world countries, while at the same time they are oppressed, exploited, controlled and threatened by the superpowers. The third world countries which are oppressed and exploited by colonialism and imperialism are the main force in opposing imperialism hegemonism of the superpowers in particular.

The revolutionary foreign policy of the People's Republic of China is based on this strategic concept of comrade Mao Tse Tung. This analysis is a powerful weapon which gives Marxist-Leninists strength and vigor, but brings shudders to and horrifies all revisionists and opportunists. Our indigenous revisionists and opportunists are no exception either.

The opportunist leadership of *Toufahn* wrote a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in November, 1975. This letter appeared in the internal publication no. 18 under the false title of "The Views of Toufahn Organization on the International Line." In this letter, after slandering the French Marxist-Leninists for treason and collaboration with their "own" bourgeoisie, they singled out comrade Mao Tse Tung's strategic concept of the three worlds as the source of a "neo-revisionist" line in the international communist movement and concluded that:

"To put it openly, we have to say that we are dealing with a new revisionism, one which has taken upon itself to defend the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie of the United States and Western Europe and its dependent world reaction against the onslaught of Soviet social-imperialism. If the Khrushchevite revisionists cover up their counter-revolutionary and capitulationist aims and do not openly defend their own bourgeoisie, the new revisionism is defending the interests of imperialist bourgeoisie openly, covertly an blunty, and, what is more, it even portrays this as genuine Marxism-Leninism." (Internal publication no. 18, p.3)

But the out-and-out reactionary content of this letter is nothing new. They are the same slanders which have been coined in Moscow and circulated among the revisionists and now flow from the pens of *Toufahn* opportunists. These distortions are aimed at no-

thing else but to cover up the fascist nature of the new Tzars.

Here it should be pointed out that the contents of this letter were drawn up and forwarded to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China behind the backs of the rank and file. They were informed after the letter had been sent. Nonetheless we lodged a strong protest in writing.

The opportunists of *Toufahn* and the revisionists of the central committee of Tudeh Party of Iran both attack the strategic concept of the three worlds with amazingly similar formulas. The opportunists of *Toufahn* wrote:

"As a consequence of the division of the world into 'three worlds,' there is not a word about socialist countries or the world of socialism." (Internal publication no. 19, p. 16)

The revisionists of Tudeh Party have not said and do not say anything different:

"According to Peking's tableau, the contemporary world looks as follows: 'first world'---'two superpowers'---the Soviet Union and the United States; 'third world'---the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and other regions; 'second world'---the developed countries which are 'between first world and third world.. (For the Maoists the question as to whether these countries have a socialist or a capitalist social system is absolutely of no significance.)" (Donya, Political and Theoretical Organ of the Central Committee of the Tudeh Party of Iran, December 1975, no. 10, p. 43)

But this is not the only question on which they have unity. The opportunists of *Toufahn* and the revisionists of the Central Committee of the Tudeh Party both consider transition from capitalism to socialism to be the fundamental content of the contemporary era. In their programme, the revisionists of Tudeh Party write: "The fundamental content of contemporary era is the transition from capitalism to socialism." (The Programme of the Tudeh Party of Iran, Section 2, p. 6)

*Toufahn*, too, does not say anything different. Consider the following:

"Our world is a world in transition from capitalism to socialism." (Internal publication no. 19, p. 16) In other words, the contradiction between socialism and imperialism is the focus of the class struggle internationally. In this way, the revisionists of Tudeh Party and the opportunists of *Toufahn* both distort the nature of the contemporary era and thereby negate national liberation struggles and the struggle of the third world against imperialism and superpower hegemonism. It is not surprising, therefore, that both of them at-

tack the strategic concept of Mao Tsetung which considers the third world as the main force in the struggle against imperialism.

In another place, the opportunists of *Toufahn* repeated the renowned revisionist slander and in a reply to us wrote:

"It has to be said that you base yourself on the foreign policy of the People's Republic of China, analyze the world accordingly, and as a result, alter the order of the contradictions and tamper with the question of friends and enemies. We have tried to avoid this and, instead, analyze Iran and the world on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles and in accordance with the concrete conditions." (Internal publication no. 19, p. 18)

You accuse us of defending the revolutionary foreign policy of the People's Republic of China. You honor us with this accusation. The fact that we have been able to do our share in defending Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought fills us with pride. But let us see the outcome of your brand of "Marxism-Leninism" with which you plume yourselves.

About six years ago, the revisionists of Tudeh Party wrote the following about the foreign policy of the People's Republic of China:

"If today it is at times difficult for some people to understand the reactionary nature of these policies or if it is sometimes difficult to prove it, tomorrow the problem will be very easy... We are confident that such a day, no matter how far, distant or difficult it may be, will surely arrive." (the monthly *Mardome* no. 74, Mehr 1350---September 1971)

And now, after six-odd years, that "far, distant, and difficult day" has finally arrived for you. That is why today you write:

"We are of the opinion that the foreign policy of China has to change and will change." (Internal publication no. 19, p. 19) Such is the outcome of your brand of "Marxism-Leninism." But your wish, which, by the way, is also the common wish of all the revisionists, will never be realized.

## TOUFAHN DEFENDS GANG OF FOUR

After the passing away of comrade Mao Tsetung, the great teacher and leader of the proletariat and the peoples of the world, the Wang-Chang-Chiang-Yao Trotskyite anti-party clique rose up to usurp party and state power. This clique which had been criticized

by Mao Tsetung many times in the past, immediately went into action after Mao Tsetung's demise, thinking the time was right for them to realize their counterrevolutionary plot.

This anti-party gang engaged in sabotaging socialist construction and the dictatorship of the proletariat, interfered with might and main with the implementation of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in both domestic and foreign affairs and was out to overthrow all the veteran cadres who were loyal to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. The struggle against the "gang of four" was a life-and-death struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism and between Marxism and revisionism.

If the "gang of four" had succeeded in usurping party and state power, all the victories won by the Chinese people under Mao Tsetung's leadership in the new democratic revolution, in the socialist revolution and construction, and in the period of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution would all be gone by the wind. With their success, the Communist Party of China would have been turned into a revisionist and a fascist party and the revolutionary color of China would have been changed completely.

But in this crucial juncture, when the "gang of four" was out to play havoc, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, headed by comrade Hua Kuo-Feng, smashed the counter-revolutionary plot of the "gang of four" with one blow, thus safeguarding and continuing the revolution and realizing the revolutionary aspirations of 800 million Chinese people.

People of the world will never forget the meritorious contribution of comrade Hua Kuo-Feng, the great Marxist-Leninist who was personally selected by Chairman Mao Tsetung, in saving socialism and safeguarding and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This victory was not solely a victory for the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China. It was at the same time a great victory for the oppressed peoples and nations of the world and for the entire international communist movement. All Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations throughout the world welcomed this victory. Only a handful of opportunists who had put all their hopes in this anti-party gang kept silent, while covertly expressing dismay at their purge. *Toufahn* was one such opportunist.

In an internal document dated October 21, 1976, they wrote: "Our organization considers the events that are taking place inside Communist Party of China as the internal struggle of that party and, for this very reason, has never discussed and judged the

political line and policies of the People's Republic of China." (emphasis added.)

Could the "gang of four" be defended any better? "Internal struggle" is a pretext for *Toufahn* to defend this revisionist gang, and despite official silence, covert propaganda in their favor is continuing nonetheless.

These amnesic opportunists even go so far as to maintain that they have "never discussed and judged the political line and policies of People's Republic of China."<sup>1</sup>

We ask, for instance, when the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution smashed the headquarters of Liu Shao-Chi and you welcomed this victory, can one say that you were in fact "judging and discussing" the political line and policies of the People's Republic of China? Or when the anti-party, capitulationist clique of Lin Biao was shattered and again you hailed it as a victory, can one say that you were "judging and discussing" questions that were internal to China? Have you ever at all discussed and judged the political line and policies of the Communist Party of China in the past?

For instance, when you state that "We are of the opinion that the foreign policy of China has to change and will change," (Internal publication no. 19, p. 19) are we then allowed to say that you are "discussing and judging" the political line and policies of the Communist Party of China?

There can only be two possible explanations for your behavior: either your past defense of Mao Tsetung Thought and the political line and policies of the Communist Party of China was mendacious and hypocritical, or your present-day silence on the "gang of four" testifies to your political degeneration. We believe you have degenerated. This is not a mere assertion; your past and present practice stands behind it.

### TOUFAHN'S REVISIONIST STYLE OF WORK

The struggle between the two lines is a general law which no viable and militant organization can bypass. But the leadership of *Toufahn* has always tried to evade or negate this principle. They have always attempted to convince others that only tranquility and complete identity of views reign inside *Toufahn* organization. But as Stalin put it: "'complete identity of views' can exist only in the graveyard!" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 225)

Therefore it is not surprising if the leadership of *Toufahn* has always staved off healthy and organized ideological struggle on the most important questions of the movement. Not only have they

never initiated such a struggle involving the entire organization, but they have conspired and retaliated against their opponents and all proponents of such struggles. Of course, by adopting such measures it is possible to create calm, but it is the calm before the storm.

After the differences between us and the leadership of *Toufahn* sharpened, they sent us an urgent letter demanding a detailed exposition of our views, to be submitted as soon as possible. Their stated reason for such urgency was that they were allegedly planning to review the international line of *Toufahn*. It was surprising to us that the decision to review the international line of the organization was being made known only to us, since such an important decision should have been made known to all, through an organizational directive, so that every member could have participated. But despite this suspicious episode, which at that time seemed insignificant to us, we prepared the paper that is printed here and sent it off. However, the development of later events proved that their so-called "review of the international line" was a sheer lie, and their letter was in fact the beginning of a conspiracy against us.

In carrying out their conspiracy against us, they resorted to the most fascistic methods. Theirs were the methods of all political scoundrels and the sworn enemies of Marxism-Leninism. To lull us, they hypocritically continued the organizational links with us, while at the same time were covertly organizing an all-out attack against us. They whipped up counterrevolutionary rumors and resorted to slanders behind our backs, and finally, with complete disregard for organizational rules, proclaimed our expulsion from *Toufahn* by expelling us from their mass organization.

By resorting to such methods, they were hoping to undermine our struggle against their opportunist line by diverting our attention at dispelling their rumors. However, we are not frightened by their slanders and do not forget the main direction of the struggle. We are the proponents of positive ideological struggle. The publication of this pamphlet is only our first open step in the struggle against their opportunist line and is a continuation of our defense of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought.

Marxism-Leninism has always gone forward in struggle. The Iranian Marxist-Leninist movement is no exception to this rule. The opportunist trend abroad which today *Toufahn* is leading and whose spearhead of attack is aimed at Mao Tsetung Thought and the revolutionary line and policies of the Communist Party of China has done great harm to the Iranian communist movement, and to remedy the situation requires enormous efforts. However, this



tortuous road should not deter us from the great task of combatting revisionism and all forms of opportunism.  
Let us unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought and go all out in order to carry through this great task.

**LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM,  
MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT!**

Warm salutations to the working class and all the working people of Iran!  
Down with imperialism, particularly the two hegemonic super-powers!  
Down with the traitorous imperialist client regime of the Shah!  
Down with the traitorous Central Committee clique of Tudeh Party!

*Explanatory Note*

*The original text of the paper which we submitted to the central leadership of Toufan appears here with some minor changes and alterations in a few passages. The paragraph on the basic contradictions in the world has been deleted. Sub-headings have been added.*

Dear Comrade:

In order to discuss the present international situation, it is necessary to define the contemporary era. The present era is still the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. Lenin defined imperialism as moribund capitalism and "the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat." Lenin inherited and developed the teachings of Marx and Engels in the era of imperialism and elaborated the theory of proletarian revolution and the tactics of revolutionary class struggle.

Although many changes have taken place since Lenin's death, nevertheless, the era has not changed and, contrary to the revisionists' claims, the fundamental principles he formulated are not outmoded and still remain the theoretical basis that guides our thinking. As Stalin said: "Leninism is the Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution."

In today's world the laws of imperialism and the laws of socialist revolution are still at work. Today's situation is the outcome of contradictions inherent in the world capitalist system. For instance, Lenin pointed out, "The essential feature of imperialism is the rivalry between several great powers in the striving for hegemo-

ny." Today this hegemonic striving and rivalry is intensifying daily, despite great imperialists' talk of "detente."

It is the contention between the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, which today is leading to a new world war, aimed at redividing the world. At the same time, the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat are forging ahead with giant strides and the movements of the oppressed peoples and nations of the world presage a great revolutionary storm. In short, countries want independence, nations want liberation, and people want revolution. This has become a powerful and irresistible trend of history.

Today's world is characterized by great turbulence and turmoil. This situation is favorable to the cause of the revolutionary struggles of the people, since it represents the weakening hold of imperialism on the world and the daily awakening of the forces opposed to imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. Meanwhile, the factors for a new world war are rapidly increasing.

### THE CONCEPT OF THREE WORLDS

Another important feature of the world today is the existence of three zones or three worlds. This concept scientifically shows the changes that have occurred in the balance of forces internationally, and defines the intermediate zones between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Today it is no longer correct to speak of the "socialist camp" and the "imperialist camp." The socialist camp broke up as the result of the transformation of the Soviet Union into a great imperialist power and the degeneration of many communist parties into revisionist parties. The unity of the "imperialist camp," too, has been demonstrably weakened both economically and militarily.

Today the world is politically and economically divided into three worlds. The correctness of this concept today is matched by the consciousness of the peoples of the second and third world countries, who consider their own interests as being opposed to those of the two superpowers. Today the overwhelming majority of the peoples of various countries can unite against their main enemies, Soviet social-imperialism and U.S. imperialism.

Third world countries are those underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America where a new revolutionary upsurge is in the making. Aside from the fact that they comprise the overwhelming majority of the world's people, these countries have at the same time been the target of the most brutal attacks by impe-

rialism and hegemonism.

Although many of these countries are ruled by bourgeois forces and, to a greater or lesser extent, various forms of pre-capitalist relations predominate in their economic and political lives and national and class contradictions exist among them, nevertheless, they are definitely moving towards unity against hegemonism.

The movement for national liberation and the struggle to safeguard state sovereignty and economic independence as well as to protect and develop natural resources have made the third world into the main force in the struggle against imperialism.

In the last two decades imperialism has been badly defeated by the victories of the oppressed nations and peoples. The victory of the three peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia last year opened a new period in the struggle against imperialism. Meanwhile, many African countries have won liberation through independent revolutionary struggle and self-reliance in the struggle against imperialism. It is under these conditions that the third world has developed and consolidated itself. Especially after the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Asia, many countries which were previously dominated by imperialism have boldly risen up, and have been moved by the current of independence.

Today one finds only a few countries which are completely tied to this or that superpower. But even in the case of such countries, one should take account of the growing contradiction between them and the two superpowers. Except for a few instances, it is no longer correct to consider third world countries as puppets of imperialism and the two superpowers. Rather one should note the aspect of developing contradiction between them and imperialism.

In this respect the Arab countries are a prime example. For a long time the Arab states were under the domination of this or that imperialist power. But today they have heightened their unity in opposition to imperialism and Zionism and in defense of the rights of the Palestinian people. At the same time, they have tremendously moved forward in the struggle to demand a just price for their oil.

Recently the Egyptian government, with the full support of its people, drove the Soviet Union out of its soil and justly renounced the unequal Soviet-Egyptian "friendship" treaty. Today such measures represent a growing trend in the third world. Other examples are the endeavors of third world countries to settle their differences peacefully and to unite in their common struggles. For example, last year Iran and Iraq concluded an agreement to end their border conflicts which were the historical legacy of colonial-

ism. This agreement provided an example of how differences between third world countries should be settled.

Every victory for the third world is definitely a blow against the two superpowers. Such victories prevent the superpowers from turning the course of events in their own favor. Moreover, the third world constitutes a tremendous force in postponing the factor of war since the war drive, particularly on the part of the Soviet Union, can be hastened if the intermediate zones pursue a policy of conciliation and compromise.

Of course the question of third world struggle is a complex and involved question, and this complexity must be taken into account. Within third world countries there are still national and class contradictions. In a great many of them there is still no genuine Marxist-Leninist leadership and we should never confuse our program with that of the bourgeoisie. Nonetheless our policy should be one of uniting with the main aspect of third world struggles. We must support every step of the third world aimed at unity against hegemonism and peaceful settlement of their differences.

The second world is the intermediate zone between the two superpowers and the third world. This zone is composed mainly of the developed countries of Europe and includes Japan, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, etc. The second world has a dual character. On the one hand these countries are imperialist countries that oppress and exploit the third world and still maintain old colonial ties. The ruling classes of these countries exploits the working class and, in general, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is the principal contradiction within these countries. However, the second world is bullied by the two superpowers and tries to put up a collective resistance against them.

The second world countries want to get rid of superpower hegemonism and power politics. For instance, Western Europe, Japan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand generally unite with the United States against the Soviet Union. But at the same time, these countries resist U.S. control and blackmail. This can be observed in the Western European policy of cooperation and expanded economic relations with the countries of the third world which is carried out against the will of U.S. imperialism.

Although the trend toward independence is developing in Eastern Europe as well, and the tendency to escape Soviet domination has been strengthened, nevertheless, this trend has not yet become a general and decisive one.

Such an analysis of the world situation must be the basis of our international tactical line. Our general policy must be: unite with

the third world, support the anti-hegemonic tendency of the second world and struggle against both superpowers. In carrying out this tactical line we should never forget class struggle and the principle of proletarian internationalism based on defending the Marxist-Leninists and the working class and peoples of other countries.

We must take advantage of the contradictions between the two superpowers, concentrate our struggles and direct the main blow against the Soviet Union which today constitutes the main source of the new world war. At the same time, we Iranian communists are duty-bound to build the working class party and utilize every twist and turn to push forward the struggle of the Iranian working class. We must resolutely strive for the establishment of a national united front based on worker-peasant alliance, and organize people's armed struggle in order to realize our strategic aim of overthrowing the ruling classes and establishing people's democratic dictatorship.

We must merge the national united front against imperialism with the international united front against the two superpowers. Our tactics within both united fronts must always be subordinate to our general strategy of fighting for the cause of the proletarian revolution.

When we say we have to utilize contradictions within the enemy camp, it should in no way be interpreted as "uniting with one superpower against the other." Of course this slander is always hurled at the Marxist-Leninists by the revisionists, trotskies and all the conciliators of Soviet social-imperialism. But the fact of the matter is that making use of the contradictions within the enemy camp is completely consistent with Marxist-Leninist tactics.

### RISE OF THE THIRD WORLD

One of the usual practices of imperialism, especially the two superpowers, in the area of trade, is to mercilessly exploit the third world by exchange of unequal values through the buying cheap of their primary products and selling dear industrial products. According to the statistics of the United Nations, prices of primary products, in U.S. dollars, exported by the developing countries (not including fuel) went down 65 percent in April 1975 as compared with the same period the year before. For the same period, the copper price on the London International market dropped from 1,268 pounds to 501 pounds per metric ton. The price of Philippine copra was down to 268 U.S. dollars per metric ton from 700 dollars. West Africa's palm oil fell from 1,455 U.S. dollars to

444 dollars per metric ton. Prices of other major commodities such as natural rubber, cotton, wool, cocoa, coffee, sugar and coconut oil all dropped drastically. On the other hand, prices of manufactured goods, though very high already, kept rising. As a result, in 1974 the developing countries paid 23 billion U.S. dollars more for imports from developed countries as a result of price hikes.

Statistics indicate that third world countries' exports in the worldwide total for 1974 did not reach the 1950 level, even with the greatly increased exports of the OPEC members included. This example alone shows that under such conditions the third world has no way out but to unite in a common struggle against imperialist plunder and deproadation. Various forms of economic cooperation among third world countries is one of the ways of countering imperialism.

Raw material production makes up a major portion of the national economies of many developing countries whose exports are mainly primary products. To counter the superpowers' practice of forcing down prices of raw materials and shifting the burden of economic crisis onto them, these countries have set up a number of raw material producing and exporting organizations. Right now there are 20 such organizations in which 75 countries participate. Out of this number, eleven were set up between 1970 and 1975.

The oil struggle occupies an important place in the struggle of third world countries, and mainly revolves around the question of determining equitable prices for oil. In an attempt to force the oil-producing countries to lower prices, the United States has made a big noise about "overproduction of oil." The Soviet Union has also, time and time again, advocated that oil prices should be "beneficial to all countries," and has accused the producing countries of "unilaterally raising the oil price." Thus, maintaining an equitable oil price has become the focus of third world oil-producing countries' struggle against hegemonism.

Due to the grave economic crisis in the major capitalist countries, oil consumption in the United States, Western Europe and Japan dropped 5 per cent in 1974, totalling 100 million tons. At the same time, the United States, in order to cow the OPEC countries and force down prices, threatened these countries with military occupation of their oil fields and reduced its volume of trade with these countries through its trade act of 1974. The OPEC countries, however, refused to be cowed. Instead, they cut down production to maintain the price of oil.

In the beginning of 1975, the U.S.-controlled "International

Energy Agency" threatened that if the price of oil was not adjusted downward, it would cut oil imports by 100 million tons, or two million barrels a day. OPEC members responded by reducing production by over 10 per cent in the first quarter of 1975, or about 4 million barrels a day---thereby thwarting the superpowers' schemes.

In their struggle to recover state sovereignty over natural resources and the right to fix prices, and in their "dialogue" with developed countries, the third world oil producers have invariably met with threats, obstruction, and sabotage by the superpowers. For example, last year the United States insisted on confining the Paris conference on international economic cooperation to discussing only the oil question, rather than the questions concerning other raw materials, in an attempt to divide the third world countries and subdue them one by one. But the oil-producing countries thwarted U.S. attempts and firmly protected third world unity. They openly declared that the conference agenda could in no case be confined to an examination of the question of oil, but should take up the question of raw materials of developing countries and the industrial products of the West and other issues.

The other superpower, the Soviet Union, tried its utmost to squeeze into the "dialogue," supposedly "in its dual character as oil producer and consumer," so as to profit from it. However, it was left out of the important December "dialogue" in Paris (the second conference). The Soviet Union abused the conference and stated that any solution to world economic problems between north and south would be impractical and detrimental to all!

The third world oil struggles have deflated the arrogance of the superpowers. Deepening of the oil struggle by third world countries is not only essential to the defence of their state sovereignty and to the development of their national economies, but is also vitally important in the struggle to oppose the superpowers' arms expansion and war preparation, and to prevent them from launching a war of aggression and to preserve world peace.

The cooperation among Latin American countries also plays an important role in the struggle of third world countries against imperialism, especially the two superpowers. A good example in this respect is the formation of a multi-national Caribbean Shipping Company at the meeting of the 15 Caribbean and Central American countries in San Jose, capital of Costa Rica, in May of last year. In the past, 88 per cent of the sea transport of this region was monopolized by foreign transnational shipping companies to which they had to pay as much as 2 billion dollars in freight each

year. Now, this situation is over for good.

At the San Jose meeting, representatives of many countries welcomed this measure and stressed the major significance of this company in smashing the imperialist monopoly of sea transportation, achieving economic independence, promoting trade among the 15 participating countries, and realizing Latin American unity.

Other Latin American countries such as Peru, Venezuela, Colombia and Chile have developed mutual economic assistance through the Andean Pact Organization, and have reduced existing custom duties among themselves for a total of 40 per cent. From the total trade value among the Andean members of 107 million dollars in 1969, the year when the Andean Pact was signed, it amounted to 817 million U.S. dollars in 1974, after Venezuela joined the organization.

Apart from strengthening their economic relations with Mexico, Argentina, and other Latin American countries, the Andean countries have also expanded trade with Japan, Canada, and the Common Market countries, thus reducing their dependence on the U.S. market.

To defend the economic interests of member states and to develop the national industries of the region, the Andean group has taken measures to protect its natural resources, and to restrict foreign capital. At the same time, along with other Latin American and third world countries, they have formed organizations of countries producing and exporting such raw materials as copper, iron, tungsten, tin, petroleum, bananas, and coffee in order to break the monopoly of the raw material prices by the superpowers.

At the 7th ministerial meeting of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) which includes Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, Singapore, and Indonesia, the representatives of the Philippines and Singapore once again stressed the need to strengthen the regional economic cooperation, further promote trade among the Southeast Asian countries, and at the same time, take a common stand and united action in economic activity with other countries.

In order to strengthen their position in the international market dominated by the two superpowers, the five Southeast Asian countries who had sustained great losses due to the decrease in the prices of their export commodities such as rubber, timber, etc., reached an agreement in April 1975 to regulate and unify their system of exports.

While developing and strengthening economic cooperation among each other, the five countries of ASEAN also strive to

strengthen their economic relations with the second world countries. After repeated negotiations in 1974, the ASEAN and the West European Common Market reached an agreement by which the Common Market would give tax exemptions to their exports of manufactured goods and reduce duties on their agricultural products.

With the rise of the third world as an independent force in the sphere of international relations, great changes have taken place in the world in recent years, and the old international economic order has reeled under heavy blows. On May 1, 1974, a special session of the U.N. General Assembly passed a "Declaration for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order." On December 12 of the same year, this Declaration was joined by a constitution for a new order, the "Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States," adopted in the General Assembly by a vote of 120 to 6, with 10 abstentions. This Declaration was premised on a shift of political power to the third world. This Declaration and consequences distressed the United States. Even the American magazine, *The Nation*, had to sing this lamentive duet along with the American ruling circles: "The United States has emerged as the major international opponent of NEO (New Economic Order). At U.N. headquarters in May and December 1974, at Lima in April 1975, and at Paris our representatives have been a shrinking minority. In Lima, we were quite alone, casting the single negative vote. Of course, many West European states abstain or join the majority at these meetings for reasons of expedience." (*The Nation*, June 12, 1976.)

The attitude of West European countries toward the third world cannot be otherwise. This "expedience" which *The Nation* attributes to the United States' European "colleagues", and which it passes over with indifference shows, precisely, the new realignments in international relations. Later on we will take up this question in more detail.

To counter the current of independence that has stirred the third world countries to defend steadfastly their state sovereignty and economic independence against superpower plunder and control, the United States has taken many retaliatory and discriminating measures against them, both in the political and economic fields. The U.S. Trade Act of 1974 is a case in point. Under this act, "tariff preferential" treatment in trade will not be granted to those countries which are the members of the Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries (OPEC) or organizations controlling the outflow of, and defending equitable prices for, basic raw materials, as

well as those countries which have nationalized the property of U.S.-owned monopoly enterprises. At the time, this act was roundly denounced by the third world countries.

For instance, in a declaration, the Latin American and Caribbean Exports Association, which has members in 24 countries, described the act as "a new form of economic aggression," adding that "it seeks to impose a trade sanction and blockade against those countries that have organized to defend the prices of their primary products. In effect, it tries to restrict the entry of these products into the U.S. markets."

The Group of 77 provides another example of third world struggle. In the beginning of February this year, representatives of the Group of 77 gathered in Manila, the Philippines, to discuss economic questions facing third world countries, and to decide on tactics for the upcoming fourth session of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The Group of 77 adopted a Declaration and a Programme of Action to be submitted to the fourth session of UNCTAD.

The Group of 77 was established in the United Nations a decade ago by 77 third world countries. Later, other countries, including some second world countries, were approved as full members to the Group of 77 to bring its membership to 110. The formation of this group facilitated consultations among member states and helped them to take a unified stand in international conferences. In the past, lack of coordination and unity among these countries whose economies are very similar, often gave the upper hand to the industrially developed countries to push through international conferences decisions which were detrimental to the former. However, the formation of the Group of 77 prevented disparity of views among these countries and enabled them to take a unified stand against such decisions.

This unity has borne positive results in many international gatherings, including the recent session of UNCTAD, held in Kenya. This conference was convened to discuss the question of trade between developing and developed countries, and to consider ways of expanding and diversifying export trade among developing countries which, in the past, only exported raw materials. Transfer of technology, stabilization of the prices of manufactured goods and cancellation and alleviation of debts of developing countries were the other questions discussed by the conference. This conference rejected the Soviet proposal on "medium and long-term trade agreements," and Kissinger's "international resources bank" and "individual commodity agreements."

In the 32nd session of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), which was held in Bangkok, Thailand from March 24 to April 2 of this year, representatives from many countries of this region showed their firm resolve to establish a new international economic order. Unity and cooperation among countries of this region is a blow against the Soviet Union's "Asian collective security system," as well as U.S. designs in this part of the world.

The importance of the third world countries' struggle is not just limited to economic questions. In the early part of 1974, after a long period of political and diplomatic struggles, the government of Panama succeeded in limiting American control on the Canal Zone. U.S. imperialism had exercised unrestricted control over the Canal for the last 70 years. Negotiations for a new Canal treaty between the United States and Panama are scheduled to continue on the basis of an eight-point agreement concluded earlier. Panama's struggle to recover sovereignty over the Canal Zone is actively supported by the Latin American and other third world countries.

In their fourth Middle East war, the Palestinian and Arab peoples dealt heavy blows against Israeli aggressors which were backed and encouraged by both superpowers. The Arab countries, using oil as a weapon, rocked Zionism and hegemonism to its very foundation. This struggle opened the eyes of many third world countries. They came to realize that the natural resources which were subjected to imperialist plunder can become a powerful weapon in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism.

Third world countries are also struggling against threats of interference and subversion from without. In the Sudan, a counterrevolutionary coup, backed by the Soviet revisionists, was smashed. Developments in Bangladesh, after the social-imperialists' dismemberment of Pakistan, dashed the hopes of the Kremlin tzars and their Indian hirelings.

Various national liberation struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America are developing vigorously. The number of independent countries in Africa, which was only a few in the early 1950's, has gone up to 42 in the 1970's. The Organization of African Unity has played an important role in promoting and strengthening unity among African countries and peoples and supporting their struggles.

The struggle to extend the sea limits to 200 nautical miles, initiated by the Latin American countries, has spread to every corner of the globe. It has become an open political battle against imperialism, especially the two superpowers.

In the United Nations, the situation in which the superpowers controlled everything has been altered. Now, third world countries form the overwhelming majority of the U.N. member states. This situation has completely changed the composition of this world organization. The restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China marked a common victory for the third world countries' unified struggle.

"The U.N. Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea," an instrument for interference in Korea's internal affairs and for aggression against that country, was finally relegated to the garbage heap of history. The days when the superpowers could do as they pleased in the United Nations are gone for good.

Here mention should also be made of summit conferences of third world countries to coordinate steps and strengthen unity, which fully demonstrates their firm resolve to unite in struggle against the common enemy.

Other examples about the common struggles of the third world can be enumerated, but this should suffice. What has been outlined reveals a general trend, namely, the rise of the third world as a major independent force in international relations. This trend, like any other phenomenon, has contradictory aspects and the struggle between them determines the direction of its development.

### MOTIVES FOR THIRD WORLD STRUGGLE

The relative decline of U.S. imperialism found supreme expression in this superpower's debacle in Indochina. The consequences of the United States war of aggression in Indochina and the fate of reactionaries like Lon Nol, Thieu, etc., showed the future fate of all those who put themselves completely at the service of U.S. imperialism. The American defeat in Indochina proved that the United States cannot and will not keep its puppets in power at any price. Therefore it was not surprising that SEATO disintegrated following the Indochina episode.

Member states of this pact, which until yesterday served as bases of American aggression against Indochina, have demanded restriction or dismantling of U.S. military bases and the withdrawal of American personnel (the Philippines and Thailand). These same countries, which until recently supported the American policy of encircling and isolating China, have taken steps to normalize relations with the People's Republic of China.

Has the class character of the governments of these countries

changed? Undoubtedly not. However, if we try to interpret the third world countries' struggles on the basis of the class position of their governments *alone*, then it will be hard to explain the steps they take against imperialism and for the defence of their state sovereignty through such organizations as ASEAN, Group of 77, etc.

The present circumstances of deepening worldwide crisis compels these countries to adopt such measures so as to stay on top. These measures, despite the subjective will of those who take them, further the unity of the third world, deal a blow against superpower war preparations and strengthen the international united front against them.

Besides, the other superpower which pursues a more aggressive interventionist policy than Western imperialism, especially at the time when the latter is following a line of appeasement towards it, leads the third world countries to rely more and more on their united strength.

The struggle of the third world people is another reason why the government leaders in these countries are forced to reconsider this or that aspect of their old policies. At the same time, they will attempt to turn this question around and pose as "national savior" and misdirect the rising movement of the people. Whether this maneuver succeeds or not depends on the people's balance of forces, their degree of organization and consciousness.

Another important motive behind the third world countries' efforts to safeguard their economic interests and defend their common cause through various organizations is imperialism's and particularly the superpowers' attempts to shift the burden of economic crisis onto their backs.

Another significant factor in the development and consolidation of third world struggles is the important role that the People's Republic of China has played as a third world country. The fact that it extends economic and financial aid to poor countries without any strings attached, establishes various political and economic relations with third world countries on an equal basis, defends their state sovereignty in the face of imperialism and the two superpowers, and does not interfere in their internal affairs all go to explain why, especially in these turbulent times, the third world countries consider People's China as a powerful support in their struggles against imperialism and the two superpowers and rally closely around it. In a word: "close relations with the People's Republic of China creates new possibilities for governments to free themselves from the hegemonism of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-

imperialism." (*Tourahm* no. 62)

Only such an evaluation of the objective situation in the world today will enable us to examine the third world and its main direction of development. Viewed from this angle, we'll see that the third world has become an important force in international relations and plays an important part in the struggle against imperialism and superpower hegemonism.

Therefore, it is not surprising that imperialists, particularly the two superpowers, are out to destroy the unity of the third world in order to subdue them one at a time and turn them into their war reserves. The recent superpowers' attempts in Lebanon to physically liquidate the Palestinian people and their organization and destroy Arab unity, as well as their attempts to disrupt the unity among the member-states of the Organization of African Unity are efforts in this direction. Although these cases are the most glaring examples of this sinister policy, however, they are not the only ones. This sinister policy goes far and wide and reaches into international conferences, commonwealth organizations of the third world, liberation organizations, etc.

### THE UNITED STATES AND THE EEC

The relative decline of the United States since the early 1950's, together with the rehabilitation of the national economies of Europe and Japan, have undermined the former U.S. position in relation to its "allies." If in 1948, the United States produced almost twice as much as all its present economic rivals taken together, today Western Europe and Japan jointly produce more than the United States. Moreover, Western Europe alone is well on its way to overtaking the United States in volume of production. The more confident the countries of Europe felt, the less willing they were to follow in the wake of American policy.

France was the first European country to steer a separate course, independent from the United States. President De Gaulle, speaking at a press conference in 1966, proclaimed his country's intention to leave the NATO military organization. Johnson, the then-president of the United States, assessed this step as a blow at the very heart of the alliance.

General De Gaulle called attention to the fact that participation in a military organization which was under the command of the Americans, could involve France in a military conflict. Such fears were not unwarranted. Some of the American bases on French territory, for instance, were used by the United States as stop-over

bases for its operations against the Congo Republic (now the Republic of Zaire) with complete disregard for the objections of the French government. The striving for independence, displayed by France, would in time inevitably find reflection, in one form or another, in the practical policies of the other European states towards the United States.

The events in Indochina were one of the main reasons behind France's decision to leave the NATO military organization. The other West European countries (in contrast to the period of the Korean war) also strove to dissociate themselves from the United States.

It is a fact that the consequences of the failure of the U.S. aggression against Vietnam dealt a serious blow to American foreign policy. At the same time, the various crises that the American government faced, sharply limited American opportunities of exerting influence on the countries of Western Europe. It is precisely in this period that the other superpower, the Soviet Union, spread its influence in Europe far and wide.

In August 1971, the United States unilaterally revoked the convertibility of the dollar, and thus dealt a telling blow on its European "allies." This has brought the complete mistrust of these countries towards the United States.

The Middle East crisis showed the incompatibility of the interests of the United States with the interests of the Common Market's nine member-states. "The nine" refused the United States permission to use the NATO bases on their territory to airlift armaments to Israel. The United States was surprised by such an unexpected development and did not conceal its resentment. There were even those who accused the West European "allies" of "treachery." But West Europe wants to play an independent role in international affairs. This desire found reflection in the speeches of the foreign ministers of the EEC "nine" at the December 1973 session of the NATO Council and thereafter.

The development of the Common Market has not been smooth. There have been conflicts and crises, times of progress, further foliated certain protective tariffs. These measures have evoked the United Things could not have been otherwise. But despite the difficulties that it encountered, the Common Market developed, expanding and strengthening the economic ties between its member-states.

The continued lowering of the custom barriers stimulated and facilitated trade exchange within the Common Market. In the first five years of the Common Market's existence, trade between its member-states increased two-fold. The expansion of trade with



countries, outside of the EEC proceeded at a much slower pace. Nevertheless, it exceeded the rate of growth of U.S. foreign trade. And this unerringly pointed to a change in the international trade in favor of the West European countries.

The crisis of the EEC in relation with the United States was born out of monetary problems. At the height of the currency crisis, the West German Federal Bank was forced to buy more than 2 billion dollars worth of foreign currency in order to support the rate of the dollar. It is a fact that the current crisis of the international monetary system is an expression of the general crisis of capitalism.

At his press conference in February 1965, De Gaulle raised the question of the need to reform the international monetary system. He called attention to the fact that the financial policy of the United States was destroying West European currencies, unleashing inflation, and creating conditions which for some of the countries led to a virtual expropriation of their enterprises. France suggested a return to a firm basis--the gold standard. But to do this it was necessary to raise the price of gold. As a matter of course, such a solution did not suit the Wall Street monopolies. It was much more convenient for them to pay with paper dollars than to endanger the U.S. gold reserves which had already shrunk considerably. Nevertheless, the United States finally agreed to the devaluation of the dollar under West European pressure, and thus the dollar was twice devalued in relation to the price of gold. Armaments was another area in which the United States attempted to penetrate the European arms industries. However, the percentage of American control is diminishing. For instance, right now 77.3 per cent of the arms needs of the German Federal Republic is produced by "Messerschmitt-Bockow-Blohm."

Although the United States still plays an important role in the European economy and, consequently, in the European politics, nevertheless, the growing trend in their relations points to daily separation. By and large, Western Europe is steering an independent course from that of the United States.

## RELATIONS BETWEEN SECOND AND THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

In order to strengthen its position vis-a-vis the United States and the Soviet Union, Western Europe is following a different policy in its political and economic relations with the third world; one that is separate from the two superpowers, and more conciliatory.

To protect their home market and impede United States encroachment of their economies, the EEC member-states have erected certain protective tariffs. These measures have evoked the United States' opposition. At the same time, West European contacts with the Arab oil-producing countries have fallen in with Kissinger's open attacks. (For instance, contacts between France and Saudi Arabia.)

At the Lome Convention, the EEC countries provided for the products of the 46 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries without imposing quotas or duties. What is more, these terms are not reciprocal. The other noticeable point of this agreement is that the EEC countries have undertaken to set up a fund to compensate the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries for any losses caused by market fluctuations. This is a new phenomenon in the otherwise "normal" international economic relations. It is an important event in the development of relations between the second and third world countries. It shows that through the united struggle of third world countries the old international economic order will eventually be replaced. Development of such relations between the second and third world countries is favorable to the cause of worldwide struggle against the hegemonism of the two superpowers.

In this regard, the EEC relations with the five Southeast Asian countries of Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, Singapore and Indonesia provide another example. After repeated negotiations, in 1974, the five countries and the West European Common Market reached an agreement by which the Common Market will give tax exemptions to their exports of manufactured goods and reduce duties on their agricultural products.

In recent years, with the steady growth of the third world countries' struggle against colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism, more and more industrialized countries of the second world have had to take a somewhat more realistic attitude towards the reasonable demands and just measures of the third world oil-producing countries. Disregarding superpower obstructions, they have carried out "dialogue" with these third world countries with certain positive results. Some have signed agreements with oil-producing countries for direct supply of oil or for trade and technical cooperation.

By and large, oil plays a key role in the political relations between Western Europe and the oil-producing countries, particularly the Arab countries. Concerning the cooperation between the Arab and European countries and the importance of this relation

in terms of the European economy, the American magazine *The Nation* writes:

"A U.S. Library of Congress study warns that a six months petroleum embargo--similar to the one carried out in 1973--within the next two years not only could mean 'a domestic economic disaster' for the United States, but 'would most certainly spread to Western Europe and Japan. . . hopes for a major economic recovery from the current world-wide recession would be dashed under these circumstances.'" (*The Nation*, May 15, 1976)

Therefore, it is not surprising that the West European countries improve their relations with Arab countries more and more, and follow their own independent policy towards them.

Of course, this does not mean that the oil cartels will put an end to their efforts at sabotage and intrigues in order to hinder the development of these relations and regain their former positions. Nevertheless, the fact of the matter is that drastic changes have taken place in the old relations between the oil-producing countries and the oil cartels. The question as to how far the oil cartels can go in their policies depends entirely on the common stand and unity of the oil-producing countries. The more they get united, the less the oil cartels can succeed. The question of third world unity itself is not a smooth one, and abounds with contradictions and complexities.

As comrade Mao Tsetung teaches us: "*When we say 'imperialism is ferocious, we mean that its nature will never change.'*" (*Selected Works*, Vol. 4, p.428) Therefore, if certain changes of a positive character have taken place in the relations between second and third world countries, it does not mean that with the emergence of the two superpowers the nature of European and Japanese imperialism has allegedly changed.

All imperialists share the same common "nature" and "essence" which explains their ferocious drive for exploitation and plunder. Nevertheless, in today's world, only the two superpowers with their huge economic, financial, military and political capabilities are capable of showing this common "nature" and "essence" in the most horrifying manner, of giving the freest rein to their insatiable quest for exploitation and plunder. In this respect, not only can the second world countries not compete with their superpower rivals, but they themselves suffer from superpower control, pressure, bullying, and even military threat.

Generally speaking, more equitable terms govern economic relations between second and third world countries, nevertheless, they are far from complete equality. However, the significance of these

relations are that they provide a motive for third world struggles against the old international economic order. On the other hand, if the superpowers succeed in drawing the second world countries away from the third world, the latter will find it more difficult to achieve its aims.

From what has been said we can conclude that the unity of West European countries will continue to develop, first in the economic sphere and then in the military and diplomatic affairs. This tendency towards unity against the hegemonism of the two superpowers will continue to grow and undermine their positions in Europe.

"Every blow that weakens the grip of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism over other states, and sharpens the contradiction between these two greatest enemies of the world's peoples is a step forward in strengthening the international united front against imperialism." (*Toufahn no. 62*)

For this reason, the trend towards unity among second world countries in the economic sphere and in the fields of defense and other areas is of great significance. The significance of this question becomes even more clear when we take into account the factor of world war.

The war for which the superpowers are preparing is aimed at world domination, and the realization of this aim is impossible without dominating Europe. That is why Europe has become the hotbed of military confrontation between the two superpowers.

Soviet social-imperialism and U.S. imperialism are the two adversaries in the coming war. However, it is the Soviet Union which is on the offensive and constitutes the main source of the new war. It is necessary to deal with this question in some detail.

### SOVIET UNION: DICTATORSHIP OF A HITLER TYPE

Soviet social-imperialist military expansion and hegemonism are by no means accidental; still less something dependent on certain people's subjective will; they are determined by the political system of Soviet revisionism, a system of fascist dictatorship, and its economic base which is state monopoly capitalism, and are an inevitable result of the predominance of the laws of imperialism. The contention between the two superpowers is a continuation of and development of the history of imperialist rivalry. "*The forms of struggle may and do constantly change in accordance with varying, relatively particular and temporary causes, but the substance of the struggle, its class content, positively cannot change while*

*Classes exist.*" (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 253)

The economic base of the Soviet Union today is state monopoly capitalism which came into being after the all-round restoration of capitalism by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique. There, the ownership of the means of production and the relations between man and man and the relations of distribution, are all dominated by the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class. The characteristics inherent in this economic structure make Soviet social-imperialism even more brutal in its aggression and expansion abroad and in its struggle for world hegemony.

Compared with the capitalist imperialist countries, state monopoly capitalism in the Soviet Union is highly monopolistic, highly concentrated and tightly controlled by the state. All economic lifelines, the war industry included, are directly controlled by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique which has a firm hold on the state machinery. This special feature gives the Soviet Union a resemblance to Germany of before and after World War I: in many respects, that is, in technology and production, it is inferior to the United States, but in respect to the organization of finance capitalism and the transformation of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism, it is superior to the United States.

Private and state monopolies are interwoven in capitalist imperialist countries. The private monopolies in this "interweaving" are the main aspect whereas the state monopolies are in a sense a tool of the private monopoly groups which use the state organs as a means of seeking maximum profits. State monopolies as such constantly and freely adopt such forms as making orders for processing or reducing taxes or giving subsidies so that the state organs serve the private monopoly capital. Even when, under special circumstances---in the time of war or crisis, for instance---nationalization is introduced to certain enterprises and certain branches for a definite period of time or to a certain extent, this is merely a means of increasing and guaranteeing the income of millionaire treasury-looters in on a branch of industry or another who are on the verge of bankruptcy.

State monopoly capitalism in the Soviet Union directly takes the form of the ownership by the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class. State monopoly capitalism of this kind does not merely dominate a few productive branches or several dozen trades, but virtually takes over all industries, capital construction, communications and transport, both domestic and foreign trade, financial and monetary affairs, public utilities, state farms and what not. Unlike the big financial groups which exist side by side in the capitalist

imperialist countries, the monopoly capital in the Soviet Union is under the concentrated control of a single center, namely, the state under the dictatorship of the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class whose representative is the Brezhnev renegade clique.

The combining of monopoly capitalism with the state apparatus of the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class has made it possible for the Soviet Union, in its bid for world hegemony, to pull its economic as well as political, military and other strength and, while lagging behind the United States in economic strength, to become a superpower contending with U.S. imperialism for hegemony and taking the offensive in the contention. This is the path similar to that which Germany travelled at the beginning of this century to climb to the "throne" of the world's number one imperialist power. As Lenin put it, "*Germany's large scale state capitalism combined with the bureaucracy---and Germany beat all records.*" (Lenin, C.W., Vol. 28, p. 80) This is the logical result of the uneven political and economic development under capitalism.

Numerous facts have proved that it is exactly these economic and political peculiarities of Soviet social-imperialism that have served as a stimulant for its frenzied expansion and aggression overseas and for its hegemony drive. It is these that have prompted it to play the role of an arbitrary, arrogant and most fierce nuclear overlord in the international scenario. As such it is creating conditions for its ruin.

That the Soviet Union is frantically pushing policies for arms expansion and war preparations and of aggression and adventure is dictated by its social-imperialist nature; this also is a reflection of its economic degeneration and backwardness. Lenin said: "*Any other basis under capitalism for division of the spheres of influence, of interests, of colonies, etc., than a calculation of the strength of the participants in the division, their general economic, financial, military strength, etc., is inconceivable.*" (Lenin, C.W., Vol. 28, p. 295)

Since Soviet social-imperialism lags behind the U.S. imperialist opponent in economic and financial strength, etc., in order to dominate the world, it inevitably tries to do its utmost to build up its military muscle. In addition, state monopoly capitalism in the Soviet Union provides conditions for its militarization. Just as Chairman Mao has pointed out, "*The Soviet Union today is under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the German fascist type, a dictatorship of the Hitler type.*"

Such are the peculiarities that have made the Soviet Union the

main source of a new world war despite the fact that it lags behind the United States in economic strength.

### REVIVAL OF MUNICH POLICY

Western imperialism realizes that war and military confrontation with the Soviet superpower is inevitable. Therefore, it is trying to drive the Soviet aggression eastward towards China so as to save its own skin and lessen the impact of its military collision with the Soviet Union. As comrade Chou En-lai stated in his report to the Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China: "*The West always wants to urge the Soviet revisionists eastward to divert the peril towards China, and it would be fine so long as all is quiet in the West.*" (quoted in *Toufahn* no. 73)

The West, particularly the United States, in pursuing this policy, is after two objectives. First, to weaken its rival by involving it in a war against China, and second, to deal a major blow against socialism and the land of the dictatorship of the proletariat. If this policy succeeds it would mean a "cheap and easy" victory for the United States in achieving its strategic aim of world domination at the expense of its Soviet rival. It is not surprising, therefore, that the United States has taken up the line of appeasement towards the Soviet Union, and most European countries are following this perilous policy.

But this policy is nothing new. It is the same dangerous appeasement policy that the monopoly groups and ruling circles of Britain and France followed towards the Hitlerite aggressors, hoping to drive the fascist peril towards the Soviet Union. It was on the basis of this rapacious, imperialist policy that the ideology of Munich was born and found its worst manifestation in the traitorous Munich pact which sacrificed Czechoslovakia at the altar of the Hitlerite regime.

At that time the Anglo-French imperialists had taken up the policy of appeasement in order to divert German military aggression towards the land of the Soviets. They dreamt of sitting on top of the mountain and watching the tigers fight. They were hoping to exhaust their fascist rivals in a war against the then-socialist Soviet Union, deal Bolshevism a devastating blow and thus bring a vast number of peoples and territories under their domination. But the great Stalin exposed the nature and the aims of this maneuver in time. In his report to the 18th Congress of the Bolshevik Party in 1939, Stalin said:

*"It is a distinguishing feature of the new imperialist war that it*

*has not yet become universal, a world war. The war is being waged by the aggressor states, which in every way infringe upon the interests of the non-aggressive states, primarily England, France and U.S.A., while the latter draw back and retreat, making concession after concession to the aggressors.*

*"Thus we are witnessing an open redivision of the world and spheres of influence at the expense of non-aggressive states, without the least attempt at resistance, and even with a certain amount of connivance, on the part of the latter."* Stalin then goes on to explain the reasons for this feature of war: "*The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder the aggressor in their nefarious work, not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, or better still, with the Soviet Union, not to hinder Germany, say, from enmeshing herself in European affairs, from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union, to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then, when they have become weak, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear, of course, 'in the interest of peace,' and to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents.*"

*"Cheap and easy!"*

However, Stalin unmasked this "cheap and easy" scheme, and temporarily aborted the Anglo-French evil plan of diverting the Hitlerite peril towards the Soviet Union by signing the non-aggression pact with Germany.

Of course the question here is not whether Hitler's aggression against the land of the Soviets was inevitable. Rather the point is whether or not the Hitlerite aggression would have taken place on the basis of a "cheap and easy" scheme whereby the Soviet Union would have had to face the fascist monsters alone, at a time when it was all quiet in the West! It is obvious that such an eventuality not only could have probably spelled the disintegration of Soviet power, but would have meant a powerful boost for the Anglo-French drive for world domination at the expense of the Soviet people.

Today we are once again witnessing the same "cheap and easy" policy repeated by the West. But as in the past, there are differences around the line of appeasement among the ruling classes and the political circles of the West, including the United States. Here it must be emphatically pointed out that the proponents of appeasement and "detente" and its opponents both are preparing

for the war in their own ways. On this point there must be no temporizing or equivocation. However, the policy of appeasement is a more dangerous policy because it hastens the war.

It is a fact that the more the outbreak of the imperialist war is postponed, the better the people of the world and the revolutionary forces can prepare themselves, and the socialist countries, particularly the People's Republic of China will be able to build up their defences. Therefore, the socialist countries cannot remain indifferent with respect to the policies that the West pursues towards the Soviet Union.

Soviet social-fascists are following in the footsteps of Hitler by feinting to the East, while attacking in the West. By feinting to the East, the Soviet Union, like the Hitlerite Germany before it, is strengthening and wooing the appeasement forces in the West in order to build up its war machine. At the same time, by stepping up its world-wide propaganda about the myth of "detente," the Soviet Union is trying to cover up its frantic war preparations and lower the vigilance of the world's peoples.

The history of the Second World War proved that in order to strike in the East, Hitler had to buttress himself in the West and bring the vast productive and human resources of Europe under his jackboots. The Soviet social-fascists are also aware that aggression against People's Republic of China and attempts at her subjugation are impossible without complete domination over the productive forces of Europe. This explains why Europe has become the focal point of superpowers' increasing contention. However, the Soviet Union is prodding and wooing the appeasement forces in the West in order to:

- 1) receive huge amounts of economic aid and long-term loans from the West, which up until now has totalled to more than 20 billion dollars, and to compensate for its technological backwardness by importing Western technology;

- 2) compensate for its agricultural breakdown and huge grain shortages, especially at a time when the West is all the more eager for such transactions as a way out of the severe economic crisis. The purchase of millions of dollars of grains, part of which are stored away for war purposes, is only an example in this respect.

Such an arrangement is designed to further militarize the Soviet economy and keep it on a war footing. But since the Helsinki conference, which sealed the fate of Eastern Europe, the forces opposed to the new spirit of Munich are being heard more and more in the West.

U.S. imperialism has made a series of political concessions to

the Soviet Union. The example of Angola is a case in point. Everyone knows that Cuba was doing the Soviet bidding when she intervened in Angola. But the United States, in an attempt to cover up its political enfeeblement and its concession to the Soviet Union, threatens Cuba and warns her against intervention in Africa. But even then no one takes her seriously. Even the American magazine *The Nation*, in reproaching such "threats" writes: "Threats to use force against Cuba, when it is clear that the United States is politically unable to do so, only weakens our image abroad." (*The Nation*, June 19, 1976)

Of late, U.S. imperialism has even adopted the notorious policy of division of the spheres of influence with the Soviet Union, known as the *Sonnenfeldt Doctrine*. This policy is aimed at keeping Eastern Europe, including Yugoslavia, permanently in the Soviet orbit, in return for the Soviet Union's abstaining from interference in West European affairs.

However, such a policy, which was also taken up by Chamberlain and Daladier in relation to the countries of the Balkans, not only did not stop the Hitlerite aggressors, but by encouraging and whetting their appetite, fanned the flames of war.

Moreover, the United States refuses to normalize its relations with the People's Republic of China on the basis of the *Shanghai Communiqué* as a gesture of good faith to the "detente" hoax of the Soviet Union.

But, as we mentioned earlier, there are disagreements in the West, including in the United States, on the question of the appeasement policy.

#### APPEASEMENT FORCES IN THE U.S.

For example, in the United States the Rockefeller-Kissinger group are the main promoters of appeasement towards the Soviet Union. This group of U.S. monopolies, like their Anglo-French predecessors who up until the outbreak of the Second World War played the game of "neutrality" towards Hitler, are in fact whetting the appetite of the Soviet social-fascists. Together with the Soviet Union they promote the myth of "detente" at a time when the danger of a new world war is increasing daily. They have agreed through the Helsinki conference to continue the dismemberment of Germany and recognize the status quo in relation to the Soviet domination of Eastern Europe.

The appeasement forces are based in both the Democratic and Republican parties and are backed by such Wall Street giants as

the Chase Manhattan Bank. This group controls such influential newspapers as the New York Times and the Washington Post.

In the American labor movement, the appeasement forces have their base in the leadership of the United Auto Workers Union and many of the "liberal" unions dominated by the revisionists.

The bourgeois forces opposed to the policy of appeasement towards the Soviet Union are backed by such powerful monopolies as the Morgan Bank and New York City Bank. The most important representative of this group was James Schlesinger, the former U.S. secretary of defense, who clearly saw the weakened position of the United States and the flabbiness of Europe as an invitation to the Soviet Union to invade. His "sudden" removal from office does not mean that the question has finally been settled in favor of the appeasement forces. Today the American presidential election has become the scene of sharp struggles between the two groups.

These two groups in the West which are locked in a sharp contention with one another are both imperialist and neither is any type of "ally" or "supporter" of the proletariat. Any equivocation on this question is suicidal for the revolutionary forces and a disservice to the cause of proletarian revolution. However, this should not prevent the revolutionaries from utilizing this contradiction in order to strike the main blow at the Munich policy which can only hasten the war and for this very reason is the most dangerous line.

The speed with which the war is thrust on the peoples of the world is very important. The longer the war is postponed, the better it is for the peoples of the world, particularly since it allows further exposure of the Soviet social-imperialists whose position in the world today is still confusing to many potential allies.

It is in this light that we should view Nixon's second trip to China at the invitation of the Chinese Government, or the meeting between Strauss and the Chinese government leaders, or the Chinese backing of Mrs. Thatcher, the leader of the British Conservative Party (as well as Schlesinger's trip to China if he is invited). These are concrete examples of utilizing contradictions within the enemy camp. It would be naive indeed to expect China to fight against two great imperialist powers at once without utilizing their contradictions.

### CHINA FOLLOWS A LENINIST POLICY

Revisionists of all colors slander this aspect of the policy of the

People's Republic of China which is aimed at isolating the appeasement policy of the West, postponing the outbreak of the war and exposing the war preparations of the Soviet Union. But their slanders won't save them. Taking advantage of every antagonism of interests among the bourgeoisie of various countries and among the various monopoly groups of a given country in the interest of proletarian revolution is the bounden duty of every Marxist. On this question Lenin says:

*"The more powerful enemy can be conquered only by exerting the utmost effort, and by necessarily, thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skillfully taking advantage of every, even the smallest, 'rift' among the enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie within the various countries, by taking advantage of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally may be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable, and conditional. Those who do not understand this do not understand even a particle of Marxism, of scientific, modern socialism in general. Those who have not proved by deeds over a fairly considerable period of time, and in fairly varied political situations, their ability to apply this truth in practice have not yet learned to assist the revolutionary class in its struggle for its emancipation of the toiling humanity from the exploiters. And this applies equally to the period before and to the period after the conquest of political power by the proletariat." ("Left-Wing" Communism---An Infantile Disorder)*

On this same question Lenin writes:

*"The Anglo-French and American imperialist vultures 'accuse' us of concluding an 'agreement' with German imperialism. What hypocrites, what scoundrels they are to slander the workers' government while trembling because of the sympathy displayed towards us by the workers of 'their own' countries! They pretend not to see the difference between an agreement entered into by the 'socialists' with the bourgeoisie (their own or foreign) against the workers, against the working people, and an agreement entered into for the protection of workers who have defeated their bourgeoisie, with the bourgeoisie of one national color against the bourgeoisie of another color in order so that the proletariat may take advantage of the antagonism between the different groups of the bourgeoisie..."*

*"When in February 1918 the German imperialist vultures hurled their forces against unarmed, demobilized Russia, who had relied on the international solidarity of the proletariat before the world revolution had fully matured, I did not hesitate for a moment to*

enter into an 'agreement' with the French monarchists. Captain Sadoul, a French army officer who, in words, sympathized with the Bolsheviks, but was in deeds a loyal and faithful servant of French imperialism, brought the French officer De Lubersac to see me. 'I am a monarchist. My only aim is to secure the defeat of Germany,' De Lubersac declared to me. 'That goes without saying (cela va sans dire),' I replied. But this did not in the least prevent me from entering into an 'agreement' with De Lubersac concerning certain services that French army officers, experts in explosives, were ready to render us by blowing railway lines in order to hinder the German invasion. This is an example of an 'agreement' of which every class-conscious worker will approve, an agreement in the interests of socialism. The French monarchists and I shook hands, although we knew that each of us would willingly hang his 'partner.' But for a time our interests coincided. Against the advancing rapacious Germans, we, in the interests of the Russian and the world socialist revolution, utilized the equally rapacious counter-interest of other imperialists. In this way we served the interests of the working class of Russia and of other countries, we strengthened the proletariat and weakened the bourgeoisie of the whole world, we resorted to the methods, most legitimate and essential in every war, of maneuver, stratagem, retreat, in anticipation of the moment when the rapidly maturing proletarian revolution in a number of advanced countries completely matured." (Lenin, C.W., Vol. 28, pp. 66-67)

It is on the basis of these Leninist teachings that the glorious Communist Party of China is utilizing the contradictions within the enemy camp in order to strengthen the camp of the people, expose the nature of appeasement policy and its dangerous outcome, bring to light the war preparations of the two superpowers, and postpone the outbreak of the war, etc. This is only one aspect of the whole revolutionary foreign policy of the People's Republic of China which has been personally formulated by comrade Mao Tsetung and is being followed under his supervision by the Communist Party of China in foreign affairs.

### NECESSARY COMPROMISES

Of course, to be able to utilize contradictions within the enemy camp, it is sometimes necessary for China to make certain compromises. However, these necessary compromises do not mean that the people and revolutionary forces of various countries should do the same. In 1946, in relation to such compromises between a so-

cialist country and imperialist countries, Mao Tsetung said: "Such compromises between the United States, Britain and France and the Soviet Union can be the outcome only of resolute, effective struggles by all the democratic forces of the world against the reactionary forces of the United States, Britain and France.

"Such compromises do not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions. The principle of reactionary forces in dealing with the democratic forces of the people is definitely to destroy all they can and to prepare to destroy later whatever they cannot destroy now. Face to face with this situation, the democratic forces of the people should likewise apply the same principle to the reactionary forces." (Selected Works, Vol. 4, p. 87)

### REVISIONIST DISTORTIONS

Revisionists and Trotskyites of all descriptions attack China's principled stand towards the two superpowers. They distort China's correct analysis of the main danger of a new world war coming from the Soviet Union to mean that the Soviet Union is the only principal enemy of the world's peoples, and that China is allegedly seeking a united front with U.S. imperialism against her. This is nothing but revisionist nonsense. With such counterrevolutionary fabrications the revisionists are trying to lower the vigilance of the people in the face of superpower war preparations and the danger of a new world war which mainly comes from the Soviet Union. They harp on the myth of "detente" in order to strengthen the imperialist appeasers of the Soviet Union in the West so as to prepare the grounds for the Soviet's Hitlerite policy of feinting to the East while attacking in the West. Such propaganda is particularly aimed at keeping the people of Europe, who are in the center of superpower confrontation, off guard. It is also designed to cover up the aggressive, warlike and fascist nature of the Soviet Union.

But if in their propaganda the revisionists follow Moscow's orders, there are others who, having become enmeshed in this revisionist propaganda network, apologetically tune in to the revisionists from the "left."

China's policy towards the two superpowers is crystal clear and leaves no room for arbitrary interpretations. She singles out both superpowers as the biggest oppressors and exploiters of the world

today, exposes their war preparations and emphasizes the grave danger of Soviet social-imperialism.

### A PERSPECTIVE OF THE COMING WAR

Although the war is inevitable, it is not imminent. In other words, it will not break out in the next few years. But what will be the attitude of socialist countries once the war does break out? They will refuse to join either side and will follow a strict policy of neutrality towards the belligerents. However, this does not mean that even if the nature of the war changes or if the war undergoes certain necessary changes so that it becomes advantageous to China and other socialist countries and the peoples of the world, they will still refuse to join in. Concerning the attitude of the Soviet Union towards World War II, comrade Mao Tsetung wrote:

"Some people say that now that the second imperialist world war has broken out, the Soviet Union will probably take sides---in other words, the Soviet Red Army seems to be on the point of joining the German imperialist front. I consider this view incorrect. On whichever side, the Anglo-French or German, the war that has just broken out is an unjust, predatory and imperialist war. The Communist Parties and the people of all countries should rise up against it and expose the imperialist character of both belligerents, for this imperialist war brings only harm and no benefit whatever to the people of the world, and they should expose the criminal acts of the social-democratic parties in supporting the imperialist war and betraying the interests of the proletariat. The Soviet Union is a socialist country, a country in which the Communist Party is in power, and it necessarily maintains a clear-cut twofold attitude towards wars: (1) It firmly refuses to take part in any unjust, predatory and imperialist war and maintains strict neutrality towards the belligerents. Hence the Soviet Red Army will never disregard principles and join either of the two imperialist war fronts. (2) It actively supports just and non-predatory wars of liberation. . . Only if the nature of the war changes, if the war in one or more countries undergoes certain necessary changes and becomes advantageous to the Soviet Union and the peoples of the world, will it be possible for the Soviet Union to help or participate; otherwise it will not." (*Selected Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 277-278)

If we closely study the history of the Second World War, we realize that in gearing up for war, the imperialists take into account the existence of socialist countries. Hence neither socialist coun-

tries nor any Marxist-Leninist party or organization, including Toufahn, can remain indifferent towards the imperialist maneuvers and warlike policies of different bourgeois forces.

### OUR INTERNATIONAL TASKS

In summary we should:

- 1) strengthen our unity with Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations, particularly with the glorious Communist Party of China and the Albanian Party of Labor on the basis of proletarian internationalism;
- 2) defend the People's Republics of China and Albania and other socialist countries;
- 3) support the national liberation struggles of third world peoples;
- 4) support the struggle of the working class and other working peoples of all countries;
- 5) support the political and economic struggles of third world countries against imperialism and the two superpowers and all the measures that promote unity among them;
- 6) support the anti-hegemonic tendency of the second world;
- 7) support third and second world countries' efforts to unite;
- 8) struggle against both superpowers as the biggest oppressors and exploiters of the world today and form the broadest international united front against them;
- 9) expose the war preparations of both superpowers;
- 10) expose the Soviet Union as the main source of the new war and discredit and isolate all revisionist parties as her fifth columns;
- 11) oppose the Soviet Union's "detente" hoax and all the warlike maneuvers of the West, particularly the policy of appeasement towards Soviet social-imperialism.

### TARGETS OF REVOLUTION IN IRAN

Lenin says: "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is working wholeheartedly for the development of revolutionary movement and revolutionary struggle in one's own country. . . ." (Lenin, C.W., Vol. 24, p. 75) This "development of revolutionary movement," however, would be impossible if we fail to determine our strategy towards friends and enemies both domestically and internationally.

Our country today has become a haven for imperialists and



above all U.S. imperialists. The Shah's regime is an imperialist client regime which represents the interests of reactionary classes in Iran. It exercises organized terror and counterrevolutionary violence against the people and suppresses all political and social freedoms. Today, Soviet social-imperialism also has a major share in the plunder of Iran. Once again the danger of colonialism threatens us from the northern borders. Hence, struggle against U.S. imperialism and the Shah's regime would be meaningless unless it is tied to the struggle against the Soviet superpower and the Central Committee clique of revisionist Tudeh Party which acts as her fifth column in Iran.

Despite 15 years of neo-colonial reforms in different areas, particularly in the countryside, the economic, political and social conditions as a whole remain unchanged. This is especially true of the countryside. The land reform could not and, in fact, did not put an end to the dominance of feudal relations in the countryside. Our country still remains semi-feudal and semi-colonial and as the "Draft Programme and Constitution of the Working Class Party" states, it is still in the stage of bourgeois-democratic revolution.

This revolution is part of the world proletarian revolution and only under the working class leadership, exercised through its party, can it succeed. The targets of this revolution are imperialism and its dependent reactionary classes, represented by the Shah's regime. This is the only correct strategy and our tactics must always be subordinated to it.

#### IRANIAN GOVERNMENT'S FOREIGN POLICY

In recent years the Shah's regime has been pursuing a contradictory policy in her international relations. In a sense, internationally it sides with the struggle of third world countries, while on the other hand maintaining a basic adherence to the imperialist powers, especially U.S. imperialism. To better understand this question, let us review some concrete examples.

For instance, by preserving the unity of OPEC and demanding a higher price for oil, it stands with the third world member-states of OPEC, but the income from such oil price increases are appropriated in such a way that only furthers the predatory interests of imperialists (e.g. investment in Krupp Industries which is on the verge of bankruptcy, joint economic ventures with racist South Africa, etc.).

The recent agreement between Iran and Iraq on resolving differences and normalizing relations on the basis of mutual inter-

ests, provides another example. On the basis of this agreement, Iraq relinquished her claim over the entire Shat'el Arab waterway and accepted the Talweg line as the water boundary. Iran in return ceased all her subversive activities against Iraq and stopped aiding the Kurds. This agreement showed that the third world countries can resolve their differences through consultation, without resorting to force. It strengthened the unity of third world countries and in this case the unity of OPEC. It was not surprising, therefore, that Boumediene played an important role in initiating discussion between the two parties.

On the other hand, once the Shah's regime felt secure within its western borders, it stepped up its chauvinist, anti-Arab propaganda in relation to Oman and carried out open aggression against that country.

On the one hand, the Shah's regime allows the Palestine Liberation Organization to set up a political office in Teheran, and on the other hand, overtly and covertly supports the Tel Aviv Zionists both materially and morally.

After the victory of the Indochinese people, the Shah's regime recognized the governments of these countries and established diplomatic relations with them, while during the American war of aggression it stood on the side of U.S. imperialism's campaign against the national liberation struggles in that part of the world.

Shah's regime refuses to join the Soviet "Asian Collective Security System" which is primarily aimed at encircling and isolating China, demands a higher price for natural gas from the Soviet Union, and tremendously builds up its armed forces with strategic offensive weapons, but at the same time in an attempt to appease the Soviet Union, it concludes a 15-year economic agreement with her and gives her a free hand in exploiting Iranian natural resources.

Of course, Shah's armament program accords mainly with the general strategy of the United States in dealing with her superpower rival, the Soviet Union, and controlling the strategic area of that region. However, it is at the same time Shah's personal response to the subversive activities of the Soviet superpower that is casting a covetous eye on Iran. This arms build-up can better be judged in the light of the Soviet-instigated invasion of Pakistan by India and the subsequent dismemberment of that country. Pakistan was divided in half despite the fact that she was a member of the CENTO treaty, and the United States, through mutual and multilateral treaties, was supposed to have "defended" her territorial integrity in the face of aggression.

These contradictory examples in the foreign policy of the Iranian regime, together with her recognition of the People's Republic of China and severance of relations with Taiwan, establishment of diplomatic relations with the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and Kampuchea, not to mention her votes in the U.N. in favor of the third world, all testify to the fact that the Shah's regime can no longer continue her old policies at a time when the world is witnessing a serious decline of imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism. The Iranian government is well aware of the fact that standing against the irresistible tide of the third world struggle is tantamount to international isolation.

On the other hand the Shah's regime also knows for a fact that it cannot separate her fate from that of U.S. imperialism, for this is a life and death question for the classes whose interests it represents. This is the aspect which plays an absolute, decisive and permanent role in the international standing of the Shah's regime, while the measures it adopts in favor of rising third world unity are relative, transient and conditional. Nonetheless, the existence of such measures is an objective fact and their recognition does not mean their endorsement.

We must utilize contradictions that arise among the imperialists, particularly between the superpowers, and between them and their clients. "But we should never allow those clients to use such transient and secondary contradictions as a weapon to misrepresent their real policies and deceive the people." (*Toufahn* no. 71, p. 2) Our attitude towards those measures which represent a secondary contradiction between the Shah's regime and its imperialist bosses must be based on this principle.

Dear comrade, such are our observations on some of the questions about which you have inquired our opinion.

With the Best Greetings,

(translated from the Persian)