

**A STRUGGLE
BETWEEN TWO LINES
OVER THE QUESTION OF
HOW TO DEAL WITH
U.S. IMPERIALISM**

FAN HSIU-CHU

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

**A STRUGGLE BETWEEN TWO LINES
OVER THE QUESTION OF
HOW TO DEAL WITH
U.S. IMPERIALISM**

FAN HSIU-CHU

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1965**

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This article was first published in the *Ta Kung Pao*,
Peking, July 26, 1965.

Printed in the People's Republic of China

IMPORTANT differences of principle exist between contemporary Marxist-Leninists and the Khrushchov revisionists on the question of how to understand and deal with U.S. imperialism.

For several years now, Marxist-Leninist parties and Marxist-Leninists throughout the world have engaged in public polemics on an unprecedented scale with the Khrushchov revisionists and waged sharp struggles against them. One of the major issues of the polemics is whether to unite with the people of the world to oppose U.S. imperialism and its lackeys or to unite with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys to oppose the people of the world.

The differences of principle on this question have come into existence since the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union where Khrushchov revisionism made its first public appearance. From that time the CPSU leadership, headed by Khrushchov, has betrayed Marxism-Leninism. It has not scrupled to sell out the interests of the Soviet people, the people of the socialist camp and the people of the whole world in order to pursue its revisionist line of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination". Moreover, it has taken every possible opportunity to accommodate and capitulate to U.S. imperialism. The Soviet and U.S. leaders have praised and increasingly collaborated with each other. They have joined in a love feast, creating a foul atmosphere. During the last few years, however, this revisionist line has met with ignominious bankruptcy after being thoroughly ex-

posed by Marxist-Leninists and resolutely opposed by the people throughout the world. It was not long before Khrushchov, who had stood briefly in the limelight as a "great personage", fell from the historical stage.

The followers of Khrushchovism-without-Khrushchov have taken over Khrushchov's trashy legacy. Realizing that things could not continue in Khrushchov's crude, bombastic and reckless manner, they have disguised themselves, put new labels on old wares and endeavoured to show that they are different from Khrushchov. They have used more cunning, softer tactics to deal with Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, employed certain hypocritical anti-imperialist phraseology to deceive the people of the world and tried their utmost to worm their way into the people's revolutionary ranks, hoping to gain a breathing-space and make political capital. But there is in fact not an iota of difference between Khrushchov and these old partners of his in respect to the nature of their revisionism. No matter how many metamorphoses they may go through, they have not departed from their line; they are still pushing ahead with their modern revisionism, still hankering after "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination" and still uniting with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys to oppose the people of the world.

The struggle of the people of the world against U.S. imperialism has now entered a period of deepening intensity. The followers of Khrushchovism-without-Khrushchov are serving U.S. imperialism in a more stealthy and crafty way; they are more, and not less, dangerous than Khrushchov. In order to lead the struggle against U.S. imperialism to still greater victories, it is necessary to expose their dual tactics and their hypocritical features

and completely smash the Khrushchov revisionist line of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination".

The differences of principle between Marxist-Leninists and the Khrushchov revisionists on the question of how to understand and deal with U.S. imperialism are mainly manifested in the following three facets:

1. How to understand the nature of U.S. imperialism.
2. How to estimate the strength of U.S. imperialism.
3. How to deal with U.S. imperialism.

HOW TO UNDERSTAND THE NATURE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

Aggression and war is the nature of imperialism. This is true when imperialism makes headway and remains true when it suffers defeat. This is true when the revolutionary forces are weak and remains true when they are strong. In a word, the nature of imperialism never changes. Anyone who departs from this point of view is apt to harbour illusions about imperialism, waver in the anti-imperialist struggle and take the path of opportunism.

A MARXIST LAW

Just before the conclusion of World War I Lenin pointed out:

...Imperialism, on the other hand, i.e., monopoly capitalism, which finally matured only in the twentieth century, is, by virtue of its fundamental economic traits, distinguished by a minimum fondness for peace and freedom, and by a maximum and universal development

of militarism. To "fail to notice" this in discussing the extent to which a peaceful or violent revolution is typical or probable is to stoop to the position of a most ordinary lackey of the bourgeoisie.¹

During the period of relative stability of capitalism after World War I, Stalin said: "Imperialism cannot live without violence and robbery, without bloodshed and shooting. That is the nature of imperialism."²

After World War II when the Chinese people defeated the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries, who were supported by U.S. imperialism, and won the great victory in their revolution, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said:

... Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again ... till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law. When we say "imperialism is ferocious", we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialists will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, till their doom.³

The whole period since the appearance of imperialism has borne out the Marxist-Leninist truth that the nature

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 44-45.

² J. V. Stalin, "Speech Delivered at the Fifth All-Union Conference of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League", *Works*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. IX, p. 201.

³ Mao Tse-tung, "Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle", *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 428.

of imperialism never changes. All the aggressive activities and war crimes perpetrated by U.S. imperialism, the leader of imperialism, since the end of World War II have further testified to this truth. Now this has been grasped by more and more people and has become a powerful ideological weapon for raising the political consciousness of the people and organizing their strength to combat U.S. imperialism.

In a class society man's class nature is his inherent character and quality. The nature of U.S. imperialism is the inherent character of the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie. Addressing the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in 1964, Lyndon B. Johnson admitted that the monopoly capitalists were stockholders of the U.S. government, who had hired him to serve them. This admission lays bare the class nature of the U.S. government.

U.S. imperialism attempts to build up a world empire on a scale hitherto unknown and to encroach on and dominate the vast intermediate zone between the socialist camp and the United States; it attempts to stamp out the revolutions of the oppressed nations and peoples and proceed to destroy the socialist countries, and thus to place all peoples and countries under the servitude and domination of the U.S. monopoly capital. This is the basic aim of the counter-revolutionary global strategy pursued by the successive U.S. administrations since the end of World War II, and it is also the concentrated expression of the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism.

In "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement", the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has quoted the correct conclusion contained in the 1960 Moscow State-

ment which points out that U.S. imperialism has become the biggest international exploiter, the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme, an enemy of the peoples of the whole world. This is a Marxist-Leninist scientific thesis.

THE MOST ORDINARY LACKEY OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

The Khrushchov revisionists, completely violating the Marxist-Leninist principle in regard to imperialism, violating the 1960 Moscow Statement which they signed, and ignoring the most obvious facts, stubbornly claim that because of the might of the socialist camp and the existence of nuclear weapons, the nature of U.S. imperialism has changed, the forces of aggression and war have changed into forces for "safeguarding peace", and the chieftains of U.S. imperialism have changed into a "reasonable group". According to them, man has only a natural attribute but no class attribute; the imperialists "also have heads on their shoulders, and brains"¹ and "do not want to start a war that will spell their own destruction".² According to them, nuclear weapons have changed the course of human history; "the atomic bomb does not draw class distinctions";³ socialism should not wage a struggle against capitalism but should like it; "some don't

¹ N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at a Meeting of Soviet-Hungarian Friendship in Moscow on July 19, 1963, *Moscow News*, Supplement, No. 30, 1963.

² N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party on June 21, 1960, *New Times*, Supplement, No. 27, 1960.

³ Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to All Party Organisations, to All Communists of the Soviet Union, *New Times*, Supplement, No. 29, 1963.

like Socialism, some dislike capitalism — we shall destroy our Noah's Ark, the globe".¹ According to them, the bourgeoisie can be changed into proletariat and monopoly capitalists can become Communists, and "when the Soviet people will enjoy the blessings of communism", even the capitalists will realize how ignorant and guilty they were when they opposed communism and they will then support socialism and "join the Communist Party". In what is said by the self-styled faithful pupils of Lenin, is there any trace of a Communist, any shadow of Marxism-Leninism? Aren't they exactly like the most ordinary lackeys of U.S. imperialism, as described by Lenin?

From Khrushchov to the Khrushchov-revisionists-without-Khrushchov, these men have persisted in their most absurd views, absolutely refusing to learn the object lessons. They embellish whoever assumes the U.S. presidency. When Eisenhower became president, they described him as a man who "has a sincere desire for peace", who "worries about ensuring peace". But when Eisenhower sent a U-2 plane to intrude into the Soviet Union, their dream of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation" was shattered. At that time Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out that "no unrealistic illusions should be cherished with regard to imperialism. Some people had described Eisenhower as a great lover of peace. I hope these people will be awakened by these facts".² The Khrushchov revisionists, however, have not woken up. When Kennedy took office, they lauded him to the skies, saying that he had "a broad

¹ N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at the Austria-U.S.S.R. Society on July 2, 1960, *Moscow News*, July 6, 1960.

² *Chairman Mao Tse-tung's Important Talks with Guests from Asia, Africa and Latin America*, Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1965, p. 7.

vision", "a clear head" and "a reasonable attitude". But it was this same Kennedy who grabbed Khrushchov by the throat during the Caribbean crisis and held him up to ridicule. When Kennedy was assassinated, Khrushchov and his like, past all sense of shame, tearfully and mournfully cried, "President Kennedy's death is a heavy blow to all who hold dear the cause of peace and Soviet-American co-operation."¹ They felt as if the whole world would stop when Kennedy went up to Heaven.

Proceeding from a pragmatic point of view, the Khrushchov revisionists even take different attitudes towards the leader of U.S. imperialism before and after he comes into power. Prior to Johnson's assumption of the U.S. presidency, they described him as one who "denies, in effect, the possibility of collaboration between the capitalist and socialist countries."² But when Johnson became president, they immediately expressed satisfaction. They were delighted when Johnson was re-elected last year, asserting that the Johnson Administration could be expected to "take concrete steps towards the further improvement of the world political climate"³ and spreading the belief that "sufficiently broad areas for co-operation" existed between the Soviet Union and the United States.

To the Khrushchov revisionists, the aggressive U.S. imperialism no longer exists; what needs to be done is to bring about "mutual concessions", "mutual compromise", "mutual conciliation", and "mutual accommodation" with the United States. But the course of events runs com-

¹ N. S. Khrushchov, Message to Johnson, *New Times*, No. 48, 1963.

² "President Kennedy's Interview", *Izvestia*, December 4, 1961.

³ Commentator's article in *Izvestia*, November 5, 1964.

pletely against their fallacy. The aggressive and warlike nature of U.S. imperialism has not changed in the least.

WHAT DOES THE "JOHNSON DOCTRINE" MEAN?

The Johnson Administration has inherited its predecessors' counter-revolutionary "global strategy", which aims at destroying the socialist countries, occupying the extensive first intermediate zone which embraces Asia, Africa and Latin America and dominating the capitalist countries in the second intermediate zone which covers Western Europe, North America, Oceania and Japan. In applying its counter-revolutionary dual tactics, the Johnson Administration has shown even greater adventurism, more reliance on wars of aggression and a stronger tendency to ignore its allies and go it alone recklessly. Here one sees the image of a highway robber.

Towards the socialist countries, the Johnson Administration adopts the cunning tactic of treating each one of them differently. It openly clamours that the United States must strive to induce forces within the Soviet Union to effect a change in order to restore the capitalist system there; and that the United States "must hasten the slow erosion of the Iron Curtain" in order to sever the Eastern European countries from the socialist camp. It also calls on the Soviet Union not to support the national liberation movements and makes this a condition for the maintenance of "peace". All this shows that, while keeping up powerful military pressure and preparing for war of aggression, the Johnson Administration is trying to disintegrate the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in Eastern Europe by peaceful means. At the same time, Johnson has also blatantly declared, "In Asia, communism wears a more aggressive face" and that it is

necessary to deal with "Communist aggression". This shows that the Johnson Administration has been trying to mainly threaten the Asian socialist countries with war and is actually perpetrating grave military provocations against them.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America, the Johnson Administration is brutally suppressing the national liberation movements and carrying out direct armed intervention everywhere. By increasingly broadening its aggression in south Viet Nam, massacring the people of the Congo (L) and sending troops to suppress the Dominican patriotic uprising, the Johnson Administration has launched wars of aggression in the countries of these three continents. It intensifies its aggression, intervention and infiltration into the national independent countries. It supports "Malaysia", a product of neo-colonialism, thus menacing Indonesia. It has directed the Thai and south Vietnamese puppet cliques to carry out frequent acts of armed provocation against Cambodia and conducted a series of subversive activities against Tanzania, the Congo (B), Burundi and other African countries. Collaborating with West Germany, the Johnson Administration supports Israel, provoking and threatening the Arab countries. In Brazil it plotted a reactionary military coup d'etat. All this demonstrates that the Johnson Administration has always tried to strangle the national liberation movements and the national independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America through war adventures and subversive manoeuvres, and has committed many evil deeds which its predecessors were afraid to commit.

The emergence of the notorious "Johnson doctrine" is another big exposure of the aggressive nature of U.S.

imperialism. In May this year, Johnson made the bellicose remark, when the United States was dispatching troops to the Dominican Republic, that "the American nations [should read U.S. imperialism] cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another communist government in the western hemisphere". He also said that in Viet Nam or anywhere else in the world where the United States has "commitments", "our power is essential, in the final test". Thus, Johnson has publicly announced to the whole world a political programme which aims at strangling the independence and freedom of all countries and suppressing the peoples' revolutionary movements by means of wars of aggression.

The "Johnson doctrine" is more adventurist and frenzied than all other "doctrines" proclaimed by previous U.S. administrations since the end of World War II. The Kennedy Administration, while stepping up arms expansion and war preparations, pursued a "strategy of peace" and, taking advantage of the adverse current of modern revisionism, carried on peaceful infiltration into certain socialist countries. It also started "operation kinship" in Asia, Africa and Latin America, sent out the "peace corps", rigged up "the alliance for progress" and sailed full speed ahead with its neo-colonialist policy. However, the accelerated development of the peoples' revolutionary movements all over the world shattered Kennedy's "strategy of peace". When Johnson assumed office he found that "peace", "democracy", "progress" and other tricks no longer worked. So he flagrantly ran up his black pirate pennant. The *New York Times* stated that the "Johnson doctrine" meant "resisting the advance of communism anywhere in the world with military forces". To launch aggression and war under the pretence

of anti-communism, to label all the peoples' struggles for independence and freedom as a "communist threat" — these were the old tricks of Hitler. Drew Pearson, an American columnist, admitted that the United States has been regarded as a "Hitler-like aggressor". The facts have proved that the "Johnson doctrine" is neo-Hitlerism.

In military strategy, the Johnson Administration has put forward the theory of "escalation". Drawing bitter lessons from the Korean war, Eisenhower dared not engage the socialist countries in direct ground warfare but advanced the strategy of "massive retaliation", attempting to use strategic nuclear weapons as a "deterrent", and "to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing". However, the great victories of the people's revolutions in Indo-China, Cuba, Algeria and other countries revealed the bankruptcy of this strategy. Kennedy had to admit that "overwhelming nuclear strength cannot stop a guerrilla war". The Kennedy Administration, therefore, adopted the strategy of "flexible response", preparing to fight nuclear war as well as limited and "special" wars. It laid emphasis on the use of "special wars" to suppress the national liberation movements and south Viet Nam became a proving ground for this "special war". But it was exactly in south Viet Nam that the "special war" met with ignominious failure. So on the basis of the strategy of "flexible response", Johnson has begun the "escalation", dividing the "special war", limited war and nuclear war into many stages and gradually intensifying his war adventures.

The Johnson Administration's "escalation" boils down to this: take a step and then decide what to do next; it is like committing murder and arson while in a constant

dread of being punished. As soon as the Korean war was over in 1954, Eisenhower said, "If the United States were, unilaterally, to permit its forces to be drawn into conflict in Indo-China and in a succession of Asian wars, the end result would be to drain off our resources and to weaken our over-all defensive position". Today, the U.S. generals and officials are still frightened to death when a war of the Korean type is mentioned. In the Korean war, the United States suffered 400,000 casualties, was driven back to where it first started the aggression and experienced an ignominious defeat. If the United States now intensifies its war adventures, it will invite bigger defeats. Nevertheless, Johnson cannot avoid going straight towards the abyss. All this gives the lie to the Khrushchov revisionists who disseminate the fallacy that the imperialists will foresee their own defeat and will therefore not start a war.

The theory and practice of the "Johnson doctrine" is a manifestation of the struggle of U.S. imperialism in its death throes. Dictated by their class instincts, all imperialists and reactionaries invariably dig their own graves by widening their wars of aggression. Wilhelm II courted his own disaster by unleashing World War I; Hitler met his doom by starting World War II; Japanese imperialism collapsed as a result of its aggression against China and the war it started in the Pacific. Now U.S. imperialism is traversing the same path, and it will never become any more "sensible" by virtue of its failures.

The reactionary, aggressive and adventurist character of the Johnson Administration is so obvious that one can hardly whitewash it. At times the Khrushchov revisionists have no alternative but to describe U.S. imperialism as being "the aggressor", "the international gendarme"

and “the main force of war and aggression of the present day”. In doing this they are merely making a show attacking U.S. imperialism, and then only to the extent that it does not affect “Soviet-U.S. co-operation”. After the Johnson Administration brought the scourge of war to Viet Nam, they treat the matter lightly and evasively say that this only shows the U.S. “ship of the state” tilts towards the “madmen” and that “today it would be unfounded to start from the supposition that the political front in the main Western countries, including the U.S.A., must inevitably move sharply to the Right in the near future”.¹

What nonsense! After all who are the madmen and who are the “sensible” ones in the U.S. ruling clique? The Khrushchov revisionists once said that Johnson was “moderate” while Goldwater was a madman, and now they say that Johnson has accepted Goldwater’s policy and tilts towards the madmen. What is the difference between the two? They say it is wrong to predict that U.S. politics is turning to the Right, but is Johnson not Right enough, or is he “Left”? They said one thing yesterday and say something else today, all illogical and self-contradictory. Whatever they say, their sole aim is to absolve U.S. imperialism and clutch a straw to save their line of “Soviet-U.S. co-operation” from drowning.

The Khrushchov revisionists assert that the nature of U.S. imperialism has changed. This precisely reflects their own class character. They have substituted the bourgeois theory of human nature for class analysis, and bourgeois pragmatism for Marxism-Leninism. According to their philosophy, “deep in the depths of the most

¹ “Foreign Policy and the Modern World”, editorial board article in *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 3, 1965.