Chairman Mao Tsetung Stands On the Pinnacle of History

— Excerpts from an article by Comrade E.F. Hill

Comrade E.F. Hill, Chairman of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), in his article which appeared in the July 28 issue of “The Vanguard,” pointed out that Chairman Mao’s strategic concept of three worlds contributes greatly to the cause of world revolution. Following are excerpts from the article. — Ed.

CHAIRMAN Mao Tsetung was the great continuer of the work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Chairman Mao was the greatest single fighter against modern revisionism. He was unswerving in his adherence to Marxism-Leninism and upholding its revolutionary banner.

Like the immortal Lenin, he stood as a giant on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theoretical principle, the purity of which is critical to the victory of proletarian revolution.

Amid all the furore of revisionism, amid the avalanche to the Right, this mighty man calmly and deliberately expounded correct Marxist-Leninist principle. He declined to go along with revisionism.

Chairman Mao Tsetung upheld with the magnificent courage of a truly classic developer of Marxism-Leninism the revolutionary essence of scientific socialism which in their day Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin had expounded and upheld.

He stood his ground against all comers.

All the recognized leaders of international communism, headed by the leaders of the C.P.S.U., proclaimed revisionism as Marxism-Leninism. Chairman Mao Tsetung denounced it as revisionism.

And Chairman Mao systematically developed the great Marxist-Leninist principle of continuing class struggle under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Even at a time when the great Stalin wrongly denied the continuance of class struggle in the Soviet Union, Chairman Mao affirmed its existence.

This theoretical principle he greatly developed.

In all respects, Chairman Mao Tsetung upheld the great truths of Marxism-Leninism. The victory of Chinese liberation and socialism are living proof of it. When the Chinese revolution followed the Marxist-Leninist line of Chairman Mao it won great victory; when it departed from that line, it suffered defeat.

Chairman Mao Tsetung made an indelible, immortal all-round contribution to Marxism-Leninism, an inestimable contribution to the cause of world revolution.

Chairman Mao Tsetung paid great attention to the development of a Marxist-Leninist proletarian foreign policy.

He proceeded from the interests of the world proletariat.

Lenin in his day, paid great attention to the international situation. From this emerged among other outstanding contributions, the possibility of building socialism in one country — a then new development of Marxism. Lenin
analysed the uneven development of capitalism, he analysed the cracks and schisms in the relationships between the capitalist powers and the need for the proletariat to take advantage of the merest crack, to ally itself if need be, with the most vacillating ally, having confidence that if the proletariat firmly adhered to Marxist-Leninist principle, it would not err.

Lenin opposed Trotsky’s idea of no deals with any imperialist.

Out of Lenin’s principled stand came the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (peace between revolutionary Russia and imperialist Germany) which saved the Russian revolution. Who was correct — Lenin or Trotsky?

Lenin’s ideas were followed by Stalin in the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact of 1939. Which was correct — Stalin’s Marxist-Leninist line or the Trotskyist line of no compromise?

Lenin ridiculed the “Left” line of “no compromises.” Lenin analysed the world in a series of classics notable among which was *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. In his speeches to the Third International he paid great attention to the divisions among the capitalist countries.

Lenin showed that capitalism dictated the development of a handful of major imperialist powers, showed the utter falsity of Kautsky’s idea of ultra (or super) imperialism (agreement between the imperialisms), he showed the differentiation between the powers and he stressed the decisive importance of the peoples of the East (now we may add Africa and Latin America).

Faithful to Lenin’s teachings and in line with them, Chairman Mao studied an immense amount of factual material of the contemporary world. He deduced his great theory of three worlds — (1) the superpowers, (2) the intermediate countries and (3) the third world.

Does this theory accord with the facts for that is the sole test of materialist dialectics?

Chairman Mao’s theory does accord with the facts.

He showed that the superpowers U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism could never agree fundamentally (contrary to views of ultra or super-imperialism), their agreement was conditional, their struggle absolute.

Is that not borne out today?

Yes it is.

In Australia it can be seen very clearly.

In the second world countries is there not rebellion at least to a degree even by the ruling circles against the superpowers? Yes there is, because the superpowers do interfere in and bully the second world countries. The bourgeoisie of these countries resist superpower encroachment; true, they compromise, are unstable. The peoples of the second world countries wage consistent revolutionary struggles.

The third world is the most reliable opponent of the superpowers. The peoples of the third world are decisive in the struggle against the superpowers.

Chairman Mao’s analysis identified enemies and friends.

It shows the conflict between the superpowers. That conflict weakens each of them. It shows the main force against them is the third world and it shows aspects of the second world as opposing the two superpowers. That is based on the dialectical principle of everything coming into being and passing away. So U.S. imperialism has come into being as a mighty imperialist power, now it is beginning to pass away. Soviet social-imperialism is coming into being as a mighty imperialist power. Materialist dialectics teaches us to discern what is growing and what is dying. Hence it is correct to point to the comparatively greater menace of Soviet social-imperialism. It is correct to recognize the contradiction between these two superpowers. At the same time, it is imperative to recognize the menace of each of them. Chairman Mao’s insistence on digging tunnels, storing grain, being prepared, testified to this.

Chairman Mao correctly recognized the aspect of the European Economic Community that constitutes a certain barrier particularly to Soviet social-imperialist expansion in Europe and at the same time, has a certain anti-U.S. imperialist aspect. Is it correct to recognize this, to take advantage of all positive factors? Of course it is.
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He greatly encouraged the third world and classified China as a socialist country of the third world. In the days of the dominant ascendency of U.S. imperialism, Chairman Mao was the world's foremost fighter against it. When Soviet social-imperialism emerged as a challenger to U.S. imperialism Chairman Mao correctly recognized it as the coming superpower and analysed the relations between it and U.S. imperialism.

All this is the very reverse of revisionism.

It is to arm the revolutionary peoples with a proletarian revolutionary foreign policy, to provide the theoretical guidance for forming the broadest united front of all who can be united against the superpowers.

Chairman Mao never confused relations between countries with relations between the classes in the given countries. But he did show and show correctly the inter-relation between the internal and external class struggle.

In the given countries, the class struggle takes on different forms and the governments of the given countries vary from one to the other.

The universal principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought are one and the same the world over. Their integration into the actual conditions of the given countries is a different matter.

The objective position of the third world countries, their common interests, weaken imperialism as a whole, even though some of their governments are fascist. It is absurd to see them as all entirely the same, but it is correct to see what is common to them—a trend of anti-imperialism. Worldwide socialism can only be successfully won in a historically short time if all factors, all their infinite variations, divisions, are taken into full account.

Chairman Mao Tsetung was pre-eminently the champion of the people. The people and the people alone make history, he proclaimed. What a magnificent concept—infinte confidence in the common folk!

In order that those people can take advantage of every weakness in the camp of their enemies and take advantage of every ally even though vacillating, conditional, he armed the proletariat with the great theory of the three worlds.

Australia is a second world country. Yet she has affinities with the third world and even belongs to certain third world organizations. On the other hand, Australia is in the orbit of U.S. imperialism which now Soviet social-imperialism is challenging.

It is correct to analyse Australia's position exploiting her second world position and her third world affinities to deal blows at the superpowers. Likewise it is correct to use her being within the U.S. imperialist orbit to deal blows at the Soviet superpower but never forgetting the U.S. imperialist enemy.

If everyone is an enemy and there are no allies, no main enemy, is this not objectively akin to Trotsky's position?

Chairman Mao with the great skill of the master of materialist dialectics that he was, discerned the facts in the world and the constant movement of the facts.

With boundless confidence in the people he applied his analysis of the three worlds. It greatly helps the people in the cause of world revolution.

His efforts have been crowned with the tremendous international and internal victories of China and her peoples, the enormous advance worldwide of Marxism-Leninism.

Chairman Mao Tsetung stood for the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principle. So long as there was fundamental upholding of Marxism-Leninism by the Communists, he insisted that different ways of looking at things by Communists in different countries should not be used to break that unity. The fermenting of differences could only weaken the common front against imperialism.

From first to last, Chairman Mao Tsetung stood for the unity of all genuine Communist Parties and Marxist-Leninist groups.

Chairman Mao Tsetung's works are noted Marxist-Leninist classics. They expound, defend
and develop the whole science of Marxism-Leninism.

The great work of Chairman Mao is being carried on by the Communist Party of China headed by Chairman Mao's successor, Chairman Hua Kuo-feng.

C.M.E.A.

Soviet Union Tightens the Screws on East European Countries

At the recent 31st session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (C.M.E.A.) held in Warsaw, Kosygin advertised the so-called "fraternal co-operation" within "the socialist community" as "international co-operation" unprecedented in the history of international economic relations. Kosygin's rhetoric went unheeded. Delegates of the other member states were more interested in making known their hardships brought on by a shortage of fuel and energy supplies.

Czechoslovak Premier Lubomir Strougal stressed at the session that solving the question of fuel and energy resources was an extremely pressing matter for his country.

Soviet revisionist boss Kosygin claimed in an attempt to quell the rising resentment and opposition of East European countries that per-capita fuel consumption in these C.M.E.A. countries already equalled that in the E.E.C. countries, adding that the Soviet Union would continue to take the most active part in solving the energy question of C.M.E.A. member states. Although the communique issued after the session said that the conference had put special emphasis on tasks related to the further expanding of the base areas of energy and raw materials, no fundamentally significant decisions were made at the meeting. This shows that Moscow and these East European countries are at loggerheads, each side having an ax to grind over the question of supplying fuel and raw materials, thus exacerbating the contradictions between them.

With insufficient energy and other resources of their own, a number of C.M.E.A. member states have all along depended on Moscow for their energy and raw material supplies. These countries now have a more pressing need for fuel and raw materials since their industrialization has gone ahead over the past few years. For instance, statistics published in the Bulgarian press shows that in recent years more than 90 per cent of the country's total oil imports, 100 per cent of its natural gas, 98.6 per cent of its electricity and 87.5 per cent of its iron ore have come from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, the self-appointed "big brother" of "the socialist community," sees this as a fine opportunity to step up its control and plunder of East European countries.

Claiming that it costs more now to exploit and ship oil and other raw materials, Moscow has made East European countries pay more. Take the price of oil for instance. It rose 130 per cent in 1975, 8 per cent in 1976 and 25 per cent this year. These sharp price increases for
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