

25

CERTAIN
INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONS
AFFECTING MALAYA

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

CERTAIN
INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONS
AFFECTING MALAYA

(Reprinted from *Malayan Monitor*, January 31, 1963)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1963

MALAYA has entered a very important stage in its struggle for national independence, re-unification, democracy and peace. Since the first sparks of the people's armed struggle, led by the Communist Party of Malaya, against the Japanese invaders in 1941, the patriotic struggle to rid the country of all forms of colonialism has spread on all levels. It was the combined effort of all patriotic sections of the Malayan population in carrying out the dual tasks of the national independence struggle, the military and the non-military, which compelled the British imperialists to concede the right of independence to the Malayan Federation in 1957 and of "internal self-government" to Singapore in 1959. In the ensuing years, British imperialism was compelled to resort to further improvisation, when it found that its puppet "governments" in the Malayan Federation and Singapore could not maintain any degree of stability in face of growing opposition. In the sphere of armed struggle, the puppet Malayan authorities could neither defeat nor contain the Liberation Army which is led by the Communist Party of Malaya; and in their desperation, the Malayan puppet authorities have been compelled to shed their "neutralist" disguise and to rely more and more on the forces and arms of British imperialism and the SEATO war bloc as a whole. In the sphere of constitutional struggle, both the Malayan puppet "governments" have long since lost popular support. In the Malayan Federation, the Rahman "government" has been subsisting on a "majority" carved out by British bayonets and other instruments of

mass repression; while in Singapore, the Lee Kuan Yew "government" has lost even its nominal majority in the Legislative Assembly.

Confronted with this situation, the British imperialists imposed, at the end of last year, a "unified military command" — incorporating their armed forces in the Far East into a centralised, supreme command, with headquarters in Singapore. Simultaneously, they imposed the "Malaysia" plan which aimed at forcing the two territories of Malaya (the Malayan Federation and Singapore) and the three north Borneo territories (Sarawak, Brunei, and "British" North Borneo) to "federate" under their overall control. However, these desperate measures also met with strong opposition in Malaya, and sparked off the armed rebellion in Kalimantan Utara (the north Borneo territories).

In addition to these improvisations, the British imperialists have increased their military and political liaison with, and provided military training to the U.S.-led SEATO puppet forces in South Vietnam, Thailand and elsewhere, in the hope of keeping their colonialist foothold in S. E. Asia. In this way, they hope to "contain" the surging national liberation movement in Malaya, Kalimantan Utara and elsewhere in S. E. Asia, or at least, put up a show of "strength" to intimidate and "deter" the peoples of this region.

The Controversy and the Facts — Unfortunately, in a situation that is increasingly favourable to the forces of peace, national liberation and Socialism, and in which maximum unity of views and actions among the worldwide anti-imperialist forces as a whole is called for, certain ideological divergences have erupted. We do not propose to deal with the mechanics of the inter-Party

controversy that has developed over the years among a number of Communist and Workers' Parties. This matter can, and should be thoroughly gone into by the appropriate and competent authority of the international Communist movement, the unifying framework for which was set up by the Communist and Workers' Parties from 81 countries in Moscow in 1960. However, insofar as the controversy has revealed certain fundamental divergences that directly affect such questions as peace, war, imperialism, and the national liberation movement; and insofar as certain erroneous views have been disseminated through every conceivable public channel on these vital questions, it becomes a matter of duty and necessity to join issue. But before we do so, we wish to make it perfectly clear that if we do not conform to the customary practice of replying to the points in issue through the same media in which they appeared, it is because we know we are not likely to be given the adequate opportunity to do so; and the only other alternative — of paying £20,000 to an imperialist paper to air what is after all, an internal, fraternal matter — is anathema to us, being in our view, tantamount to nuclear annihilation of working class principles and morality.

The central point of the attack launched by the revisionists seems to be this: The Chinese Communist Party and others who regard imperialists and all reactionaries as "paper tigers" make light of the striking-power of the imperialists, especially when the latter are armed with nuclear weapons. Therefore, argue the revisionists, the exponents of the theory (on "paper tigers") are "irresponsible" and, by implication, even callous about human lives.

Such attack, in our opinion, and in the experience of the overwhelming majority of the world-wide anti-imperialist movements, is completely unjustified. The peoples in the colonies and the semi-colonies have never had any difficulty about understanding the meaning and deep significance of Mao Tse-tung's thesis on "paper tigers". Its critics could not have read it. Or, if they have read it, they certainly could not have read with any degree of intelligence. The "paper tiger" thesis as expounded by Mao Tse-tung is basically, and in terms of principle of action, revolutionary strategy and tactics, no different from Lenin's thesis on the "moribund" nature of imperialism and his characterisation of imperialism as a "colossus with clay feet". Again, just as Lenin implicitly and explicitly advocated a fearless, bold, and relentless struggle against imperialism (the practical strategy), he also opposed impulsive, ill-prepared, adventurist policies and actions that turn potentially victorious battles into defeat (tactics). How is this different from Mao Tse-tung's brilliantly succinct summation: "Slight" (i.e., treat with the knowledge of its outwardly strong, but intrinsically weak, brittle and moribund nature) the "paper tiger" strategically; but deal with it seriously on all tactical considerations.

Why then, the attack; and what is even more serious, the deliberate distortion?

That is a question which not only serious Marxist-Leninist Parties, but also all others throughout the world who are seriously endeavouring to rid the world of the imperialist evil should perhaps go into most thoroughly.

Meanwhile, it is sufficient to say that no genuine revolutionary movement against imperialism, no genuine national liberation movement aiming at national eman-

ipation, indeed, no genuine anti-imperialist Party have achieved success without understanding and applying the understanding of the "paper tiger" nature of imperialism.

Has "The Bomb" Made Any Difference to the "Paper-Tiger" Theory?—The revisionists also argue that the theory on "paper tigers" may be "all right" at the time of the Chinese Revolution, but it is "all wrong" when the imperialists are "armed to the teeth" with nuclear weapons.

This typically mechanical form of argument is not even accurate in point of chronology. Mao Tse-tung's theory on "paper tigers" was first made public in 1947 — that is to say, two years after the U.S. imperialists had not merely been "armed with", but had actually dropped atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. What is even more pertinent: because of the immensely greater devastation suffered by the Soviet Union than by the U.S. in the anti-Fascist war, the U.S. was able to achieve not just superiority, but sole monopoly of nuclear weapons at the relevant time! Mao Tse-tung's theory on "paper tigers" is all the more significant in the light of the fact that it was first expounded at a time when the imperialist camp held *absolute monopoly* of nuclear weapons, when China was deeply penetrated and almost completely surrounded by the imperialists, when the Chinese Liberation movement was still virtually at the stage of guerilla warfare, and when the first-ever atom bombs dropped (in Hiroshima and Nagasaki) were dropped close to the Soviet Union and China, and with almost devastating undertones of an imperialist "show of strength".

However, such is the "moribund" (Lenin's version) and "paper tiger" (Mao's version) nature of imperialism; such

[was] the correct understanding of this by the Marxist-Leninist Parties and national liberation movements at the time, that with all its overwhelming, global superiority in arms, bases, and resources, imperialism could not stop the emergence of one Socialist State after another, one independent country after another — until, to date, imperialism finds itself rolled back like a dirty carpet and confronted with a Socialist Camp and a world-wide combined anti-imperialist force for freedom and peace which in the aggregate is decisively superior in numbers, in resources, in “conventional” strength, in space-conquest and yes, in nuclear weapons too! If the characterisation of imperialism as “paper tiger” was correct and accepted in practice by all serious Marxist-Leninist Parties, and if it vitally contributed to the liberation of China, the establishment of the Socialist Camp, the gigantic sweep of world-wide national liberation in the colonies and the semi-colonies, and to the relentless defeat of the imperialists’ “global strategy”, at the time when the imperialists enjoyed nuclear monopoly and overall military and material superiority, then by what factual test and process of reasoning has the characterisation become “all wrong”, “irresponsible” and “underestimation of imperialism” at a time when the combined forces of Socialism, national liberation and peace have long since outstripped imperialism? The logic of the revisionists and their “new” analysis of the world situation are, to say the least, topsy-turvy. And the result of their “logic” and their “new” analysis, if put into practice, could only be the weakening of the Socialist Camp, the diversion of the struggle for peace into opportunist channels, and the emasculation of the national liberation movement.

The “Nuclear Annihilation” Theory — Failing to answer satisfactorily the factual challenge of history against their “logic” and their “new” analysis, the modern revisionists use tactics of moral and intellectual stampede. First, they slander (as the Tito clique of Yugoslavia does) the People’s Republic of China and all other Revolutionaries as “warmongers”. Then they argue that because “both sides” (the anti-imperialists and the imperialists) now possess large stocks of nuclear weapons, a nuclear war would virtually “annihilate all mankind”.

The first point is not worth dwelling upon. It suffices to say that it is a foul slander which only advanced desperados resort to and which only those with abnormally low intelligence would credit. The shame is not on those slandered; it is on those who perpetrate it and those who credit it.

The second point is worth more serious examination, because many sincere people in the world are worried by the threat of nuclear war; and the element of latent fear or concern in most people, when stirred up by imperialist “show of strength” and nuclear blackmail, or by the revisionists’ moral and intellectual stampede, can assume horrifying proportions. In other words, this is a practical question, a question of immediate importance, and it is a question which involves many aspects of the Revolutionary struggle.

To begin with, one should note that the revisionists have advanced their “nuclear annihilation” theory roly-poly fashion. They have thrown their ingredients together in a heap (questions of peace, national liberation, class struggle, Socialism, Communism, imperialism, anti-imperialism, peaceful co-existence, etc., all in an in-

distinguishable jumble), and wrapped up the lot into a terrifying shape — the shape of the “nuclear bomb”!

To do their case full justice, one can describe it as the theory of the omnipotence of weapons, or, weapons decide all; or, weapons transcend the human factor (and, by implication, the factor of scientific Revolutionary struggle as well).

At every stage in human history, there has existed a gap between those with weapons and those without. Whatever the nature of the weapons, the oppressors had, at first, enjoyed monopoly or near-monopoly of weapons of mass destruction; and they had never hesitated to use them to suit their purpose. In the appropriate context of historical development of mankind, particularly in the realm of Revolutionary struggle of the oppressed against the oppressors, the relative gap between the oppressors who possessed weapons of mass slaughter and the oppressed who possessed none or little of such weapons, was quite terrifying. Add to that the fact that hundreds of millions of men, women and children perished or were crippled for life every year under the heel of modern imperialism, and one begins to understand how terrifyingly disproportionate the balance of forces was not so long ago between the imperialists and the other reactionaries on the one hand and the oppressed peoples on the other. Even today, in countries where imperialists and other reactionaries still hold sway, this “terrifying” disproportion still exists. Does this mean that the oppressed peoples in these countries are without hope, must give up their Revolutionary struggle, and await the tender mercies of “peaceful evolution”? By no means! Everywhere people have learnt or are learning rapidly that neither weapons nor a combination of weapons and all other instru-

ments of oppression can be regarded as “omnipotent” or transcending the human factor — much less, when the human factor has been galvanised by the only omnipotent weapon known to the human race, the weapon of scientific Revolution as shaped by Marxism-Leninism. As Fidel Castro put it, in the light of his own and his compatriots’ first-hand, up-to-the-minute and most “terrifying” experience vis-a-vis that much-boloneyed nuclear monster, U.S. imperialism:

“We know that by resisting the imperialists and remaining firm in the face of the U.S. imperialists, we are defending the rights of mankind. This is how we Cubans think. . . .

“The number of those who died in a year in Latin America, died of starvation or of disease because of the lack of medical care, was greater than that of those who died for their own liberation. Because here, the fight cost the lives of 20,000 people, but they have saved the lives of many times 20,000.” (“Speech to the Women’s Congress of the Americas”, 16th January, 1963.)

Indeed history bears this out. Right up to the end of the outbreak of the Great October Socialist Revolution, there was not a single country in the world that was freed from the shackles of capitalism-imperialism. The oppressed peoples of the world possessed nothing but their chains. The capitalist-imperialists had every conceivable material superiority. But the oppressed peoples had begun to be armed with the only invincible, the only omnipotent weapon — Marxism-Leninism. By using this weapon faithfully and creatively, one after another of the oppressed peoples was freed; one after another of the capitalist-imperialists’ superiority in weapons and other material resources was wrested from their hands. In a

word, the world saw the progressive destruction of the "colossus with clay feet", the "paper tiger".

Revisionists' Caricature of Revolution and Peaceful Co-existence — To justify their argument, the modern revisionists caricature those who advocate and stand by the principles of revolutionary struggle as "opponents to compromise" and "disrupters of peaceful co-existence".

No genuine revolutionary has ever opposed compromise on principle; and no genuine revolutionary has ever opposed peaceful co-existence among nations having different social systems. The revisionists cannot cite a single instance to back up their charge. On the contrary, it is a matter of unimpeachable record that it is precisely the governments, Parties and movements which are most clear, correct and faithful in the understanding and application of Marxism-Leninism which have all along successfully combined frontal struggle against imperialism with principled negotiations and principled compromise; appropriate and principled use of force against imperialist armed aggression with other forms of struggle; and relentless class struggle internally and proletarian internationalism externally with peaceful co-existence on a State-to-State level vis-a-vis countries having different social systems. Throughout the relevant periods of the October Revolution and the consolidation of the Soviet Union against internal and external enemies, Lenin and Stalin defined and successfully implemented these multiple facets of the Revolution. Throughout the relevant periods of the Chinese Revolution also, when the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Revolution faced a life-and-death struggle, these multiple facets of the Revolution were clearly defined and implemented by Mao Tse-tung; and today, China's uncompromising struggle and support

for all struggles against imperialism goes on, side by side with a practical demonstration of peaceful co-existence on a world-wide scale (including a whole series of border settlements and negotiations) that is second to none. Nor are these the only examples of the correct way in which the multiple facets of the Revolutionary struggle are being implemented.

In contrast, the modern revisionists and their friends who are so free in their slander of the Marxist-Leninist Revolutionaries as "warmongers" and "dogmatists" and whose bankruptcy of principles, morals and common manners was eloquently demonstrated by their resort to booing and catcalls at certain Party congresses, have a sorry record of unprincipled compromise and even co-habitation with imperialism. The Tito clique of Yugoslavia, in particular, whose back-door intrusion into the threshold of the fraternity of the world's Communist and Workers' Parties has taken place without the approval or knowledge of the fraternity as such, has since its inception embraced the bourgeois nationalist concept of the State and of "evolutionary socialism". Consistent with this stand, the Tito clique sees itself as "free from" all "burdensome" Revolutionary principles and obligations in its domestic and foreign policies. In domestic affairs, the Tito clique preaches and practises the theory of "class-tolerance", whereby "free enterprise" and the profit-motive exist in industry and agriculture — not as a matter of principled, phasal and controlled development towards complete working class hegemony, but as a state of things "special" to the "conditions in Yugoslavia". Thus, more than 17 years after its liberation by the Soviet Red Army and the efforts of the rank-and-file partisans, Yugoslavia has still to taste the fruits of Socialism. In its interna-

tional relations, the Tito clique spurns the "old" concept of proletarian internationalism as "dogmatic", and exercises the "independent" authority of a "cabal" or a junta in picking its own friends and its own enemies.

The utter lack of principles it has shown in this has, not surprisingly, led to fantastic results — fantastic, that is, for people who claim to be "communists". For example, the Tito clique scorns the Marxist-Leninist appraisal of imperialist "aids" as "dogmatic", and has accordingly become a recipient of and debtor to U.S. imperialism; until today, it has the doubtful honour of being in the top half of the list of victims from whom the U.S. imperialist creditors are daily exacting their pound of flesh.

Receipt of imperialist "aid" by the Tito clique has had other and even more disastrous consequences. Active participation in the U.S.-led "Balkan alliance" (the NATO of the Balkans) is one; and the sedulous echoing of imperialist slanders against Socialist countries and Marxist-Leninist Parties is another. Thus, throughout the U.S. imperialist armed occupation of China's Taiwan, the Tito clique blames—not the U.S. imperialists—but the People's Republic of China for causing "tension" in the region! When the Tibet counter-revolution (hatched and carried out at the instigation of the imperialists) broke out, the Tito clique reserved a kick for the People's Republic of China and an apologia for the imperialists and the counter-revolutionary elements. Likewise, when the Hungarian counter-revolution (again hatched and carried out by the imperialists) broke out, it transpired that the Tito clique not only harboured but even sent words of encouragement to the imperialist agents, and attacked the necessitous armed aid of the Soviet Union to the Republic of Hungary as "aggression". Since 1947, the Tito

clique has continuously sent its emissaries overseas — to the Middle East, Africa and Asia (including Malaya) — to try and offset the militant anti-imperialist struggles of the peoples by peddling a brand of "anti-colonialism" later to be identified with that of such men as Nehru of India and Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore — to mention only two of the recently-exposed associates of Tito. When, in October 1962, the Nehru government, with imperialist arms, launched a large-scale attack on China in the boundary region, the Tito clique was among the most vociferous in its slander of the People's Republic of China as "aggressor" and "betrayers" of the peaceful co-existence principle.

The Tito clique's upside-down "theory" and practice of "socialism" and "anti-colonialism" is not confined to larger and, presumably more profitable targets of attack. For many years, it has inveigled itself into the realm of the national liberation movements of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, bearing one message: Do not do anything to "provoke" the imperialists; follow the "evolutionary" road; do not involve the question of the struggle for peace with the naming of imperialism as the source of war; the "essence of peaceful co-existence is compromise"; and so on. Even this degeneration into unprincipled liaison with imperialism is, apparently, not enough for the Tito clique: it has now rephrased "peaceful co-existence" into "peaceful co-operation" — the essence of which is indistinguishable from (even if one assumed it wasn't a part of) Kennedy's "offer" of a 20-year "peace". That is, "peace" involving the cessation of national liberation struggles; "peace" involving the U.S. imperialists' "right" to "democratise" the Socialist countries; "peace" which spells complete liquidation of the world-wide

struggle for peace, democracy and Socialism without a single genuine concession from U.S. imperialism in return. And the Tito clique and its revisionist friends blame the "dogmatists" (i.e., the genuine Revolutionaries) for rejecting and exposing this offer of a viper's kiss!

Revisionism and Neo-Colonialism — By its very nature, its historical antecedents and its performance, modern revisionism is the negation of the Marxist-Leninist concept of class struggle. Like their ideological progenitors — the Kautskys and the Bernsteins — the modern revisionists do, as a matter of expediency, emit loud noises against capitalism and imperialism; and like the Kautskys and the Bernsteins, the modern revisionists pay copious lip-service to anti-colonialism and the emancipation of the oppressed peoples.

The modern revisionists are, however, far more ambitious and dangerous than their predecessors: they regard themselves as the vanguard of a new crusade to help set up "neutralist", "non-bloc" alignments among newly independent States and among the national liberation movements of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Their aim is to check at source, the world-wide, anti-imperialist united front of the peoples; to substitute proletarian internationalism with cosmopolitanism. One of the ways the revisionists set out to achieve this is to incite and spread crude, chauvinistic sentiments — especially among peoples who thirst for national independence. A glaring product of this crusade is the "re-formed" "Communist Party of India" under the leadership of S. A. Dange. When the bourgeois, chauvinistic government of Nehru, with U.S.-led imperialist armed backing, attacked China, Dange and his associates hastily threw themselves into the "war effort", defended Nehru to the

hilt (including the latter's use of imperialist armed aid), hailed Nehru's government as "democratic", slandered the People's Republic of China as "aggressor" and a "military dictatorship", and lauded the Tito clique of Yugoslavia as "correct" exponents of "Marxism-Leninism" and "socialism". And, to show how completely Dange and his friends had fulfilled the graduation standards of the revisionist "reformation", Dange himself undertook an international tour to propagandise the cause of India's "war effort" (i.e., aggression and slander against China) after due briefing by the extreme right-wing Minister of the Interior, Shastri.

Needless to say, the Tito clique and its revisionist friends heartily applauded this remarkable demonstration of "re-formed" "communism", "re-formed" "Marxism-Leninism", "re-formed" "patriotism", and "re-formed" "proletarian internationalism".

Needless to say, too, the imperialists, especially the U.S. State Department, saw in all this, "new potentialities" for their cause. The U.S. State Department went so far as to consult U.S. Western allies on the possibilities of exploiting what they called the "split" within the international Communist movement and within the world-wide, anti-imperialist united front. The U.S. State Department, by way of giving a "guiding line" for action, characterised the just and staunch stand of the People's Republic of China as "militant communism", most "aggressive", and most "dangerous", and, therefore, must be "contained". By inference, all militant national liberation movements — that is, those refusing to be "re-formed" by the revisionists — are "aggressive" and "dangerous" and must be suppressed by armed intervention. To cite but three current examples: the unrelaxed U.S.

imperialist invasion-threat against Cuba, the extension of direct armed intervention by the U.S. imperialists against the South Vietnam people's Liberation Front, and the British imperialist armed suppression against the people's Liberation movement in Kalimantan Utara.

Therefore, at a time when the imperialists, especially the U.S. imperialists, are using the dual weapon of armed aggression and false doctrines (including U.S. State Department-vetted "Marxism-Leninism") to achieve their neo-colonialist ends, it becomes a matter of extreme importance for the national liberation movements of the world to combat modern revisionism as part of their general anti-imperialist struggle.

The Question of Unity—It is sometimes said that to achieve unity, one must be prepared to compromise with advocates of different viewpoints. This is eminently correct; but it represents only half the truth. There are certain matters on which compromise is possible and acceptable; but there are certain other matters on which compromise is impermissible, such as matters of fundamental principles. "Unity" for the sake of formal adhesion does not, in fact, advance the cause of peace, or Socialism, or national liberation. On the contrary, it leads to confusion as to who is friend and who is foe; it leads to diffusion and eventual distortion of basic principles; it could, if allowed to persist, lead to the very "split" over which the imperialists are licking their chops. Therefore, the sooner consolidated unity is achieved on the basis of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, the better it will be for the forces of peace, Socialism and national liberation everywhere.

与马来亚有关的一些国际问题

*

外文出版社出版(北京)

1963年第一版

编号: (英)3050-675

00019

3-E-567p