

**WHAT'S
IN
A
PRIORITY
?**

Nusret Sen

Chip Publishing

WHAT'S IN A PRIORITY?

**WHAT'S
IN
A
PRIORITY
?**

Nusret Sen

Chip Publishing

Published by:

**Chip Publishing
Box 50,
213 Camberwell Road
London SE5 0HG**

Copyright © Nusret Sen 1998

Second printing: 2009

ISBN: 1 900614 02 2

**British Library Cataloguing in publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the
British Library.**

Cover Design: Nusret Sen

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	6
CHAPTER I	9
COMMENTARY	9
A.1. SOVIET UNION—KRUSHCHEVITES and CPSU	9
A.2. WHAT'S IN A PRIORITY?	16
B. E. HOXHA AND THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA.	21
C. MAO TZE-TUNG AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA	25
D. AN INTERESTING EXAMPLE: THE POLISH EXPERIENCE	28
E. THE RESULT	29
CHAPTER II	30
DOCUMENTS	30
A. THE SOVIETS	30
B. E. HOXHA AND THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA .	46
C. MAO TZE-TUNG AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA	64
D. AN INTERESTING EXAMPLE: THE POLISH EXPERIENCE	79
APPENDIX	84
1. GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR	84
2. PEACEFUL ROAD OF TRANSITION TO COMMUNISM ...	92
3. TRUE BELIEVERS	94

INTRODUCTION

The perceived wisdom is that, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) has set upon a revisionist course beginning with its 20th congress(1956); that Stalin was attacked for the first time at this congress and that by Khrushchov in his secret speech which many people did not know of till some time later; that the Communist Party of China (CPC) and Party of Labour of Albania (PLA) has began a defence of Stalin and a fight against the revisionism of the 20th congress some time after this; that the fight of these parties represent the fight of Marxist-Leninists against the Soviet revisionists; that this fight represents the defence of Stalin against his enemies; that the division thus came about between the CPSU and the CPC and PLA is the first division in the communist movement after Stalin's death between the Marxist-Leninists and the revisionists, etc., etc.

We have to look into the correctness or falseness of these propositions. That we have to do so should have been obvious to all for obviously we have been defeated in a bad way, we have been smashed to smithereens and obviously the ideologies perpetrated by all quarters in the above mentioned division have not given us a weapon to fight with but a rope to hang ourselves with. And we most certainly hanged ourselves with that rope. Long past the time we realised what has gone on and what is going on.

This work is a small start in this respect. It shows that the attack upon Stalin—if Stalin means building communism- has began in August 1953, at the latest, that his plan of building communism has been openly attacked at the beginning of August 1953 and carried on being openly attacked at the 20th Congress. That for only those

who understand from an attack upon Stalin an attack on his personality and thus sink Stalin to their own narrow, petty, personal (personality cult) level can think that the attack upon Stalin began with the secret speech of Khrushchev at the 20th Congress and can not see the attack that was openly started before the 20th Congress and carried on, again openly, at the 20th Congress.

And again, when we look at the documents of CPC and PLA we can easily see why is it that they understand from the defence of Stalin a defence of his personality etc. For we see that when it is an issue of policy of how to build communism, they, the Soviet, the Chinese and the Albanian leadership, are one and the same, that they full heartily have taken part in the attack upon Stalin's Plan of Building Communism; that their plan of building communism has nothing in common with that of Stalin's but everything in common with Khrushchov's and with Bukharin's and Trotsky's.

In the first section of this study, we comment on the documents that are presented to the reader in the second section of the book. We have divided the commentaries just as we have divided the documents as those of Soviets, Chinese and Albanians with an interesting addition from the Poles. The third section of the book, the appendix, has been added to strengthen the views presented in the first section, that the CPC and ALP knew of the attacks on Stalin's plans, did not defend his plans and that they took part in the formulation of revisionist policies.

All has to choose whom they will follow: Stalin—with his Plan of Building Communism—or his opponents—with their own plan of building “communism”.

There never was, and there is not now, a third road.

One either joins the fight against all revisionists of Marxism-Leninism without any compromise, or one preserves one's ways of compromise and keeps one's connections with the enemies of communism.

CHAPTER I

COMMENTARY

A.1. SOVIET UNION—KRUSHCHEVITES and CPSU

The attack upon Stalin's Plan of Building Communism did not start with an attack upon Stalin's personality during the 20th Congress. It started just six months after his death—leaving aside the political conspiracies which started immediately after his death, indeed most likely before his death. What is attacked is not his personality but his Plan of Building Communism. Nor is this done behind closed doors but in the open, in the public meeting of the Supreme Soviet of August 1953. I shall here follow this attack, the attack upon Stalin's Plan of Building Communism, specifically on one point - the relatively higher rate of expansion of production of means of production generally known as the priority development of production of the means of production, for historically that is how it starts. You can read the first available example of this attack in,

*Malenkov's Speech Before the Supreme Soviet Pravda and Izvestia, Aug. 9,v (1953. mn) pp 1-4.
Complete text:
(DOCUMENTS I)*

Hereby it has now been established by the enemies of Stalin's Plan of Building Communism that, "on the ba-

sis of the progress we have made in the development of heavy industry, we have” “the opportunity to develop light and food industry at the same rate as heavy industry.” That of course means, “we must first of all concern ourselves with further development and growth of agriculture.”

This is the basis of the New Line and it is not the line of “Trotskyite and right-wing capitulators and traitors” we are told, because heavy industry has now been built and dominates the economy.

Whatever these traitors may claim this is the line of Trotskyite and right-wing capitulators and traitors. A line violating the 1951-55 Five Year Plan—a treasonable offence under the Soviet Law-, a line which has been exposed as anti-Marxist by Stalin in his “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, a line which has been exposed as anti-Marxist, yet again, at the 19th Congress of the Party just a year before this speech by this very Malenkov himself.

As this line requires “the growth of agriculture”, the next group of justifications of this line of traitors relates to agriculture directly. You can read this in,

Measures for the Further Development of Agriculture in the U.S.S.R. by N. S. Khrushchov. Report Delivered at a Plenary Meeting of the C. C., C.P.S.U. 3 September, 1953.
(DOCUMENTS II)

As you can see, these traitors have now, detected a “discrepancy between large-scale industry and agriculture.”, and a “discrepancy between purchasing power of the people and the supply of consumer goods and food”, and that they openly declare that they have to change the

1951-55 five year plan in line with their plan, because “..the basic purpose and main task of the socialist mode of production is the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society”. Anyone who has studied Stalin’s “Economic Problems..” knows that this “consumerist” approach of the traitors to Marxism is nothing new.

The above meeting of the CC Plenum already brings forth interesting changes in agriculture which are followed by the below mentioned decrees; these are detailed and the scope of diversion from 1951-55 five-year plan, i.e., the last Stalin Plan, is obvious to all who simply glance through these decrees. They are only mentioned; the only quotation from them is yet another theoretical justification for the change of the line in relation to priority development of production of the means of production.

The detailed descriptions are given in,

Decrees:

- i-Decree on Developing Animal Husbandry. (Sept.26 1953), by the Council of Ministers and the Communist Party Central Committee.*
 - ii-Decree on Increasing Output of Consumer’ Goods. (Oct. 28 1953), by the Council of Ministers and the Communist Party Central Committee.*
 - iii-Decree on Increasing Output of Food Products. (Oct. 30. 1953), by the Council of Ministers and the Communist Party Central Committee.*
- (DOCUMENTS III)**

And yet, it should have been obvious to all concerned that the demands of the New Line could not have been met by agriculture, for, due to the very nature of agricul-

ture, production can not be increased more or less at will—if, that increase is to be sustained. A sustainable increase in agricultural production would have required the application of the “Stalin Plan of Transformation of Nature”. But of course if one wants quick and temporary results this is possible to achieve in a country with a large tracks of virgin and “unused” lands. Therefore, the opening of virgin lands and burying of the “Stalin Plan of Transformation of Nature”—that insisted on the sustainable rather than unsustainable—extensive-arming practices—, this Law of the motherland disregarding of which is a treasonable offence, could not be opposed by anyone who did not object to the new line. Thus we find:

Resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee on Virgin Lands. 23 February—2 March 1954.
(DOCUMENTS IV)

This is only mentioned just like the Decrees.

This of course does not only mean the opening of the virgin lands as such.

Opening of such lands require large number of tractors and other machines—therefore large quantities of steel and engineering factories must be built to produce these, and as these lands can carry on producing food stuffs only if they are supplied with plenty of chemical fertilisers—in opposition to Stalin Plan of Transformation of Nature—, they require building of a lot of chemical factories to produce these fertilisers—yet more steel and engineering (and oil and gas) production diverted for this purpose.

In other words, you take one step in the wrong direction and keep at it, it will take you into hell of destruction

of communism—if you are a Marxist, or into heaven of destruction of Communism—if you are a traitor.

Reader, of course would be totally wrong in assuming that the proponents of the New Line had it easy, and that things went their way all the time.

Not at all. They met with opposition??? The following document clearly shows the type of opposition that was encountered:

The General Line of Party and Vulgarisers of Marxism. D. Shepilov. 24/1/1955 Pravda.
(DOCUMENTS V)

I would like to say that this Shepilov fellow is mentioned by Stalin in his “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR”, (p.50), as follows: “As regards the other questions, I have no remarks to make on the “Proposals” of comrades Ostrovityanov, Leontyev, Shepilov, Gatskovsky, etc.”

Well, if we look at his new “Proposals”, we can see why Stalin did not think much of his proposals.

Shepilov proves that “the higher relative rate of growth of the production of means of production” is “a law of socialist economy” and thereby “defends” the Party Line against its opponents, “defends” Stalin against his distorters.

And yet, his opponents assertion “that, since 1953 the Soviet land has entered on a new stage of economic development, the essence of which lies in a radical change of the Party’s economic policy”, is solidly based on the above mentioned policy documents, on all the practical steps taken as a result of these documents which are many and varied indeed, and they are correct in their assertion that Party’s economic policy has been radically

changed. What does he do? As someone who exposes a theoretical change of line, does he also expose the fact that the Party Line has been radically changed? No. He answers this correct judgement by stating that it is wrong, that its exponents are the ones who are “crudely distorting the essence of Party and Government decisions for an increase in mass consumer goods” for, “discovering disproportions which arise in the national economy, the Party constantly takes steps of this kind”.

In other words: do what you are doing, by all means, but do not say priority of light industry or words to that effect -for that would be a change of line in theory. Say, correction of discrepancy, and do not even think of reminding anybody that the Party’s line has been changed in reality.

With an enemy like this, who needs friends.

There you have it. The proponents of the New Line opposed, Stalin defended and as the speech of N. S. Khrushchov to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. and the speech of N. A. Bulganin to The Supreme Soviets immediately after this article prove, they have been defeated as well. Take a look at the following documents:

*“On Increasing the Output of Livestock Products.”
N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Plenum of the
Central Committee of the CPSU, January 25,
1955.*

(DOCUMENTS VI)

*Speech by N. A. Bulganin. Meeting of The Su-
preme Soviet of the USSR. February 8 and 9,
1955.*

(DOCUMENTS VII)

Is this not typical of opportunism. Say one thing and yet do another.

Shepilov, Khrushchov and Bulganin are pretending to defend the principle of priority development of the production of means of production whereby they claim to defend the Party Line and yet they carry on putting into practice everything that the New Line requires. The only thing that changes is the rhetoric.

It is thus that, Khrushchev can appear as the defender of the Party Line, while defending the New Line at the 20th Congress. You can read him and others, as well as the resolution of the Congress on the subject matter in these documents.

Report of The CC of the CPSU to The 20th Party Congress. February 1956. N. S. KHRUSHCHOV.
(DOCUMENTS VIII)

Speech by A. I. Mikoyan. 16 February 1956. 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.
(DOCUMENTS IX)

Speech by G. M. Malenkov. 17 February 1956. 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.
(DOCUMENTS X)

Speech by V. M. Molotov. 18 February 1956. 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.
(DOCUMENTS XI)

RESOLUTIONS OF THE 20th CONGRESS OF THE C.P.S.U.
(DOCUMENTS XII)

In other words, business as usual. Everything and more will be done to put the New Line into practise, that everything that has been done to put the

New Line into practise is correct and must carry on, but we are not Trotskyite and right-wing capitulators, we defend the priority development of the heavy industry???

A.2. WHAT'S IN A PRIORITY?

It is indeed possible to defend the priority development of heavy industry and at the same time to stick to the New Line formulated in August 1953 and began to be put into practise after the decrees mentioned. All one has to do is juggle with the words. "production of means of production, of heavy industry".

Let us read from Stalin:

"Reply to Comrade Alexander Ilyich Notkin

...

The forth point

.....

It should first of all be observed that in this case it is not "means of production" that agriculture produces, but only one of the means of production-raw materials. The word "means of production" should not be juggled with. When Marxists speak of the production of means of production, what they primarily have in mind is the production of implements of production, what Marx calls "the instruments of labour, those of a mechanical nature, which, taken as a whole, we may call the bone and muscles of production," which constitute the "characteristics of a given epoch of production." To equate a part of the

means of production (raw materials) with the means of production, including the implements of production, is to sin against Marxism,(my italics -NS) because Marxism considers that the implements of production play a decisive role compared with all other means of production. Everyone knows that, by themselves, raw materials cannot produce implements of production, although certain kinds of raw materials are necessary for the production of implements of production, while no raw material can be produced without implements of production.”

J. Stalin. Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. Foreign Languages Publishing House. Moscow 1952. (P.60-61)

Indeed, the very use of “priority development of heavy industry” instead of “priority development of means of production” which equate production of means of production with heavy industry can itself be used as such a juggling of words.

What is this famous heavy industry: “chiefly ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, coal and oil, power, engineering, chemicals and building materials.” All of these, other than engineering industry, produces raw materials which can very well be directed to agriculture or light and food industry.

The key here is the engineering. It provides the instruments of labour for “ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, coal and oil, power, chemicals and building materials.” as well as itself. Therefore, the important key is that part of engineering industry which provides instruments of production for itself, i.e., building of machines to build machines. If one directs the engineering industry into producing instruments of labour for heavy industry

and yet direct all of these to achieve a rapid rise in consumer goods and agricultural production, one has achieved the requirements of “priority development of heavy industry” and all the requirements of the New Line as well. This is what was done. Indeed, in U.S.S.R., one can achieve “priority development of heavy industry” directing it to produce not the means of production, nor the means of consumption, but the means of destruction! This is what they have done too. In other words, this juggling of words can be used to direct the national economy into destruction while apparently adhering to the policy of “priority development of the means of production”. In the mean time, the engineering industry would find it impossible to develop itself steadily and therefore to automate all the production processes, i.e., to lead the way to communism. Game, set and match, as they say.

Priority development of means of production is a law of socialist economy.

But by itself, it does not differentiate socialist economy from capitalist economy. Indeed, once industrial capitalism has developed the production of means of production assumed priority for it too. Without this, extended reproduction is impossible even under capitalism.

Under capitalism, this law does not operate continuously and consistently, because the basic law of capitalism (obtaining maximum profits) most readily leads to the priority of not production but destruction of means of production. This is the only way capitalism can achieve its internal balances i.e., resolve its crises of overproduction.

It is otherwise under socialism. Under socialism, this law operates continuously and consistently and only thus can socialism achieve its own balances for this law operates under the law of balanced and proportionate devel-

opment of socialist economy; as such it provides the most important imputes to balance the economy. The law of balanced and proportionate development of economy is specific to socialism. This law comes into operation under socialism and enables it to develop continuously and consistently i.e., without crises, without the destruction of means of production. And the socialist economy can be balanced only if this balance is achieved to satisfy the constantly rising material and cultural needs of the people utilising the highest and constantly developing technique of production-this is the basic law of socialist economy.

Therefore, the negation of the law of the priority of the production of means of production can be utilised to distort all balances of the socialist economy, to paralyse the law of balanced and proportionate development of socialist economy and thus to put an end to the functioning of the basic law of socialist economy.

Indeed, the New Line began attacking the law of priority development of means of production, using this to violate the five-year plan which was a reflection of the law of balanced and proportionate development of socialist economy. They have later on changed their rhetoric and adapted it to Marxism and carried on as before in the name of correcting discrepancies in the balances of socialist economy. They have themselves created discrepancies and further used these to paralyse the planning organisations that enabled these laws to operate. The results are too well known.

Let us read some more on the subject matter from Stalin:

“In order to pave the way for a real, and not declamatory transition to communism, at least three main preliminary conditions have to be satisfied.

1. It is necessary, in the first place, to ensure, not a mythical “rational organisation” of the productive forces, but a continuous expansion of all social production, with a relatively higher rate of expansion of the production of means of production. The relatively higher rate of expansion of production of means of production is necessary not only because it has to provide the equipment both for its own plants and for the other branches of the national economy, but also because reproduction on an extended scale becomes altogether impossible without it.”

“.....Such fundamental tenets of the Marxian theory of reproduction as the division of social production into the production of means of production and the production of means of consumption; the relatively greater increase of production of means of production in reproduction on an extended scale; the correlation between Departments I and II; surplus product as the sole source of accumulation; the formation and designation of the social funds; accumulation as the sole source of reproduction on an extended scale—all these fundamental tenets of the Marxian theory of reproduction are at the same time tenets which hold good not only for the capitalist formation, and which no socialist society can dispense with in the planning of its national economy.....”

J. Stalin. Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. Foreign Languages Publishing House. Moscow 1952. (p.74) and (p.89)

B. E. HOXHA AND THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA.

According to some would be Marxists E. Hoxha was one of those who defended Stalin, and therefore Marxism against the Khrushchovite revisionists. How can one defend Stalin if he is engaged in participation of the destruction of the Stalin's Plan of Building Communism? If he is engaged in such an activity and yet claims to defend Stalin, does he not become an even more dangerous enemy of Stalin than the ones who oppose him openly? Is he not just another one of the enemies of Stalin's Plan of Building Communism and therefore an enemy of Stalin, a revisionist of Marxism from yet another direction?

Of course he is.

Read the following text of E. Hoxha:

"ON MEASURES TO FURTHER RAISE THE STANDARD OF LIVING OF THE WORKING MASSES". Report to the 9th Plenum of the CC of the P.L.A. December 24, 1953.
(DOCUMENTS XIII)

I was thinking of providing the reader with a summary of activities of Khrushchovites until 1956 to show that it is not simply a matter of "priority development of means of production". I gave up the idea when I came across the note 7. of this document that is presented to the reader (and Molotov's speech to the 20th congress). These are indeed perfect summations of Khrushchovism in action. All done, of course, "to reduce the disproportion in the development of industry and agriculture and to improve the living conditions of the people". Should not E. Hoxha sent his thanks to Khrushchov and Shepilov?

And if the reader, or rather the true believer, thinks this is a simple result of the Khrushchovite pressures exerted on the Albanians mentioned above, carry on reading:

“ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA”. Report to the 3rd Congress of the PLA, by E. Hoxha. May 25, 1956.
(DOCUMENTS XIV)

As can be seen from this document, “the PLA did not make any concessions on matters of principle,..., and preserved its Marxist-Leninist general line intact” i.e., the policies mentioned in this document are a part of their general line. And yet one may still think that even this is just a saying, a moral booster, that although there was a temporary diversion from the general line it was corrected as soon as they noticed Khrushchovism, and that is why they say they have not deviated from their general line?

Such an approach to one’s mistake would in itself be contrary to Bolshevism, but still...

Unfortunately for the lovers of these traitors such is not the case. The views put forward at the above mentioned document is very much their line.

And that is the real reason why they have never objected to the attack on Stalin’s plan. Just carry on reading:

“ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA”, Report to the 4th Congress of the PLA, by E. Hoxha. (Extracts) , February 13, 1961.
(DOCUMENTS XV)

Here you can see the way they stick to the Leninist line of “priority development of means of production”. First of all, the rates of development of group A and B, are almost equal although, the more backward you are, the more the development of group A has to be forced. Secondly, the development of the means of production consist in developing the raw material basis, not the engineering. In other words, E. Hoxha is juggling with the words means of production in a way we were warned by Stalin. It is this policy which we are asked to accept as Marxism.

This policy leaves the country in such a situation that, E. Hoxha, in his dying days, still has to import agricultural equipments from outside. And why? To turn the collective farms into state farms. According to this Trotskyite our motherland, USSR, was not ready to pass into communism in

1956 as its industry was backward, but Albania was ready for state ownership of collective farms, i.e., for communism in 1980's, although they could not even produce their agricultural equipments. Well, why not.

After all they had a “Marxist” Party!?

Let us carry on to insure that we are not making a mistake here:

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA. Report to the 5th Congress of the PLA, by E. Hoxha. November 1, 1966.

(DOCUMENTS XVI)

Here, not only do we have a faster rate of development of means of consumption but the development of

the means of production is basically “the development of the heavy processing industry, which is decisive in ensuring the superiority of the production of means of production”.

Nor one must forget the two legged policy of Mao Tse-tung which certainly reflects the Khrushchovite New Line perfectly. “Our Party adheres to the line that we must have not only a developed industry, but also an advanced agriculture, that for our economy to be strong and independent it must base itself on its two legs, both on industry and agriculture. This is a major issue of principle, which has special importance for our country.....”. Also, youth must go to the mountains. Just like the Chinese Cultural Revolution one might think (more of this later).

One must still not rush. Special conditions you know? Let us read on:

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA. Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, by E. Hoxha. November 1, 1971.

(DOCUMENTS XVII)

Cat is clearly out of the box: “In the complex development of industry, priority during this five-year period, too, will be given to the branches of industry extracting minerals and fuels.” and this of course means, “in deciding the proportions between heavy and light industries, priority will be given to heavy industry. This has been and remains a correct and unshakeable principle for the development of our industry.” Now we clearly know the real meaning of giving priority to the production of means of production.

Let us finish with the continued example of the priority of heavy industry, which to this sort of Marxists is the extractive and processing industry, equipment for which must be bought from outside. We shall be told that it brings in hard cash, some of which will be used to buy agricultural equipment. After all, industry is there to serve agriculture and if it can not make the agricultural equipment it can certainly buy it from the capitalists after forty years of “socialism”. Some national independence that will give you! Even the most radically nationalist, “socialist” anti-Marxist can not but give rise to total dependence of his country on the capitalist countries. Such was the fruits of E. Hoxha’s work.

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA. Extracts from the report submitted to the 8th Congress of the PLA, by E. Hoxha. November 1, 1981.
(DOCUMENTS XVIII)

C. MAO TZE-TUNG AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

We start the study of the CPC’s approach to the question by some articles on the subject matter written by people other than Mao Tze-Tung. Our reason for this approach is that, unlike E. Hoxha, Mao Tze-Tung has not left us with an abundance of materials and that some people who can not give up Mao Tze-Tung declares that some of the materials which are known to belong to him

are not acceptable for they were not printed while he was alive. These people will see that the materials we have utilised were used by the article writers while he was alive. They also provide the reader with a very good historical summation of the activities of the CPC and Mao Tze-Tung and our reference to him follows this historical summation. Let us read:

INDUSTRIES TASKS IN 1959 by PO I-PO
(DOCUMENTS XIX)

Here is the famous “two legged” policy which the supporters of Mao, who also support Stalin (?) claim is Marxist -by the way, we have seen that E. Hoxha is also a supporter of this “two legged” policy.

If this two legged policy of these four legged characters is Marxist, what is written in Das Capital by no less a person than Marx and referred to by Stalin above, is not Marxist.

Well, why not. Mao and Hoxha the Marxists. Marx, not the writer, but the reviser of the Capital.

Reader will be able to put two by two and make four, i.e., see that this is a policy put in opposition to Stalin’s line of building socialism and communism which is claimed to have walked on one leg of industry—heavy industry at that- while the clever chaps such as Mao and Enver walked on both legs of industry and agriculture, heavy industry and light industry, etc.

Reader shall see that China has also turned its face to agriculture by the end of 1954 and that Mao Tze-Tung is one of the authors of this policy and that all the talk of priority of heavy industry, it being the core etc., is based on serving the agriculture and the light industry. That “of course” is the result of China ‘s special conditions?

The history of the development of this policy can be seen in the following documents:

Agriculture: Foundation of the National Economy
by Yang Ling
(DOCUMENTS XX)

ALL-OUT SUPPORT FOR AGRICULTURE. Editorial
by Renmin Ribao.
(DOCUMENTS XXI)

Having provided the documents published in Mao's time, we can now safely go to Mao Tze-Tung himself using the writings of him already mentioned in the above documents. We do not have, for we do not need to make any comments.

Mao Tze-Tung's Preface to "Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside".
(DOCUMENTS XXII)

ON THE TEN MAJOR RELATIONSHIP. April 25, 1956.
(DOCUMENTS XXIII)

ON THE CORRECT HANDLING OF CONTRADICTIONS AMONG THE PEOPLE.
February 27, 1957.
(DOCUMENTS XXIV)

Let us finish with a Party document to insure that Party Line was as expressed in the above mentioned documents.

*COMMUNIQUE OF THE TENTH PLENARY
SESSION OF THE EIGHTH CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF
CHINA.*
(DOCUMENTS XXV)

Agriculture as the foundation!

Is it any wonder these people—Hoxha as well as Mao—did not object to the change of Stalin's policy initiated by Malenkov and Khrushchev. They took to it like the fish to water.

**D. AN INTERESTING EXAMPLE: THE POLISH
EXPERIENCE**

*GENERAL PREMISES OF ECONOMIC POLICY
BY TADEUSZ LYCHOWSKI.*
(DOCUMENTS XXVI)

This document shows an approach to the change of policy as a temporary re-balancing act. It is quite similar to Shepilov's approach and proves the damage caused by the defence of the practise of a change in policy while pretending to oppose it in theory, which inevitably leads one to find excuses for the new policy.

E. THE RESULT

The result of this short search into history is that the attacks on J. V. Stalin and his line of building socialism and communism not only have come from Khrushchovites but also from Mao and Hoxha.

It is a well known proposition of Stalin that the form of opportunism which is not fought against is the most dangerous one. Furthermore, if one does not fight one form of opportunism and adapts its policies, one can not fight the other form of opportunism either.

Did Mao and Hoxha and those who adopted their policies fought against

Khrushchovism? Did Khrushchev and those who adopted his policies fought against Maoism and Hoxhism? Or, did those who took a bit from one and a bit from the other fought them both?

Only the opportunists can claim so. We know about these fights and their practical results for the communists. It is great defeat.

Either clear the field of all opportunist rubbish or go on being defeated.

There is no other choice.

CHAPTER II

DOCUMENTS

A. THE SOVIETS

DOCUMENT I.

***Malenkov's Speech Before the Supreme Soviet.
Pravda and Izvestia,
Aug. 9, (1953. mn) pp 1-4. Complete text:***

“It is known that the Party began the Industrialisation of the Country by developing heavy industry-metallurgy, the fuel and power industry and expansion of our own machine building. Assuring the independence of our motherland would have been inconceivable without this. The Party firmly and unswervingly maintained its line in the struggle against the Trotskyite and right-wing capitulators and traitors who opposed building up heavy industry and demanded the transfer of funds from heavy Industry to light industry. Adoption of these proposals would have meant the doom of our revolution, the doom of our country, for we should have been disarmed in the face of capitalist encirclement.

.....

We shall continue in every way to develop the heavy industry metallurgy, the fuel, power, chemical and lumber industries, machine building, the building industry- and to develop and improve our transport. We must always re-

member that heavy industry is the foundation of foundations of our socialist economy, for without its development it is impossible to ensure further growth of light industry and growth of agriculture's productive forces and to strengthen our country's defence capacity.

Today on the basis of the progress we have made in the development of heavy industry, we have all the necessary conditions for bringing about a sharp rise in the production of consumer goods.

.....

Hitherto we have not had the opportunity to develop light and food industry at the same rate as heavy industry. Now we can (my u.—N.S.) and consequently we must accelerate the development of light industry in every way in the interest of securing a faster rise in the living standards and cultural level of the people.

.....

The government and the Party Central Committee consider it necessary to increase considerably the Investment of funds in development of light industry, the food industry, particularly fishing, and agriculture, to make adjustments in the direction of substantially increasing the plans for production of consumers' goods, and to give machine-building and other heavy industry plants a greater part in production of consumer goods.

....

It is our task to make a sharp improvement in the production of consumers' goods and to ensure faster development of light and food industry.

But in order to bring about a sharp expansion in production of consumers' goods we must first of all concern ourselves with further development and growth of agriculture, which supplies the public with foodstuffs and light industry with raw materials.(my u.—N.S.)

.....
 It is our immediate task to secure in the next two to three years the establishment in the country of an abundance of foodstuffs for the public and of raw materials for the light industry on the basis of general development of the whole of agriculture and further organisational and economic strengthening of the collective farms.”

The Current Digest of the Soviet Press. Published Each Week by The Joint Committee on Slavic Studies. Vol. V, No. 30.

DOCUMENT II.

Measures for the Further Development of Agriculture in the U.S.S.R. N. S. Khrushchov. Report Delivered at a Plenary Meeting of the C.C., C.P.S.U., 3 September 1953.

“The great Lenin taught that “the only possible material basis for socialism is a large-scale machine industry that is also capable of reorganising agriculture.”* Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Soviet people have created a comprehensively developed heavy industry which serves as a mighty foundation of the socialist economy. With this foundation, it is now practically possible to organise a steep increase of output of all the light industries and the food industry, and considerably to expand the production of articles of popular consumption, since the basic purpose and main task of the socialist

* V. I. Lenin Works, Vol. 32, p.434. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow 1954.

mode of production is the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society.

But in order to organise this steep increase of output of articles of popular consumption, our agriculture must be advanced at accelerated speed.

.....

....A marked discrepancy has arisen between the rate of development of our large-scale socialist industry, of the size of our urban population and the material standards of our working masses on the one hand, and the level of our agricultural output on the other.

.....

However, the prosperity of the Soviet people, their purchasing power, their standards have risen even faster, and the production of food is far from satisfying the rising requirements of the working people. It is therefore of particular importance to improve the food supply of the population. (P. 5-14)

DOCUMENT III.

Decrees:

i-Decree on Developing Animal Husbandry (Sept. 26 1953), by the Council of Ministers and the Communist Party Central Committee.

The Current Digest of the Soviet Press. Published Each Week by The Joint Committee on Slavic Studies. Vol. V , No. 39.

ii-Decree on Increasing Output of Consumer' Goods.

(Oct. 28 1953), by the Council of Ministers and the Communist Party Central Committee:

“The solution of the task of developing heavy industry, which is of primary importance, has radically changed the relationship between heavy and light industry in the total volume of industrial production.

The share of the means of production in the output of the entire U.S.S.R. industry will total approximately 70% in 1953. Thus, the relative proportion of heavy industry is more than two-thirds the total volume of industrial production. Now, on the basis of the success achieved in developing heavy industry, there is everything necessary to organise a sharp increase in consumers' good production, and there is opportunity to increase significantly the capital investment in the development of those branches of industry producing consumers' goods.

In addition, it has become possible to make broader use of machine-building, metallurgical, chemical and other heavy industrial enterprises for consumers' goods production.”

The Current Digest of the Soviet Press. Published Each Week by The Joint Committee on Slavic Studies. Vol. V, No. 42.

iii-Decree on Increasing Output of Food Products. (Oct. 30. 1953), by the Council of Ministers and the Communist Party Central Committee.

The Current Digest of the Soviet Press. Published Each Week by The Joint

Committee on Slavic Studies. Vol. V, No. 42.

DOCUMENT IV.

Resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee on Virgin Lands. 23 February-2 March 1954.

Resolutions and decisions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Volume 4. Editor: Grey Hodnett. University of Toronto Press.

DOCUMENT V.

The General Line of Party and Vulgarisers of Marxism. D. Shepilov.

“Views on fundamental questions of the development of socialist economy which are deeply alien to Marxist-Leninist political economy and the general line of the Communist Party, have recently begun to be formed among certain economists and teachers at our higher educational institutions.

The essence of the views put forward in certain articles and contributions might be set out schematically as follows:

....

The higher relative development of production of means of production, or heavy industry, was an economic necessity only in the first stages of the development of socialist society, when our country was backward. Now

that we have created a mighty industry, the position has radically changed. Production under socialism is undertaken for consumption. A more rapid growth of production of means of production, of heavy industry, they say, contradicts the basic law of socialism. From this they draw far-reaching conclusions: the policy pursued by the party of the forced development of heavy industry enters into conflict with the basic economic law of socialism, for the forced development of branches of heavy industry would retard national consumption.

Distortion of Decisions

Crudely distorting the essence of Party and Government decisions for an increase in mass consumer goods, the authors of the above view assert that since 1953 the Soviet land has entered on a new stage of economic development, the essence of which lies in a radical change of the Party's economic policy. Whereas previously the Party emphasised the development of heavy industry, the centre of emphasis has now shifted to the development of light industry, to production of mass consumer goods.

Attempting to present their invented receipts as demands of the basic law of socialism, these economists propose for the whole period of completing the building of socialism and gradually moving from socialism to communism, to establish equal rates of development for heavy and light industry, or even to secure a higher relative development of light industry compared with heavy industry.

....

Replacing the Line of Economic Development

Subjecting the Party's general line to revision, the above economists propose to replace this general line by another line of economic development.

What would be this other line, in the opinion of the economists we have mentioned? In his article P. Mstislavsky proposes to accomplish "a decisive change in the correlation of rates of development" of the production of means of production and the production of consumer goods, and to establish new proportions in the national economy.

....

The higher relative rate of growth of the production of means of production, as a law of socialist economy, by no means excludes the fact that in particular years it may prove in practice expedient and necessary, in order to liquidate a lag in the production of mass consumer goods, to push ahead the light and food industries and rural economy. Discovering disproportions which arise in the national economy, the Party constantly takes steps of this kind.

.....

A "Law" of Socialist Production

.....

It is well-known that in 1952 Stalin spoke of the necessity, as one of the most important steps for the transition from socialism to Communism, of securing: "A continuous expansion of all social production, with a relatively higher rate of expansion of the production of means of production. The relatively higher rate of expansion of production of means of production is necessary not only because it has to provide the equipment both for its own

plants and for the other branches of the national economy, but also because reproduction on an extended scale becomes altogether impossible without it.”

(Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, p. 74)

Decisions on Agriculture

In the recent period the Party and government have taken a whole number of important decisions for the further upsurge of socialist agriculture, for increasing the production of mass consumer goods. The importance of these decisions for the national economy is tremendous. Moreover the most important Party documents invariably stress that only on the basis of further mighty development of heavy industry can a sharp upsurge in all branches of the rural economy be achieved and the supply of food to the population of our country be made considerably more secure. The Communist Party is mobilising the great energy of the people for the successful carrying out of these decisions.

....

24/1/1955 Pravda.”

New Age. May 1955. (P.20-31). Political Monthly of the Communist Party of India. Asaf Ali Road. New Delhi.

DOCUMENT VI.

“On Increasing the Output of Livestock Products.”, N. S. Khrushchev, Report to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, January 25, 1955.

“In connection with the measures recently taken for increasing the output of consumer goods some comrades are guilty of confusion in the question of the rate of development of heavy and light industry in our country.

Relying on incorrect conceptions and a vulgarised interpretation of the basic economic law of socialism, these pseudo-theoreticians try to prove that at some stage of socialist construction the development of heavy industry ceases to be a main task and that light industry can and should precede all other branches of industry. This is a deeply mistaken view, alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.”

quoted in

“Political Economy”. A textbook issued by the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., p. 534, Lawrence & Wishart. London. 1957.

DOCUMENT VII.

Speech by N. A. Bulganin. Meeting of The Supreme Soviet of the USSR. February 8 and 9, 1955.

“Heavy industry has always been, and remains, the foundation for the further advance of our national economy. Today, the output of heavy industry is nearly three and a half times as great as in the pre-war year 1940.

.....

Heavy industry ensures the development of all branches of our national economy—agriculture, and light and food industries—and is therefore the source of the continued rise in the well-being of the Soviet people.

In order to ensure the advance of agriculture, which provides raw materials for light industry, it must be supplied with tractors, combines and other farm machinery in sufficient quantities. Only heavy industry is able to give us all this.

In developing heavy industry we have always followed, and we shall continue to follow the directives of great Lenin and J. V. Stalin, the loyal continuer of his work. The line of giving the predominant place to the development of heavy industry, which our party upheld in fierce battle against the class enemy and his agents, has been justified by the entire course of socialist construction in our country. It is in accord with the vital interest of the Soviet state and our people.

In the economic sphere, therefore, the government will continue firmly to apply the general line of the Communist Party, which provides for the development of heavy industry in every way (prolonged applause).

A very important task of the government is to carry out the measures drawn up by the Communist Party for the development of socialist agriculture and designed to ensure the satisfaction of the constantly rising requirements of the population as regards foodstuffs and of industry as regards raw material.....development of virgin and long unused lands...

Soviet News. February 1955. N0.5

DOCUMENT VIII.

Report of The C.C. of the C.P.S.U. to The 20th Party Congress. February 1956. N.S. KHRUSHCHOV.

“A feature of the Soviet economy and of that of all socialist countries is their all-round development and general peaceful trend. The countries of socialism are giving unremitting attention above all to the development of heavy industry, which is the foundation for the continuous expansion of social production as a whole. At the same time they are giving great attention to the growth of agriculture and the light industries. Living standards are steadily rising: culture is flowering. (p.11-12)

Guided by the behest of the great Lenin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always worked steadfastly to ensure the priority development of heavy industry, which is the foundation for the growth of all branches of socialist economy, the raising of our country's defence potential, and the improvement of the well being of the people.

This is the general line of our Party, a line tried and tested in the course of the entire history of the Soviet state and corresponding to the vital interests of the people. The Communist Party will follow this general line with all firmness and consistency in the future as well. (p. 48)

...The aim of socialist production is the maximum satisfaction of the steadily growing material and cultural requirements of the working people, of society as a whole. As heavy industry expands, the development of industries directly engaged in meeting the growing needs of the population acquires an ever greater scale. Now that we possess a powerful heavy industry developed in every respect, we are in a position to promote rapidly production of both the means of production and consumer goods... (p.56.), Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow 1956.

DOCUMENT IX.

Speech by A. I. Mikoyan. 16 February 1956. 20th Congress of the CPSU

“The main task has been to eliminate the lag in agriculture, to remove the resultant disproportion between the development of industry and agriculture—a disproportion which was most dangerous for our country and which in future could be a very big hindrance to our progress. To accomplish this task a number of measures were taken, such as providing greater material incentives to the collective farmers and developing virgin and long-fallow land. Thirty-three million hectares of new land

have been cultivated in the past two years. Could we ever dream of anything like that in the past?.”

Published by Soviet News. 3 Rosary Gardens
London S. W. 7.

DOCUMENT X.

Speech by G. M. Malenkov. 17 February 1956. 20th Congress of the CPSU

“..We are indebted for these achievements to the constant concern of our party and its central committee for the utmost progress of heavy industry, which is the bedrock foundation of development in all branches of the national economy and a further rise in the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people. The line of priority development of heavy industry has been and remains the general line of our party.

What is characteristic of the past years is the implementation of a programme of concrete measures to eliminate the failings in a number of major branches of the national economy, the policy of ensuring technical progress in all spheres of socialist construction, and of carrying out important measures to advance agriculture. The party is waging a purposeful battle along all lines for the swift and comprehensive development of socialist agriculture and livestock farming. The disclosure of big mistakes and a substantial improvement in the guidance of agriculture, both at the centre and in the localities, the consistent and correct application of the principle of material incentive to collective farms and their members, the resolute removal of shortcomings in this

respect—all this is already producing constructive results and will no doubt make it possible to overcome the lag in agriculture in a short time and to ensure its rapid advance.”

Published by Soviet News. 3 Rosary Gardens, London S. W. 7.

DOCUMENT XI.

Speech by V. M. Molotov. 18 February 1956. 20th Congress of the CPSU

“Since the 19th Congress our party has done much to fortify still more the alliance of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry. The attention of the party was rightly focused on the advance of agriculture.

This was imperative, in so far as agriculture obviously lagged behind the general development of national economy, the rapid expansion of industry.

To ensure the early satisfaction of the increasing requirements of the population in foodstuffs and of the food and the light industries in agricultural raw material, the party and the Soviet government have applied a number of new measures. Among them, first of all, are: greater material incentives to collective farms and their members, machine and tractor stations and state farms to increase agricultural production, with a corresponding adjustment of prices on these products; extensive work to increase the mechanisation of agriculture and expand the production of mineral fertilisers; measures for the organisational consolidation of collective farms, machine and tractor stations and state farms, and especially the sending of new highly qualified personnel for leading work in the collec-

tive farms, and also agronomists, mechanics etc.; the organisational consolidation of party organisations in the countryside. Of special importance was the successful implementation of the bold plan for cultivating virgin and long fallow lands (my u.—N.S.), which has increased the sown area by 33 million hectares, chiefly under grain. The question of a decisive expansion in the planting of maize, which is of exceptionally great importance for the rapid development of livestock farming, was raised in a new way. These and many other measures have opened up new prospects for the progress of our agriculture and they are meeting with the full support of the collective farm peasantry.

.....

Our party has always worked for the utmost expansion and progress of industry and transport. In so doing the party has invariably laid emphasis on the priority development of heavy industry, since upon it depends the advancement of agriculture and other branches of national economy, the strengthening of the defences of our socialist motherland and the further improvement of the people's well-being."

Published by Soviet News. 3 Rosary Gardens, London S. W. 7.

DOCUMENT XII.***RESOLUTIONS OF THE 20th CONGRESS OF
THE C.P.S.U***

II

“The Communist Party believes it absolutely essential to continue the priority development of the heavy industries, chiefly ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, coal and oil, power, engineering, chemicals and building materials (my u.—N.S.). At the same time, the Congress believes that the level of social production now attained makes it possible to advance at a rapid rate not only production of means of production, but of consumer goods as well.”

*Foreign Languages Publishing House,
Moscow, 1956.*

**B. E. HOXHA AND THE PARTY OF LABOUR
OF ALBANIA****DOCUMENT XIII.*****ON MEASURES TO FURTHER RAISE THE
STANDARD OF LIVING OF THE WORKING
MASSES.***

*Report to the 9th Plenum of the CC of the P.L.A.
December 24, 1953.*

“Comrades,

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party has been called to this meeting to analyse the reasons for the measures recently taken by the Political Bureau and the government, as well as to lay down the necessary guidelines for the future regarding the urgent need to improve the standard of living of the working masses of the town and countryside.

In June this year, after analysing the difficult economic situation of the working masses of the town and countryside, the Political Bureau directed the government to take a series of important economic-administrative steps towards improving the standard of living of the workers of the town and countryside.

Despite some improvement, the economic situation of the workers in the town and countryside is still very difficult. The directives to quickly build big costly projects, which are often not so essential for the present, the inflation of the administrative apparatus and failure to fulfil the state plan have made it very difficult to improve the living conditions of the urban and rural workers. The necessary care has not been devoted to increasing agricultural and livestock products which are essential to the improvement of the living conditions of the workers as well as one of the main supports for the further economic development of the country, because the principle means and forces were concentrated mostly on the industrial projects which continually demanded new forces, means, and supplies. This has created a very difficult situation.

To cope with the needs of the people better it is necessary to analyse the difficult economic situation of people in town and countryside. This will also enable a better understanding of the reasons which impelled the Political Bureau and the government to take measures and define the proper tasks to improve the situation.”

“Note 1. The difficulties in the economic situation referred to in this report were due to certain factors, namely, to the still pronounced backwardness of the country, to the insufficient experience in the planned management of the economy, to the extraordinary obstacles caused by the intensified hostile activities of the US and British imperialists and their lackeys on the borders of our homeland, etc.

To overcome these difficulties, the PLA relied mainly on its own efforts, but at the same time the CC of the Party turned to the CC of the Communist Party and the government of the Soviet Union for help in coping with this situation. However, after J.V. Stalin's death in March 1953, in the relations between the PRA and the USSR, there appeared the first signs of interference in our internal affairs and of impermissible pressures on the part of the Soviet leadership. There appeared a lack of complete readiness to give unconditional and disinterested assistance to a small, still backward, socialist state and especially geographically completely encircled by sworn enemies of socialism and of the national independence of the People's Republic of Albania. This manifested itself in the demands of the Soviet government in June and December 1953 to reduce the rates of development of industry in Albania and to cut out the plan of the construction on a number of important industrial projects essential to the economy of the country. The real aim of these demands came to light later, when the interference and pressure of the Soviet leadership assumed a brutal and blatant character.” (P.358-360)

“III.—THE PRINCIPAL CAUSES THAT HAVE ABOUT THE SERIOUS ECONOMIC SITUATION

OF THE PEASANTRY AND OF ALL THE WORKERS

1.—Mistakes in the rates and proportions of development of the branches of our people's economy

From an analysis made by the Political Bureau it is clear that serious mistakes have been made in our planning. These plans were influenced by wishful thinking, while the proportions of investments among the different sectors of our economy have not been sufficiently examined on the basis of our urgent needs and internal possibilities. The credits granted us by the Soviet Union, in the first place, and by the countries of the people's democracy, due to the lack of serious study on our part, have been sought for the setting up of industrial projects which are correct in principle, but which we could have done without for a period, because they have been costly to us: From this it emerges clearly that we have shown insufficient interest in agriculture. It would have been more correct to invest a considerable part of the credits accorded us in agriculture and to develop this in harmony with our industry. This problem has not been viewed correctly, and the big projects set up in so short a period of time have weakened the countryside and impoverished agriculture from the standpoint of manpower and many other necessities. We have built the "Stalin" textile combine, the sugar refinery, the "Lenin" hydro-electric plant, the woodworking complex, the cotton-ginning plant, and a number of other projects of major importance and essential to our country. These have yielded their first fruits and have saved the people from lack of these products. But, in regard to a number of other factories, we have stepped up the rate of building them, and we have not

harmonised this speed with the development of other sectors, of agriculture in particular.

There are a number of other factories that we could have done without for a while. Our agricultural products have not been enough to meet all the needs of existing industry with raw materials, nor the needs of the working class, which is increasing, or of the people as a whole, for agricultural products. The construction of big industrial projects has caused us to neglect to supply the countryside with many products, like timber, nails, manufactured products, and so on. These industrial projects have been built at the cost of burdening our economy, also because of poor organisation of the work and inaccurate estimates”.

(P.378-9)

Note 6. To reduce the disproportion in the development of industry and agriculture and to improve the living conditions of the people, during 1953, on the basis of the respective decisions of the CC of the PLA, the Council of Ministers adopted important measures to the advantage of agriculture and for the well-being of the workers of town and countryside (my u.—N.S.). The ratio of investment in the main branches of the economy under the first five-year plan was revised and premature industrial projects were cancelled; the bulk of the investments released from industry went to agriculture, while the rest was earmarked for the increase of consumer goods; all peasants' arrears in deliveries of grain and other agricultural and livestock products were cancelled; the peasants' obligations for all categories of land were reduced; arrears in financial taxation were cancelled for all members of agricultural co-operatives; prices for locally produced farming tools were lowered, and the purchase prices paid by the state for some agricultural products

were raised; a decision was adopted to considerably increase agrarian credits, and equip agriculture with a greater number of tractors. (p.392)

Note 7. The economic measures to pull agriculture out of backwardness were supplemented with the further improvement of planning in agriculture.

Excessive centralisation of planning in this branch strangled the initiative of agricultural economies, and to some extent, had impeded the development of agriculture. According to the new method of planning, the state plan for the development of agriculture defined the volume of agricultural and livestock products to be procured through obligatory deliveries, the volume of surpluses to be purchased, the contracting and amount of payment in kind for the work of the MTS's. The planning of agricultural production was done directly by each state, co-operative, and individual agricultural economy in collaboration with the state organs for agriculture. This new method freed from bureaucratic work many specialists in agriculture, who were mostly sent to the grassroots, and enhanced the responsibility of the state cadres in the districts for the management of agriculture. (p.393)"

*ENVER HOXHA, SELECTED WORKS, V. II.
THE "8 NENTORI" PUBLISHING HOUSE.
TIRANA, 1975*

DOCUMENT XIV.

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA.

*Report at the 3rd Congress of the P.L.A. May 25,
1956.*

“Note 1.....

Unlike what happened with many other communist and workers' parties, the PLA did not make any concessions on matters of principle, in spite of the pressure by the Soviet revisionist leadership, and preserved its Marxist-Leninist general line intact. (p. 485)

THE RESULTS ACHIEVED IN THE ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL FIELDS DURING THE 1ST FIVE-YEAR PLAN, AND THE PRINCIPAL GUIDELINES OF ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT FOR THE COMING FIVE YEARS.

THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRY ESPECIALLY OF THE MINING INDUSTRY, MAINLY ON THE BASIS OF THE FULL USE OF THE EXISTING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITIES AND THE UTILIZATION OF INTERNAL RESOURCES, AND THE RAPID DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE, MAINLY ON THE BASIS OF REORGANISING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION ON SOCIALIST FOUNDATIONS AND ON THE BASIS OF THESE CHANGES, TO BRING ABOUT A FURTHER IMPROVEMENT OF THE MATERIAL WELL-BEING AND CULTURAL UPLIFT OF THE ALBANIAN PEOPLE.

(P. 506-513)”

*ENVER HOXHA, SELECTED WORKS, V. II.
THE "8 NENTORI" PUBLISHING HOUSE.
TIRANA, 1975*

DOCUMENT XV.

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

Report to the 4th Congress of the P.L.A.
(Extracts), February 13, 1961.

"A- THE SUCCESSFUL CONSTRUCTION OF THE ECONOMIC BASE OF SOCIALISM

....

In formulating and applying the policy of socialist industrialisation, the Party proceeded from the concrete conditions of our country, from the internal possibilities, the natural resources, the economic co-operation among the socialist countries. Under the new historical conditions, for our small country with limited possibilities in human forces and material and financial means, the creation of all branches of industry has not been possible. The high rates of growth in industrial production, the creation and development of a number of branches of heavy industry giving priority to the mining industry, the development, alongside it, of light industry, are some of the salient features of the socialist industrialisation of our country.

....

During this period our Party has also struggled to solve the non-antagonistic contradictions which have arisen from our progress in socialist construction, such

as the contradiction between the advanced political power and the relatively low level of the productive forces, between the rapid development of industry and the lagging behind of agriculture, between the advanced equipment and the need for cadres and their level of training, between the level of production and consumption, etc. ... (p.196-201)

“B- THE 2nd FIVE-YEAR PLAN—AN IMPORTANT STEP IN THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF OUR ECONOMY AND CULTURE

...

The 3rd Congress of the Party put forward as the main task the further development of industry, especially mining industry, chiefly on the basis of the full use of the existing productive capacities and the mobilisation of the internal reserves, and the rapid development of agriculture mainly on the basis of the reorganisation of agricultural production on socialist foundations...

... Production of means of production (group “A”) increased at an average annual rate of 18 per cent, as against 14.8 per cent, and of consumer goods (group “B”) 16 per cent, as against 13.5 per cent, which was the target..... (p.203-4)

-III-

THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF OUR COUNTRY ON THE ROAD OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

....

Priority to the increase of production of means of production, as compared with the production of consumer goods, is another distinguishing feature of this five year plan. This is the result of the economic policy followed by our Party in the industrialisation of the country and in the distribution of investments to the different branches of the economy.

.....

1. CONTINUATION OF THE SOCIALIST INDUSTRIALISATION OF OUR COUNTRY—DECISIVE FACTOR FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MATERIAL AND TECHNICAL BASE OF SOCIALISM

During the 3rd Five-year Plan, too, our Party of Labour considers the further development of the socialist industrialisation of the country, giving priority to the rapid development of heavy industry, an important task.

.....

Production of means of production increased by 54 per cent, while production of consumer goods (group "B") by 50 per cent. Production of means of production will account for more than half the total volume of industrial production.

As can be seen, in its economic policy concerning the socialist industrialisation of the country, despite the existence of special features, our Party always has in mind the Leninist thesis that heavy industry is the basis of so-

cialist industrialisation, that in this process, production of means of production must be increased at higher rates than the production of consumer goods.

The mining and processing industry will undergo great development, with the aim of achieving better utilisation of the wealth of the country—the useful minerals, sources of fuel and hydro-power, the forest wealth, agricultural raw materials, and so on. Large funds will be invested for the establishment of new branches of heavy industry, such as the chemical industry for the production of nitrogenous and phosphoric fertilisers for agriculture, as well as for the ferro-chrome metallurgy, electro-metallurgy of copper, and preparations will be made for the establishment in the future of the ferrous metallurgy base.

...

The rapid rates of development of the oil and mining industries, the new projects of non-ferrous and ferrous metallurgy and the chemical industry, which will be built during the 3rd and subsequent five-year plans for the processing at home of our underground wealth, make it urgently necessary to ensure and extend the raw materials base.

....

The main targets of the mechanical engineering industry in the future, too, will be the profitable increase and extension of the range of spare parts for industry and especially, for the oil industry, road transport, agriculture and other branches of the people's economy. The work begun for producing simple machines must be continued and the existing engineering base must be exploited in depth. In 1965 the engineering industry must meet not less than 50 per cent of the country's needs for spare parts. The task which the Party puts forward for the pro-

duction of spare parts has special significance for our country. Its achievement will help in the better utilisation and maintenance of the equipment and machinery, and will reduce our imports. (p.215-221)”

*ENVER HOXHA, SELECTED WORKS, V. III.
THE “8 NENTORI” PUBLISHING HOUSE.
TIRANA, 1980.*

DOCUMENT XVI.

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA.

Report to the 5th Congress of the P.L.A., November 1, 1966.

“1.—THE CONTINUATION OF THE INDUSTRIALISATION OF THE COUNTRY REMAINS ONE OF THE VITAL TASKS FOR THE SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

....

... Total industrial production is 34.8 times greater than it was before the war. Production of means of production has increased 34.3 fold and that of consumer goods 35 fold...

....

Putting this great program into practice will give a new and powerful impulse to the mining industry, which, in our conditions, occupies the main position in the production of means of production.....

Thus, our country will enter a new phase of industrialisation, the phase of the development of the heavy processing industry, which is decisive in ensuring the superiority of the production of means of production, within the framework of all industry.....

2.— THE DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE— THE MOST IMPORTANT LINK FOR THE FULFIL- MENT OF THE MAIN ECONOMIC TASKS OF THE 4th FIVE-YEAR PLAN

.....

Our Party adheres to the line that we must have not only a developed industry, but also an advanced agriculture, that our economy to be strong and independent it must base itself on its two legs, both on industry and agriculture. This is a major issue of principle, which has special importance for our country.....

Weighing up and assessing all these factors correctly, the Party is setting very great and important tasks for the development of agriculture during the 4th Five-year Plan. In this plan, agriculture occupies the main position in the development of the people's economy as a whole.

.....

.... However, the main source to populate mountain zones in general must be the population of the towns, first of all the youth, who are courageous, patriotic, enthusiastic and always respond to the directives of the Party.

The development of our agriculture in this way will not only bring a greater increase of agricultural products, hence the creation of considerable reserves, but will also help normalise the distribution of the population. Going to the mountains will put an end to the noticed harmful un-economical, petty-bourgeois, bureaucratic tendency to

leave those areas and go down to the towns, regardless of whether or not the needs of the economy require this.”

ENVER HOXHA, SELECTED WORKS, V. IV. THE “8 NENTORI” PUBLISHING HOUSE. TIRANA, 1982, (p.114-208)

DOCUMENT XVII.

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA.

Report to the 6th Congress of the P.L.A. November 1, 1971.

II

“DEVELOPMENT OF THE ECONOMY AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

....

For this, it is necessary: To strive for a further development of industry by improving its structure with new branches and productions, especially of the heavy processing industry, to expand the energy and raw materials base, and to utilise the resources and assets of the country more rationally;

.....

During this five-year period our objective will be to strengthen our extracting and heavy processing industry, in particular, to further modernise it and raise it to a higher level....

....

Consistently pursuing the correct policy of creating a powerful national industry, in this period the main objective of our industrialisation will be utilisation of the natural resources of the country on a wider scale and with a greater economic effect, with the aim of fulfilling the greatest and most urgent needs for extended reproduction. In line with this orientation, the development of heavy and light, extracting and processing industries, will be continued simultaneously, in the proper proportions according to our needs and possibilities, always in harmony with the development of agriculture in particular and other branches of our economy in general.

.....

The establishment, for the first time, of the ferrous-metallurgical industry is of exceptional importance to our whole economy. The metallurgical combine which will be built in Elbasan, a gigantic undertaking which will strengthen the independence and self-sufficiency of our economy, will ensure within the country the raw materials essential to the development of the engineering industry and to its eventual transition to a machine-building industry, greatly strengthening the material base of construction work.

In the complex development of industry, priority during this five-year period, too, will be given to the branches of industry extracting minerals and fuels. This will be done for the purpose of extending the raw material base for metallurgy and for the chemical industry, with the purpose of increasing exports of minerals, as well as of strengthening the energy base which is so necessary for industry itself and for our people's economy as a whole.

....

The engineering industry must play a special role in strengthening the technical base of industry itself and of the other branches of our economy. Its primary task has been and still is to ensure that the machinery and equipment which our economy has at its disposal is kept in good order and works without interruption and with high productivity. The other equally important and urgent aspect of the main task of our engineering industry is to greatly and continuously improve the quality of the spare parts produced. However much the volume of production of this branch may increase, if the quality of these products is not raised to a higher level, the burden on our economy of importing spare parts will not be eased.

In the conditions when steel, rolled metal and cast iron are to be produced locally, when the question is raised of giving a further impulse to technical and scientific progress, great new prospects are opened to this branch of industry. It must not restrict itself simply to the production of spare parts, but the time has come for it to go boldly into the production of machines as well. This has become an urgent need for our economy, which must be dealt with step by step, with determination, in line with the new possibilities which will be created. In this very important but complicated question, we must start, first of all, with those machines, mechanisms and items of equipment which our economy needs most, which can be produced in series, and which ease the burden of imports.

...

... In deciding the proportions between heavy and light industries, priority will be given to heavy industry. This has been and remains a correct and unshakeable principle for the development of our industry.

ENVER HOXHA, *SELECTED WORKS*, V. IV.
THE "8 NENTORI" PUBLISHING HOUSE.
TIRANA, 1982. (P 683-773)

DOCUMENT XVIII.

ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA.

*Extracts from the report submitted to the 8th
Congress of the P.L.A. November 1, 1981*

"1. THE FURTHER STRENGTHENING OF INDUS- TRY—A DECISIVE FACTOR FOR THE GENERAL ADVANCE OF THE COUNTRY

.....

In the 7th Five-year Plan our industry will advance still further and develop on a broad front. About 46 per cent of all the investments of the five-year plan will be made in this branch. The aim of the policy of the Party for the development of industry is: to consolidate the multi-branched structure of industry, giving priority, as always, to heavy industry; to maintain and further improve the positive balance of energy resources, attaching particular importance to the oil industry; to further develop the mineral extracting and processing industry, while also starting to utilise new minerals; to make tangible improvements in the structure of means of production and consumer goods; to put industry even more in the service of the intensification of agriculture; to expand the existing

productive capacities through their reconstruction and modernisation

The Party devotes special attention to the energy industry, to the extraction of oil, gas, coal and the production of electricity power. We have created a powerful and independent energy system which meets the growing needs of the country for energy and earns hard currency from its export....

....

Now that we have our own steel and have built a powerful mechanical engineering industry the conditions have been created to set this branch greater tasks. The production of the engineering industry in 1985 will be 43-45 per cent greater than in 1980.

The engineering industry successfully fulfilled the task of producing spare parts, set by the 7th Congress of the Party, meeting 95 per cent of the needs of the economy for them. In this five-year plan this achievement must be consolidated by radically improving quality and greatly increasing quantity.

In the years of this five-year plan the engineering industry will engage on a larger scale in the production of equipment and machinery for the construction of new production lines and factories, for various reconstructions and extensions of productive capacities. To carry out such a task demands improved organisation and management of this branch of industry, and the technology of processing, planning, the co-operation and the standardisation of production must be put on the most scientific basis possible.

Urgent and comprehensive measures must be taken especially for the preparation of the technological and structural designs of equipment and machinery for the new projects to be built and the reconstructions to be

done during this five-year plan. Much of this equipment and machinery will be produced for the first time. The designing and production of this equipment and machinery on time and with high quality is one of the most difficult tasks which our engineering industry has to cope with.

.....

The chemical industry will undergo great expansion and development during this five-year plan. Compared with 1980, in 1985 its production will go up 63-65 per cent. Particular importance will be given to increasing production of phosphate fertilisers and chemicals for plant protection.....”

*ENVER HOXHA, SELECTED WORKS, V. VI.
THE “8 NENTORI” PUBLISHING HOUSE.
TIRANA, 1987. (P. 310-459)*

C. MAO TZE-TUNG AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

DOCUMENT XIX.

INDUSTRIES TASKS IN 1959 by PO I-PO

“.....

Practice in the past year has further proved how completely correct is the Party’s principle of “walking on two legs.” By “walking on two legs” we mean simultaneous development of industry and agriculture on the basis of priority for heavy industry, simultaneous development of heavy and light industry, of central and local industry, of large enterprises and medium and small enterprises, of production in both modern and indigenous ways, the

combining of centralised leadership with mass movements on the industrial front and in the present period combining “steel as the key” with an all-round industrial leap forward. This complete set of principles correctly reflects the actual conditions in our country and the demands of objective economic law; that is why it has demonstrated its great vitality in practice. By implementing it further, we can not only continue to leap forward in 1959 but do so with even greater success.”

(Peking Review, January 6, 1959. P. 9-11)

DOCUMENT XX.

Agriculture: Foundation of the National Economy by Yang Ling

“...In July 1955, Comrade Mao Tse-tung once again pointed out in his report on “The Question of Agricultural Co-operation”: It is necessary to “resolve the contradiction between the ever-increasing demand for marketable grain and industrial raw materials and the present generally poor yields of staple crops”, otherwise, “we shall not be able to complete socialist industrialisation.” Industry and agriculture, he said in the same report “cannot be separated, cannot be dealt with in isolation from each other. More-over, there must be no attempt to put emphasis on one only and underrate the other “

After having led the rural areas of the country to an upsurge in the socialist revolution and won the great victory in agricultural co-operation, the Political Bureau of the Party’s Central Committee, on the basis of the proposal of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, put forward in January

1956 the draft National Programme for Agricultural Development. This great programme for the high-speed development of socialist agriculture and building the new socialist countryside has played a tremendous role in promoting the upsurges of both agricultural production and socialist construction as a whole. At an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Party's Central Committee held in April 1956, Comrade Mao Tse-tung made a report on "Ten Sets of Relationships" and listed as the primary question the correct handling of relations between industry and agriculture and between heavy and light industry. In September of the same year, the Resolution of the Party's Eighth National Congress on the Political Report of the Central Committee further pointed out:

"Agriculture has a wide and extremely important influence on industrialisation. Agricultural development not only bears directly on the living standards of the people and the rate of growth of light industry, it also has an impact on the rate of growth of heavy industry. We must make a still greater effort to develop agriculture." In February 1957, Comrade Mao Tse-Tung in his report "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" gave a more penetrating analysis of the relations between heavy industry, light industry and agriculture. He pointed out that this is the question of China's path to industrialisation and put forward the policy that "industry and agriculture must be developed simultaneously." In the light of the new upsurge in socialist construction that emerged after the nation-wide rectification campaign, the Third Plenary Session of the Party's Eighth Central Committee in September 1957 put forward and adopted the revised draft of the National Programme for Agricultural Development. The Programme declares in its

introduction: “.....the development of agriculture occupies a vital place in our socialist construction. Agriculture supplies industry with grain and raw materials. At the same time, the countryside with its more than 500 million population, provides our industry with the biggest domestic market in the world. In this sense, without our agriculture there could be no industry in our country. It is utterly wrong to neglect the importance of agricultural work.”

At the Second Session of the Party's Eighth National Congress in May 1958, the general line for building socialism was formulated, listing simultaneous development of industry and agriculture as one of its fundamental points. The fact of the big leap forward demonstrates the power of this general line and further proves that industry and agriculture can be simultaneously developed at high speed. During the big leap, on the basis of the logical trend of growth of China's agricultural production and the great creation of the masses of the people, the Party's Central Committee and comrade Mao Tse-Tung gave timely leadership to the people throughout the countryside in establishing the people's communes, thus creating this best form of organisation for the, high-speed building of socialism and the future step-by-step transition to Communism. On the basis of the big leap and under the conditions of the steady consolidation and sound growth of the people's communes, our socialist construction entered a new period of a continued leap forward. It was then that the Central Committee of the Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung made a further Marxist summing up of the rich experience of the proletariat in leading socialist economic construction, put forward the policy of taking agriculture as the foundation, industry as the dominant factor and integrating priority for the development of heavy industry with the speedy development of

agriculture, pointed out that accelerating the growth of agriculture is a central link in the high-speed and proportionate development of our socialist economic construction, and put forward the task of speeding up the technical transformation of agriculture.

.....

..... As Comrade Liu Shao-chi said in his political report to the Second Session of the Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party on behalf of the Central Committee of the Party: "Why is it that industry and agriculture must be developed simultaneously? It is because ours is a large agricultural country, and of our over 600 million people, more than 500 million are peasants who constitute a most powerful force both in the revolutionary struggle and reconstruction. Only by relying on this powerful ally and giving full play to the peasants' initiative and creativeness can the working class of our country achieve victory. The paramount importance of the peasantry as an ally is just the same in the period of construction as it was in the period of revolution"

..... In 1958 and 1959 the amount of steel allocated by the state for the manufacture of agricultural machinery and farm implements exceeded the total amount of steel products used for this same purpose during the period of the First Five-Year Plan; again in 1960, steel allocated for this purpose according to the state plan is around 100 per cent greater than in 1959. The strength of other branches of industry to support agriculture has also grown considerably..."

(Peking Review. October 18, 1960. P.14-22)

DOCUMENT XXI.

ALL-OUT SUPPORT FOR AGRICULTURE Editorial by Renmin Ribao

“In 1955 Comrade Mao Tse-tung, in *The Question of Agricultural Co-operation*, gave a comprehensive explanation of this line adopted by the Party. He said: “We are carrying out a revolution not only in the social system, changing from private ownership to common ownership, but also in technology, changing from handicraft production to mass production with up-to-date machinery. These two revolutions interlink. In agriculture, under the conditions prevailing in our country, co-operation must precede the use of big machinery. (In capitalist countries agriculture tends to develop along capitalist lines.)”^{*} —He also said in the same report: “The economic conditions of our country being what they are, technical reform will take longer than social reform. It is estimated that it will take roughly four or five five-year plans, that is, twenty to twenty-five years, to accomplish, in the main, the technical reform of agriculture on a national scale. The whole Party must work to carry out this great task.”^{**}

.....

The most fundamental factor in the drive to give greater support to agriculture is continued implementation of the general policy of developing the national economy with agriculture as the foundation and industry the leading factor,—as put forward by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, and to give first importance to the development of agriculture. (my u.—N.S)

^{*} *The Question of Agricultural Cooperation*, Eng. Ed., Foreign Languages Press Peking, 1959, pp. 23-24

^{**} *Ibid.*, p.34

Our national economic plans must take the development of agriculture as their starting point and work along this line, so as to speed up our socialist construction. According to the decision of the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Party, all government departments, in drawing up plans and working out measures, are required to take agriculture as the foundation of the national economy, turn their faces to the countryside and give first consideration to the question of how to aid agriculture and the collective economy of the people's communes.

Industrial Assistance

First of all, industry. It is necessary to make a resolute readjustment in the work of our industrial departments according to the policy of making agriculture the foundation of the national economy. In industry, and particularly heavy industry, the first thing to do is to carry forward the work of readjustment, consolidation filling out and raising standards in accordance with the needs of the technical reform of agriculture. Only in this way can industry supply agriculture with a larger amount of more suitable means of production such as machines, chemical fertilisers, insecticides, building materials, fuel, power and means of transport and other materials which the rural market demands, thereby helping the gradual technical reform of agriculture. It is also only in this way that industrial development can be put on a reliable basis and that our industry will enjoy the largest domestic market and bases of supply of grain and agricultural raw materials which any country has ever had in the course of its industrial development.

In 1957 Comrade Mao Tse-Tung delivered an address entitled "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People." in which he emphasised that both heavy and light industries have to regard the countryside, embracing more than 500 million peasants, as their main market. He said: "As China is a great agricultural country, with over 80 per cent of its population in the villages, its industry and agriculture must be developed simultaneously. Only then will industry have raw materials and a market, and only so will it be possible to accumulate fairly large funds for the building up of a powerful heavy industry. Everyone knows that light industry is closely related to agriculture. Without agriculture there can be no light industry. But it is not so clearly understood that agriculture provides heavy industry with an important market. This fact, however, will be more readily appreciated as the gradual progress of technological improvement and modernisation of agriculture calls for more and more machinery, fertilisers, water conservancy and electric power projects and transport facilities for the farms, as well as fuel and building materials for the rural consumers."*

This relationship can now be seen very clearly. The broad market in China's rural regions where agricultural collectivisation has been completed is a market with extremely great potentialities, capable of absorbing an increasing amount of industrial goods. Take tractors for instance. If one tractor can handle 1,000 mu of cultivated land, the number of tractors needed for our agriculture amounts not to tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands but to more than a million. In the case of chemical

* On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Press. Peking. 1960, pp 67-68. (Peking Review. November 16, 1962, P 13-14)

fertilisers, if 30 jin of them are applied to every mu of cultivated land annually, our agriculture needs not hundreds of thousands or millions of tons but more than 10 million tons a year. The demand for other agricultural means of production and consumer goods for peasants is steadily increasing too. As long as industry firmly turns its face to China's vast rural market and agricultural needs, it will have the widest scope for future development.

As to the raw materials, marketable grain and manpower called for by industrial growth, they can only be produced in the process of gradually carrying out the technical reform of agriculture and through the growth of agriculture. We cannot regard industry and agriculture as two separate, isolated things. The various branches of industry should arrange their work according to the policy of making agriculture the foundation of the national economy, resolutely cater to rural needs, and gradually build an independent, comprehensive and modernised industrial system in the course of supporting the technical reform of agriculture and its modernisation.

DOCUMENT XXII.

Mao Tze-Tung's Preface to "Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside"

"

This is the situation. The book has been edited twice, first in September and now again in December. The first time, 121 articles were selected, most of them reflecting conditions in the early half of 1955, a few covering the latter half of 1954. Advance copies of these articles were printed and distributed to responsible comrades from

provincial, municipal, autonomous regional, and regional Party committees attending the sixth plenary session (enlarged) of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, held from October 4 to 11, 1955. Their comments were requested.....

Much more than a mere question of material is involved however. The point is that in the latter half of 1955 the situation in China underwent a fundamental change. At present (late December 1955), of China's 110 million peasant households, more than 70 million (over 60 per cent), in response to the call of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, have joined semi-socialist agricultural producers' co-operatives.

In my report of July 31, 1955, on co-operation in agriculture I stated that 16,900,000 peasant households had joined co-operatives. But since then, in only a few months' time, over 50 million more have joined.

This is a tremendous event. It tells us that we need only one year—1956—to practically complete the change-over to semi-socialist co-operation in agriculture.* In another three or four years, that is, by 1959 or 1960, we can complete, in the main, the transformation from semi-socialist to socialist co-operatives.....

.....

The problem facing the entire Party and all the people of the country is no longer one of combating rightist conservative ideas about the speed of socialist transformation of agriculture. That problem has already been solved. Nor is it a problem of transformation of capitalist industry and commerce, by entire trades, into state-

* Actually, by November 1956, over 96 per cent of all peasant households throughout the country were in semi-socialist co-operatives and fully socialist advanced co-operatives. Eighty-three per cent of them had joined the advanced co-ops—Translator.

private enterprises. That problem has also been solved. In the first half of 1956 we must discuss the speed of the socialist transformation of handicrafts. But that problem will easily be solved too.....

Mao Tze-Tung, December 27, 1955, Preface. Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside. Foreign Languages Press. Peking 1957.

DOCUMENT XXIII.

ON THE TEN MAJOR RELATIONSHIP

April 25, 1956

"I. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HEAVY INDUSTRY ON THE ONE HAND AND LIGHT INDUSTRY AND AGRICULTURE ON THE OTHER

The emphasis in our country's construction is on heavy industry. The production of the means of production must be given priority, that's settled. But it definitely does not follow that the production of the means of subsistence, especially grain, can be neglected. Without enough food and other daily necessities, it would be impossible to provide for the workers in the first place, and then what sense would it make to talk about developing heavy industry? Therefore, the relationship between heavy industry on the one hand and light industry and agriculture on the other must be properly handled.

In dealing with this relationship we have not made mistakes of principle. We have done better than the Soviet Union and a number of East European Countries. The prolonged failure of the Soviet Union to reach the highest pre-October Revolution level in grain output, the

grave problems arising from the glaring disequilibrium between the development of heavy industry and that of light industry in some East European countries—such problems do not exist in our country. Their lop-sided stress on heavy industry to the neglect of agriculture and light industry results in a shortage of goods on the market and an unstable currency. We, on the other hand, attach more importance to agriculture and light industry. We have all along attended to and developed agriculture and have to a considerable degree ensured the supply of grain and raw materials necessary for the development of industry. Our daily necessities are in fairly good supply and our prices and currency are stable.

The problem now facing us is that of continuing to adjust properly the ratio between investment in heavy industry on the one hand and in agriculture and light industry on the other in order to bring a greater development of the latter. Does this mean that heavy industry is no longer primary? No. It still is, it still claims the emphasis in our investment. But the proportion for agriculture and light industry must be somewhat increased.

What will be the results of this increase? First, the daily needs of the people will be better satisfied, and, second, the accumulation of capital will be speeded up so that we can develop heavy industry with greater and better results. Heavy industry can also accumulate capital, but, given our present economic conditions, light industry and agriculture can accumulate more and faster.

Here the question arises: Is your desire to develop heavy industry genuine or feigned, strong or weak? If your desire is feigned or weak then you will hit agriculture and light industry and invest less in them. If your desire is genuine or strong, then you will attach importance to agriculture and light industry so that there will be more

grain and more raw materials for light industry and a greater accumulation of capital. And there will be more funds in the future to invest in heavy industry.

There are now two possible approaches to our development of heavy industry: one is to develop agriculture and light industry less, and the other is to develop them more. In the long run, the first approach lead to a smaller and slower development of heavy industry, or at least will put it on a less solid foundation, and when the over-all account is added up a few decades hence, it will not prove to have paid. The second approach will lead to a greater and faster development of heavy industry and, since it ensures the livelihood of the people, it will lay a more solid foundation for the development of heavy industry.”

*SELECTED WORKS OF MAO TSE-TUNG.
Volume V. (P. 287-8) FOREIGN LANGUAGES
PRESS. PEKING. 1977*

DOCUMENT XXIV.

ON THE CORRECT HANDLING OF CONTRADICTIONS AMONG THE PEOPLE. February 27, 1957

“XII. CHINA’S PATH TO INDUSTRIALISATION

In discussing our path to industrialisation, we are here concerned principally with the relationship between the growth of heavy industry, light industry and agriculture. It must be affirmed that heavy industry is the core of China’s economic construction. At the same time, full

attention must be paid to the development of agriculture and light industry.

As China is a large agricultural country, with over 80 per cent of its population in the rural areas agriculture must develop along with industry, for only thus can industry secure raw materials and a market, and only thus is it possible to accumulate more funds for building a powerful heavy industry. Everyone knows that light industry is closely tied up with agriculture. Without agriculture there can be no light industry. But it is not yet so clearly understood that agriculture provides heavy industry with an important market. This fact, however, will be more readily appreciated as gradual progress in the technical transformation and modernisation of agriculture calls for more and more machinery, fertiliser, water conservancy and electric power projects and transport facilities for the farms, as well as fuel and building materials for the rural consumers. During the period of the Second and Third Five-Year Plans, the entire national economy will benefit if we can achieve an even greater growth in our agriculture and thus induce a correspondingly greater development of light industry. As agriculture and light industry develop, heavy industry, assured of its market and funds, will grow faster. Hence what may seem to be a slower pace of industrialisation will actually not be so slow, and indeed may even be faster. In three five-year plans or perhaps a little longer, China's annual steel output can be raised to 20,000,000 tons or more, as compared with the peak pre-liberation output of something over 900,000 tons in 1943. This will gladden the people in both town and country."

SELECTED WORKS OF MAO TSE-TUNG. Volume V. (p.419-20) FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS, PEKING, 1977.

DOCUMENT XXV.

COMMUNIQUE OF THE TENTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE EIGHTH CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

“

The Tenth Plenary Session holds that the urgent task facing the people of our country at present is to carry through the general policy of developing the national economy with agriculture as the foundation and industry the leading factor, as put forward by Comrade Mao Tse-Tung, attach first importance to the development of agriculture, correctly handle the relationship between industry and agriculture and resolutely readjust the work of the industrial departments according to the policy of making agriculture the foundation of the national economy.

In the field of agriculture, it is necessary to continue to carry out the Central Committee's various policies concerning the people's communes,.....

In the field of industry, the first thing to do is, in accordance with the needs of the technical transformation of agriculture and the present availability of materials and manpower, to further carry out rational readjustment, strengthen the productive capacity of the weaker departments, energetically improve management, increase the variety and raise the quality of products.”

(Peking Review, September 28, 1962. P. 5-7)

D. AN INTERESTING EXAMPLE: THE POLISH EXPERIENCE

DOCUMENT XXVI.

GENERAL PREMISES OF ECONOMIC POLICY BY TADEUSZ LYCHOWSKI

“The principle of giving priority to capital goods in planning the national economy, carried out with great success in the Soviet Union in the inter-war years, is understood by every economist. History shows that the development of every industrial country is dependent directly on the amount of investment in heavy industry. The expansion of capital goods industries makes possible the development of other sectors of production in the given country.....

.....

....In view of these facts, therefore, is the Polish Six-Year Plan correct in placing the main emphasis on development of heavy industry, when the limited financial resources might rather induce Poland to concentrate on light industry requiring smaller investment and relatively fewer skilled workers?

The answer is simple. For Poland to become an industrial-agricultural country in which, with expanded and modernised agriculture, the main part of national income derives from industry, she must have an adequate part of this industry devoted to production of the capital goods, i.e., machines. Contrary to the long-standing views expressed consciously or unconsciously by economists of highly industrialised western countries, the true industrialisation of a country does not depend on just any kind of industrial establishments

as, for example, branches of industry totally dependent upon the import of machines, or spare parts, or even foreign technical experts and specialists. Such a country cannot be considered industrialised. It will only become so when it can itself produce machines for a considerable part of its industry, when in other words it can itself guarantee the development of some of the most important branches of industry. In order to do this there must be heavy industry the iron, steel, chemical and machine industries.....

.....

3) That such a rapid increase in industrial output was possible was only because the production of capital goods had been given priority....

7) Are there no shadows on this bright picture of Poland's industrialisation? Of course there are. During the course of such fundamental transformations as Poland has experienced so far in the Six-Year Plan, serious lacks and shortcomings were bound to occur, even in such a sector as industry where very rapid progress had taken place....

8) The subject of particular concern in carrying out the economic policy of Poland is that of agricultural production which very clearly lags behind in its development as compared to the rapid development of industry. In the first four years of the Six-Year Plan, 1950-1953 industrial production rose by 118 per cent and agricultural production by 10 per cent. Disproportions also arose in the various branches of farming; whereas livestock increased during this period by 23 per cent, crop production, partly due to bad harvests, increased by a bare 2 per cent.

This is an unsatisfactory state of affairs especially in the face of a very great expansion in industrial production and consequently, in consumption by the population.....

9) This enormous shift of people, bringing into production hundreds of thousands of persons who heretofore were only partially employed substantially raised the level of consumption in the country. Real income of the farm population (per capita) increased from an unusually low pre-war level by three quarters, and the income of those employed outside agriculture by more than 40 per cent. This provides for healthy growth in consumption which should be accompanied by adequate production of consumers goods, in particular of foodstuffs. The years 1952-1953 revealed that production is clearly unable to keep pace with the growing requirements.

10) These difficulties-like the afore-mentioned shortcomings and excesses in industrial production-are the growing pains, felt by any healthy organism, temporarily suffering from this or another lack.....

11) Certain measures introduced by the government at the end of 1953 and the beginning of 1954, intended to strongly increase production of consumers' goods, and above all of agricultural produce, provided a solution for these problems and shortcomings. Though a marked increase is to be noted in the real income of the population, it is, nevertheless insufficient in view of the objective of the economic policy in People's Poland.

During the first 7-8 years of reconstruction and the initial stage of development such shortcomings were inevitable. The share of capital accumulation in the national income was bound to surpass one-fourth of the total, since otherwise it would have been impossible rapidly to raise Poland from destruction, stagnation and economic backwardness. At the turning point between 1953 and

1954 it was already possible—due to the large scale fulfilment of the objectives of the Six-Year Plan—to lower this share which in 1955 is to amount to no more than 20 per cent of the national income. This automatically increases the part of the national income consumed, thus raising the standard of living of the population at a more rapid rate than hitherto. So that production could meet the augmented purchasing capacity of the population, particular attention is presently being paid to the increase of agricultural production—on State Farms as well as on co-operative and private farms—while simultaneously the industrial production of consumers goods is being increased.

12) Such directives are not at all (as foreign observers frequently and erroneously maintain) a departure from the general principles of Polish economic policy. This continues to be mainly directed towards the industrialisation of the country, where there is still much left to be done, and within the framework of that particular section the production of capital goods continues to hold the place of greater importance. This policy was proved to be correct and the relatively small changes made at present have the sole purpose of eliminating disproportion and excesses, which arose during the period when this policy was being carried through.

The objectives of Polish economic policy proved to be fully justified and the overwhelming majority of the Polish people understand and fully appreciate this. Adherence to these principles enables the Polish people gradually to achieve the aims this policy had set itself from its inception: to satisfy to a maximum the constantly growing material and cultural requirements of the entire Polish people.

“POLONIA” FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE, WARSAW, 1955, (P.32-63)

APPENDIX

1. GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Let us read from J. Stalin as to how things stood in this respect in 1952.

“The disintegration of the single, all-embracing world market must be regarded as the most important economic sequel of the Second World War and of its economic consequences. It has had the effect of further deepening the general crisis of the world capitalist system.

The Second World War was itself a product of this crisis. Each of the two capitalist coalitions which locked horns in the war calculated on defeating its adversary and gaining world supremacy. It was in this that they sought a way out of the crisis. The United States of America hoped to put its most dangerous competitors, Germany and Japan, out of action, seize foreign markets and the world's raw material resources, and establish its world supremacy.

But the war did not justify these hopes. It is true that Germany and Japan were put out of action as competitors of the three major capitalist countries: the U.S.A., Great Britain and France. But at the same time China and other, European, people's democracies broke away from the capitalist system and, together with the Soviet Union, formed a united and powerful socialist camp confronting the camp of capitalism. The economic consequence of the existence of two opposite camps was that the single all-embracing world market disintegrated, so

that now we have two parallel world markets, also confronting one another.

It should be observed that the U.S.A., and Great Britain and France, themselves contributed—without themselves desiring it, of course—to the formation and consolidation of the new, parallel world market. They imposed an economic blockade on the U.S.S.R., China and the European People's Democracies, which did not join the "Marshall plan" system, thinking thereby to strangle them. The effect, however, was not to strangle, but to strengthen the new world market.

But the fundamental thing, of course, is not the economic blockade, but the fact that since the war these countries have joined together economically and established economic co-operation and mutual assistance.

The experience of this co-operation shows that not a single capitalist country could have rendered such effective and technically competent assistance to the People's Democracies as the Soviet Union is rendering them. The point is not only that this assistance is the cheapest possible and technically superb. The chief point is that at the bottom of this co-operation lies a sincere desire to help one another and to promote the economic progress of all. The result is a fast pace of industrial development in these countries. It may be confidently said that, with this pace of industrial development, it will soon come to pass that these countries will not only be in no need of imports from capitalist countries, but will themselves feel the necessity of finding an outside market for their surplus products.

But it follows from this that the sphere of exploitation of the world's resources by the major capitalist countries (U.S.A., Britain, France) will not expand, but contract; that their opportunities for sale in the world market will dete-

riorate, and that their industries will be operating more and more below capacity. That, in fact, is what is meant by the deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system in connection with the disintegration of the world market.

This is felt by the capitalists themselves, for it would be difficult for them not to feel the loss of such markets as the U.S.S.R. and China. They are trying to offset these difficulties with the “ Marshall plan”, the war in Korea, frantic rearmament, and industrial militarization. But that is very much like a drowning man clutching at a straw.

This state of affairs has confronted the economists with two questions:

a) Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Stalin before the Second World War regarding the relative stability of markets in the period of the general crisis of capitalism is still valid?

b) Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Lenin in the spring of 1916—namely, that, in spite of the decay of capitalism, “on the whole, capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before”—is still valid?.

I think that it cannot. In view of the new conditions to which the Second World War has given rise, both these theses must be regarded as having lost their validity.

J. Stalin. Economic Problems of Socialism in the U. S. S. R., (P. 34-37.)

As can be seen, according to Stalin, the general crisis of capitalism has deepened after the second world war as a result of formation of two opposed markets—which shrunk the markets of capitalists—and will further deepen particularly as a result of fast industrialisation of the countries of the People’s Democracies—which will con-

tinually shrink the markets of capitalists. And thus the changes to the above mentioned thesis.

These views of Stalin are attacked at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.

Let us read from Khrushchov, Shepilov and Mikoyan:

“It should be said that the idea that the general crisis of capitalism means complete stagnation, a halt in production and technical progress, has always been alien to Marxism-Leninism. Leninism pointed out that capitalism’s general tendency to decay did not preclude technical progress or an upswing in production in one period or another. “It would be a mistake to believe,” he wrote, “that this tendency to decay precludes the rapid growth of capitalism. It does not. In the epoch of imperialism, certain branches of industry, certain strata of bourgeoisie and certain countries betray, to a greater or lesser degree, now one and now another of these tendencies.” (Works, Vol. 22, p. 286.) Therefore we must study the capitalist economy attentively and not over-simplify Lenin’s thesis on the decay of imperialism but study the best that capitalist science and technology have to offer, in order to use the achievements of world technological progress in the interest of socialism.”

(N. S. Khrushchov. Report of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U to the 20th Congress. p.14.)

“It does not follow, however, that we should draw simplified conclusions about a steady down-grade in capitalist production. Marxist-Leninists have always decisively rejected the theory of “stagnation” of capitalism—the erroneous and unscientific view that the decay of capitalism in the imperialist era means the “bottling up” of

productive forces, that a stop is put to technical progress.”

(Speech by D. T. Shepilov at the 20th Congress of the CPSU , February 16 1956. p. 20.)

“In analysing the economic situation of present-day capitalism it is doubtful whether we get any help from Stalin’s thesis in the Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. or whether it is correct-in relation to the United States, Britain and France-that, with the break-up of the world market the “volume of production in these countries will shrink”.

This assertion does not explain the complex and contradictory phenomena of present-day capitalism and the fact of the growth of capitalist production in many countries since the war.

As has been stated in the report of the central committee, Lenin in 1916 in his work on imperialism, having brilliantly illuminated the laws of imperialism, pointed out that the decline of capitalism does not preclude a rapid growth of production, that in the epoch of imperialism individual branches of industry and individual countries display, to a greater or lesser degree, now one and now another of these tendencies.

All the facts show that these Leninist theses are in no way outdated.

Incidentally, one cannot but note that other theses of the Economic Problems as well, if strictly examined, demand from our economists profound study and critical re-examination from the stand point of Marxism-Leninism.

(Speech by A. I. Mikoyan at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, February 16 1956. p. 20.)

Criticisms of Khrushchov and Shepilov are clear enough. One can not readily see who is being criticised if one knows Stalin's "Economic Problems...". Mikoyan's criticism is even clearer and it is obviously Stalin and Stalin's above mentioned views which are being criticised. In these criticisms the talk about technique is used to cover up the real aim, for Stalin does not air any views as to the changes in the development of production technique under the new, deepening general crises of capitalism, indeed he does not preclude the development of production technology, as can be seen below, and as industrial militarization he mentions above would require such a development:

"We are all acquainted with facts from the history and practice of capitalism illustrative of the rapid development of technology under capitalism, when the capitalists appear as the standard-bearers of the most advanced techniques, as revolutionaries in the development of the technique of production. But we are also familiar with facts of a different kind, illustrative of a halt in technical development under capitalism, when the capitalists appear as reactionaries in the development of new techniques and not infrequently resort to hand labour.

How is this howling contradiction to be explained? It can only be explained by the basic economic law of modern capitalism, that is, by the necessity of obtaining the maximum profit. Capitalism is in favour of new techniques when they promise it the highest profit. Capitalism is against new techniques, and for resort to hand labour, when the new technique do not promise the highest profit." (*ibid.* p. 47.)

Nor does he refute any increase in production. He simply exposes that under the than prevailing conditions, capitalism could not develop as fast as it used to and that they are facing a gigantic crises of markets, a continuous instability of markets.

The real aim of the critics is precisely to refute Stalin's conclusions or rather to change the conditions that gave rise to these conclusions. Let us take another look at the facts which these traitors wanted to change:

“The result is a fast pace of industrial development in these countries. (the People's Democracies—mn.—N.S.) It may be confidently said that, with this pace of industrial development, it will soon come to pass that these countries will not only be in no need of imports from capitalist countries, but will themselves feel the necessity of finding an outside market for their surplus products.

But it follows from this that the sphere of exploitation of the world's resources by the major capitalist countries (U.S.A., Britain, France) will not expand, but contract; that their opportunities for sale in the world market will deteriorate, and that their industries will be operating more and more below capacity. That, in fact, is what is meant by the deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system in connection with the disintegration of the world market.” (ibid. p. 35)

If these are facts, all that follow from these are also facts; they can not be objected to, nor would one have any reason to object to them, i.e., the two thesis mentioned are no longer valid. But we know that the critics have turned these facts around with their policies-the fast pace of industrialisation of the people's democracies and that of U.S.S.R. has been stopped, and they want to

carry on with their traitorous policies. Under the conditions they began to create, Stalin's views lose their ground, are groundless, are not correct any more. It is not that Stalin's views are wrong. It is that, these revisionists have changed and wish to carry on changing the conditions upon which these views were based. The opposition of the critics have validity only on the basis of the removal of the threat from the U.S.S.R. and Peoples Democracies to the markets of the capitalist countries—the fast pace of industrialisation of these countries. This criticism is in fact a declaration to the capitalist countries of the removal of this threat and the preparation of the theoretical basis for the inevitable lengthening of the life of capitalism. An inevitable and integral part of this aim is the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. in collaboration with the capitalist world.

Reader will take note that not one of the so called supporters of Stalin has objected to these criticisms. And that this was not part of the infamous secret speech of Khrushchov, but an open attack on Stalin's theory- which followed the open attack on his practise as we have shown above. Reader will take note that to this sort of defenders of Stalin, what matter is the name calling of Stalin, not the theory and practise of Stalin which was most clearly attacked in the open during-and before—the 20th Congress, with Stalin's name and writings being clearly mentioned.

What more one needs to see that Stalin's "Economic Problems.." and therefore his plan of building communism is under attack? Does not Mikoyan openly attack these views? Does not Khrushchov and Shepilov indirectly attack these views? Yes. They do. What more does a "Stalinist" need to realise that our theory and practise is

under attack? Nothing. Only an opportunist compromiser, only a traitor can keep quite under these conditions and join them!

2. PEACEFUL ROAD OF TRANSITION TO COMMUNISM

One other proposition of the supporters of Mao and Enver, who used to travel the same path with him till the end of 1970s, is that Khrushchev is the proponent of the peaceful road of transition to socialism which he formulated at the 20th Congress, while these gentlemen were such revolutionaries.

Lies. Nothing but lies. They are one and the same in negation of the theory of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Let us read.

Speech by D.T.Shepilov, Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. February 16, 1956

“The masses of the people and the Communist and Workers’ Parties have produced much that is new and unique in the course of the profound social changes that have taken place in each of the European people’s democracies. Still more is the course of the socialist revolution in China unique. After the revolutionary establishment of the people’s power, the Chinese Communist Party, creatively applying Marxism-Leninism, concluded that in the conditions of China, “not only individual private property can be replaced by socialist, collective property, but also capitalist property by socialist property by means of peaceful methods, that is methods of persuasion and education,” as comrade Mao Tse-tung has pointed out.

Having isolated and made harmless that vicious enemy of the people, the comprador bourgeoisie, the Chinese State is transforming, step by step, private ownership in its various forms into socialist ownership.

From the point of view of pedants whose Marxism is all book-learning, such an approach to the question of transforming the property of the exploiters into socialist property is nothing less than a travesty of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, yet actually this is creative Marxism-Leninism in action, the masterly, bold and wise application of Marxist dialectics to the concrete conditions of China by her heroic Communist Party.

There is no doubt that in the future the creative efforts of the millions will produce a still greater variety of forms of transition from capitalism to socialism.

In this connection the precepts set forth in Comrade Khrushchov's report in the section "Some Fundamental Questions of Present-Day International Development", among them the precepts on the forms of transition to socialism in different countries, are of tremendous theoretical and practical significance."

*Soviet News. London. Booklet No. 10.
P.12-13.*

Buharin declared that kulaks would grow into socialism, under the new Soviet conditions—the conditions of the dictatorship of proletariat, replacing the theory of class struggle. The new Buharin, i.e., Mao Tze-Tung proposes the same theory under the new Chinese conditions—with education and persuasion. And of course, the Soviet Revisionists do not waste time in making common cause with such comrades of theirs. Khrushchov's theories on peaceful transition makes full use of Mao's

Bukharinist theory. They are themselves nothing but a new version of Bukharin's theories on the growth of kulaks into socialism.

3. TRUE BELIEVERS

Church told us that God made men-and all life on earth-about 5-10 thousands years ago. Than came the fossils of Dinosaurs. Well, the prophets of the God did not know of them, therefore did not even mention them. So what? God did not say it. It is the medieval church's fault. God made them all. Than there came the theory of evolution. God did not make things as we see them, they have evolved from the simple forms of life. Rubbish. God made them all, and even if they evolved, who made the life that evolved? And how there you say we come from the monkeys?. Engels said that chemistry would solve the problem of the beginning of life etc. Chemistry did solve it. Life has began as amino acids. So what? Who made the amino acids? It is a chemical reaction. So what, who made the atoms and molecules that react chemically to form the amino acids? Universe as we know it began with the big bang and all the atoms etc. began to form after that. So what, who made the big bang? Especially with our professors who for a cool million quid will tell you that there was no time and space before the big bang, that time and space began with the big bang, we can show that it is the God Almighty who was, is and will be who made the big bang. In other words, the very development of natural sciences has been pushing the God out of creation and has pushed him now right back to and beyond the big bang.

No worries. God still exists in the timeless and spaceless something before the big bang.

What a relief.

Time and space was is and will be. Their unity is motion. The most simple differentiation of motion is that of attraction and repulsion. If matter is to be comprehended as distinct from motion, then it is the unity of differentiated motion. Unity of attraction and repulsion is matter. There is nothing in the universe but time and space, infinite and infinitely changing giving rise to all other forms of matter, including life, that we know and we will find out in future as our knowledge of matter develop. Big bang and the developments since the big bang is nothing but a passing moment in the movement of the infinite time and space. Time and space has no beginning and no end. They were, are and will be.

Any clever idealist who wants to preserve God first of all deviates attention from the study of human history. For the real solution to God's coming into being is to be sought in the human history, in the history of the development of knowledge, not in the history of nature. There we can determine more or less exactly when the idea of one God was created by men. Secondly, the clever idealist knows that the question that has to be answered is that of infinity. For even a fool is bound to ask that if the God exists before time and space, how is that possible, what kind of existence is this without time and space and who the hell made him? The answer has to refer to infinity. God was, is and will beWhere?

Infinitely. But still, where and when? Infinitely say the man, did you not here? God is the infinite spirit. That spirit was, is and will be. He made everything from nothing. Now that we know of the big bang, he, this infinite spirit made the big bang.

Here is the choice which has always faced us. Either matter is infinite: Was, is and will be. Or this spirit which,

as our knowledge of matter develops, ends up being pushed back and back in time and space. We all have to choose between the two. There really is no other choice. Give us a few million quid, and we will choose the spirit even though we are "a man of science". And why should someone give us a few million quid to choose the infinity of the spirit instead of the proven infinity of matter? If everything changes, so must the social conditions we live in, the private property is nothing immutable. It will come to pass. Those who have the millions can not have that, and the idea of the infinite spirit in all its cultural mutations-Islamic, Christian etc., help these very finite gentlemen preserve their very finite private property which by the very logic of finite things is doomed. Everything is finite and thus has a limit. Everything that is born, must die. Even God will end up dying, for men has made him after his own image as is proved by the human history.

When the men needs him no more to explain things, he will die. He is dying in front of our eyes right now. There is no place for him before the big bang. Time and space did not start with the big bang. They have changed and gave rise to the conditions which resulted in the big bang. When the expanding universe starts to collapse, it will create similar conditions which will give rise to another big bang. Circular motion is a most general law of motion which is dialectical. Circular motion give us the form of infinity of motion and thus of space and time. Only the idiots with a million quid in their pocket and claim to be a men of science knows not this law of motion.

What is the connection between the true believers of the God and the so-called Marxist, whom we are told do not believe in God(don't you believe it. Their theory always leads to idealism which do not believe in god and

that is the last refuge of the God Almighty). The connection is that, I may sit down and prove the fact that Khrushchov, Mao and Enver were all Trotskyite, Bukharinist traitors, following the every step they took. The true believer will always find an escape route to defend them.

Some of them, after being pushed quite a lot, came up with the theory of the big Marxists who commit big mistakes. When you ask them why is it that Mao or Enver are big Marxists who made big mistakes but not Khrushchov, they refer to the defence of the latter of Stalin. Then you show them that Khrushchov, and particularly Brezhnev “defended” Stalin just like these people, while distorting Stalin’s teachings on building communism, they come up with the theory of the latter ones being revolutionary. As if we are discussing “being revolutionary”. We are discussing Marxism here “comrade”. When you show them that what makes them “revolutionary” is nothing special, nothing more than a rhetoric of revolutionary violence etc., and that such verbal garbage is common to all sorts of “revolutionaries”, that these are no grounds that separate Marxists from anti-Marxists, they come up with the theory of the “bridge”! Mao and Enver, by fighting the Khrushchovites, on revolutionary grounds, formed a bridge from the Khrushchovite revisionism to Leninism. This theory of bridge is borrowed from the Luxemburgists. They used to claim that Luxemburgism at least formed a bridge between the Social Democracy and Leninism. They were answered: bridge? What bridge you are talking about.

If one leg of this bridge is in Social Democracy and the other is Leninism, to built such a bridge, you must first have Leninism. And once you have Leninism who on earth need such a bridge that unites the Leninists with

the Social Democrats. Luxemburgists first fight Lenin, fight the formation of Leninism, and now wants to be a bridge that unites Leninism to Social Democracy. No thank you. First rule of Leninism is to break such bridges. Who ever does not fight such bridges, ends up in Social Democracy.

Well, our true believers will never give up their bridge made up of rotten woods of Mao and Enver. They are the true believers indeed. This is the connection between God and our “revolutionary” opportunists—the true believers of a fight against Stalin, of a fight against our motherland. Whatever we do, however we expose their “God”, however we push their Gods beyond the big bang, they will find a way to defend them even beyond the big bang. Such is the logic of class struggle. These people can not give up the bridges that connect them to the bourgeoisie.

Or, as quoted by Marx when he was talking of Proudhon:

***“wo Begriffe fehlen
Da stellt zur rechten Zeit ein Wort sich ein”***

***(Where ideas fail (When an idea fails)
There at the right time a new idea turns up.)***

*Capital V.I. P. 74. English Edition.
Lawrence & Wishart, London. 1974.*