

Price 2s 6d

**THE
NATIONAL
PROBLEM**
in light of the
teachings of
LENIN
and
MAO TSE-TUNG

by
A. H. EVANS

A DAVID—GOLIATH PUBLICATION September 1967

THE NATIONAL PROBLEM

**In Light of the Teachings
of LENIN and
MAO TSE-TUNG**

By A. H. EVANS

INTRODUCTION

"Communists must always go into the whys and wherefores of anything, use their own heads and carefully think over whether or not it corresponds to reality and is really well founded; on no account should we follow blindly and encourage slavishness." From the thought of Mao Tse-tung.

"Party struggles lend a party strength and vitality; the greatest proof of a party's weakness is in diffuseness and a blurring of clear demarcations; a party becomes stronger by purging itself. . . ." From a letter to Karl Marx by Lasselle, approvingly quoted by Lenin before his preface to **WHAT IS TO BE DONE**.

It is in the light of these quotes that this pamphlet has been written. With little doubt it will incur the hatred of dogmatists, revisionists, Trotskyists, and the usual assortment of fools who are attracted to any sort of political movement—and should not be casually dismissed, because of extreme egotism they can attract a certain following and cause mischief.

This pamphlet may also arouse the misgivings of comrades who follow the teachings of Mao Tse-tung; they may think I have badly chosen and timed my basic subject matter, that my criticism of Stalin on the national problem may play into the hands of our enemies. Such comrades should examine themselves much more closely. It is by no means good enough to approvingly quote from the thought of Mao Tse-tung; when you do this you elevate theory into an all-in-all, you degrade practice upon which theory is so largely dependent. A separation of these two opposites is impossible and is a complete negation of Marxism.

To elevate Mao's thought and ignore his practice can only lead to sterile sermonizing, to a modern form of pulpit oration, to dogmatism. As I was brought up in the atmosphere of a Welsh chapel with its masters of oration, its thunderous preachers of the thought of God and of Jesus and their close followers, I assure the reader that I have as sharp an eye for sermonizing as **MONKEY** had for monsters and evil devils of all kinds.

Sermonizing leads inevitably to a withdrawal from the world of reality, it leads to cowardly retreat in the face of the enemy. Certain comrades, for example, are so frightened of police penetration within their ranks that they panic into total anonymity in the name of "protecting our

membership"—and this in places where bourgeois legality is still the order of the day.

How possibly can a leadership known to the masses be developed by such a method of facelessness? No attempt to identify anyone but a "leader" and one or two of his associates. How do people find out who is emerging as a good Marxist, who is not quite as good, who is not good at all? How can real criticism be brought to bear when nameless articles fill the periodicals? Is it not obvious that the police are bound to accumulate lists of revolutionaries? How can a worker be active on a job, gain respect of his mates, establish leadership, by keeping in the background and trying to coax other workers to do the required job? Would that not be a betrayal of workmates?

Or intellectuals, can they develop into staunch Marxists inside a quiet study? The working class badly needs and must attract to its cause intellectuals; we cannot win power and maintain it without them. Mao Tse-tung has pointed out that books are very useful but that he transformed himself from a bourgeois intellectual into a Marxist intellectual, "mainly through practice". Is this not so?

Then we also possess the type of comrades who are very positive they are sound Marxists, even very good followers of the thought of Mao, yet such comrades are more than content to remain outside their native countries for many years on end, ten, twenty, and even more. Of course, there is the very occasional circumstance, but I am of the firm opinion that a five-year stay in Peking or a foreign country is long enough for anyone who accepts Marxism.

Such comrades should realize that they are dodging the column, their field of struggle should be directly against their own capitalist class. The Chinese people are strong, even very strong; they possess an ever-firmer leadership of hundreds of thousands, even millions, gathering the people under the banner of the thought of Mao Tse-tung. But in the homelands of capitalism the revolutionary forces are very weak or comparatively weak. I hope the comrades we have been talking about will think this over and gird their loins, as it were, for real struggle.

But by no means all the sermonizers of the thought of Mao Tse-tung are non-Chinese; there are also people born in China, mostly Hans, who seem to be more than content to "drift with the tides". Now, to make such an assertion without offering a fair measure of proof would be opening myself to the charge of "malicious mongerer", "he who fishes in

muddy waters"; hence I am forced to place my thought before as many people as I can reach, so that they can judge things for themselves. Of course, the number of people I can reach is very small, not more than two or possibly three hundred, but this is not my fault, it is the fault of history.

How can one expect a bourgeois working class such as the British to be interested in the thought of Mao Tse-tung? It is clearly impossible. So with intellectuals, with luck you might find one or two, but history is not decided by luck. However, things are not too black; after the British people have gone through a number of agonies, after they have had their living standard smashed to smithereens with no hope of recovery save through a revolutionary uprising they will accomplish that uprising. Of course, before that event many British workers will become interested in the thought of Mao Tse-tung, and they will be joined by a few intellectuals. As favourable objective conditions emerge a party of the thought of Mao will come into being, that is how things stand. Wish-fulfilment is for fools, not Marxists.

Our Chinese comrades, following the splendid examples set by Mao Tse-tung, are proving by word and deed the revisionism of such as Chou Yang and other double-faced scoundrels fully deserving the death penalty for their attempted betrayal of the peoples of China and the world revolutionary movement. The person in authority at top level, Liu Chao Chi, has likewise had his notorious work, *HOW TO BE A GOOD COMMUNIST*, subjected to line-by-line examination. Only people with uneasy consciences dislike this method of minute, all-round examination. It is a correct Maoist method. As I stated, there are still Chinese comrades who sermonize for all they are worth but, at least in English translation, do little else. Sometime ago I accused Mao Tun of being a ravenous wolf in sheep's clothing, a creature more vile than a Khrushchov, for this blatherer was not an intellectual. An intellectual betrays knowingly, he is fully aware of his action, as the Khrushchovs never are.

Mao Tun was sacked from his job, the sacking gave me a lot of satisfaction. However, after time had passed, a matter of nine months or so, I became dissatisfied for this reason: not a word had appeared in English giving reasons for the sacking of this vermin. I was keenly looking forward to a line-by-line examination of the work of Mao Tun a la Chou Yang, yet nothing of the sort has occurred up to the moment of writing. I asked myself the question, who is protecting Mao Tun? I asked myself another question: why is Kuo Mo-

jo sermonizing for all he is worth instead of subjecting his close friend, Mao Tun, to a Maoist line-by-line examination? There is self-criticism and self-criticism. Let me exemplify. At one time I thought highly, far too highly, of the work of Shakespeare, Goethe, Heine, and many other artists and writers of the capitalist, feudal and slave eras. Not until I had read a number of times Mao's talks at the Yen-an Forum did I come to understand that my glorification of the past was a bad thing.

I had blindly, like a fool, accepted bourgeois evaluation; I had not learned to think sufficiently for myself; I thought superficially, groping on the surface of things. However, I did my best to follow the advice of Mao, I re-examined a good deal of my work and published, when possible, my findings. This is the way things should be done, careful self-examination subjected to the opinion of others, to open polemic.

Kuo Mo-jo is a highly talented man, a creative writer, a translator, an administrator. Talented people of this order are not found under every rosebush. Why isn't he using his talent, his specialized knowledge of the arts, particularly literature, to expound the thought of Mao Tse-tung? Kuo Mo-jo had openly stated that he, like this writer, was taken in by bourgeois thought. That public admission is good, but not good enough. Let us have the weakness of the thought of Shakespeare, of the thought of Goethe *et al*, explained to us. Whos is more capable than Kuo Mo-jo of doing this job? Then why isn't he doing it?

Our practice must not be confined to breast-beating and quotes from our great teachers. We must prove our ability to translate the thought of Mao Tse-tung into a living breath of life, then indeed life will begin to hum, as it is humming, louder and louder, in People's China. In a very small and insignificant way I have attempted to make one or two things hum in this pamphlet, which I hope the reader will subject to close and careful analysis.

THE WORLD ROLLS ON,
TIME PRESSES,
TEN THOUSAND YEARS ARE TOO LONG,
SEIZE THE DAY, SEIZE THE HOUR!

Mao Tse-tung.

CROWD YOUR YEARS WITH MOVEMENT,
NO SUBJECT CLOSED—TOO PURE!
TO LEARN, ENCYCLOPAEDIC,
ALL SUBJECTS—THEY ARE YOURS!

A. H. Evans.

ONCE AGAIN — ON NATIONALISM

History is a discourteous mistress, she kowtows to no one, she inexorably drives home the lesson that objective, concretized truth will finally emerge purged of every vestige of subjectivism. This final truth is time-conditioned, it cannot be "searched for", it is not a "buried treasure" awaiting some fortunate digger. Concretized knowledge is the historical accumulation of partially acquired truths which have been subjected to historical practice and withstood all tests. Concretized truth is a completely successful marriage of practice-theory, theory-practice.

The duty of Marxists is to constantly subject the history of the working-class to scrutiny, to ever fresh examination, and, on the basis of living practice which embodies past theory, to advance Marxism as a living science. Unless we examine all phenomena from this point of view there is always danger of Marxism being turned into a dogma, its upholders into talmudists, with our past leaders being treated as holy mummies, venerated as god-men. In short, there is always a danger of Marxism being transformed from a scientific tool into another religion.

A danger arises here, that in our quest for absolute knowledge we are turned into sceptics and overburden our minds with the thought that even a Marx, a Lenin, a Mao Tse-tung, are human-bound to "allow" subjectivism to creep into the picture; hence hesitation emerges, which can rapidly develop into political wavering.

The sceptical mind becomes an easy prey to pragmatism of one kind or another, with an active dislike and distrust for theory and a belief that everything must be immediately subjected to practice. This sort of thinking is bourgeois through and through. The bourgeoisie of our day are frightened of the power inherent in the human mind to rationalise and place things in a correct order of historical development.

The bourgeoisie will never give up their attempts to "blow up" a facet of knowledge and make it a whole, proclaiming they have finally discovered the ultimate philosophy. Marxists must firmly grasp the fact that relative knowledge contains a "little bit" of the absolute, that the absolute is only fully understood and grasped through firm knowledge of intimate detail, the thousand and one connecting

links which give a phenomenon particularity, its own clear distinctness.

Because all comrades, no matter on how high a level of intelligence, are bound by the very nature of their being to make mistakes of one kind or another our enemies inside and outside the working-class movement leap for joy—"Marxism has been disproved!" What hysterical and cowardly fools they really are. However, a danger arises, the danger of trying to "cover up" mistakes by comrades whose loyalty to the movement of the working-class is beyond question.

Such comrades fear that to admit mistakes and errors is to hand over weapons to our enemies. This is a form of opportunism which has in the past done great harm to our movement. Its base is the underestimation of the fortitude and strength of purpose of the working class and its closest allies and from this grows a belief that our enemies are far stronger than they actually are. For example, Lenin's justified criticism of certain weaknesses in the psychological make-up of Stalin was not brought forcibly enough to the attention of Soviet people and this played into the hands of the Trotskyists and others. Again, Stalin's 1913 thesis on the National Question came to be regarded as the last word on the problem, yet the fact is that Lenin was sharply critical of Stalin's views on the National problem.

Authority and Mao Tse-tung

Mao Tse-tung has repeatedly emphasised the unquestioned right and class duty of people to question authority to the political pinnacle; his views differ fundamentally from those put forward by Liu Shao Chi, who states in his book, *How to Be a Good Communist*, "You must obey even if the great majority and superiors on the central committee are actually wrong". The Chinese have correctly dubbed this "slavishness", and have pointed out that Lenin, like Mao, was termed an "arrogant splitter" because of his point-blank refusal to depart from Marxist principle.

Mao Tse-tung has pointed to the Paris Commune as a good example of a people's democracy in action. Mao emphasizes the need to "put politics first", to act and think in a political manner even when considering and carrying out "ordinary daily tasks". It is with this thought in mind, the absolute necessity to think and act politically, that we turn to a fresh examination of the National question.

But first, the Trotskyists always blame all the defeats—and are silent on victories—suffered by the revolutionary movement during the hegemony of Stalin on Stalin's *direct* influence on the international movement. The Trotskyists preach that the German, French, British and other communist parties followed "the line laid down by Stalin". We could counter this, of course, by asking them: "And where was the counter-influence of the great Trotsky?" After all, Trotsky had been fighting for a Trotskyist line since 1903. Who but fools can deny this? So Trotsky was first soundly defeated by Lenin, then by Stalin—and that is exactly how matters stood.

But the real answer, that it is completely impossible for anyone to lay down "a line for the world revolutionary movement" lies in the fact that nations are historically developed and do not emerge simultaneously. Nations came into being during the feudal era and certain nations broke with feudalism and established capitalism centuries before others—for example, Holland and Britain took the capitalist road over three centuries before Japan and China.

Still further, all nations taking the capitalist road do so under the main influence of internal development. Thus, in England the capitalist state played a role largely of regulator in so far as the internal economy was concerned, but in Germany the capitalist state emerged as an energizer of rapid capitalist accumulation and concentration through its use of internal state monopoly—its railroads were built in such a fashion.

The result of such historical differences and divergences—which need to be multiplied times over—led to the class struggle assuming a strongly tinged national flavour, even when we examine such an elementary organization as the trade union movement. In some countries this movement was, in very large measure, subservient to revolutionary politics—as in Russia—in others it developed into a movement extremely hostile to "political interference"—as in Britain. In Britain the working class became a bourgeois working class, lost its revolutionary desire for rapid change due to British capitalism being in a world position very favourable to itself, enabling it to set aside certain of its profits to tone-down the class struggle in its homeland through bribery of its own working class.

Also, even within the framework as outlined above there were more or less sharp divisions, reflecting the exact relationship of classes, sub-divisions and groups, each strug-

gling for a greater share in the national wealth. The leadership of the working class, as well as the leadership of all other classes and sub-classes, reflected, and could only reflect, this living historically conditioned relationship. A Pollitt was a product of British history, nor could he, granted the mind of a Lenin, a Mao Tse-tung, have changed the course of British history in any decisive way. Only changed objective conditions, flowing out of the inter-relationship of the entire world economy, which is again reflected in the superstructure, will bring about conditions in Britain where the future British working class leadership will be enabled to truly grasp the Marxism-Leninism of our day, the thought of Mao, and translate it into an invincible weapon for the complete destruction of British capitalism. Yet there are fools who deny the above logic, who think you are degrading the British worker by agreeing with Marx, Engels, Lenin's, Stalin's and Mao's repeated assertions that any working class reflects, and can only reflect, exact historical conditions. Such people should be bluntly told: "Your hysteria has no future!"

The Subjective Angle

From the subjective point of view, how possibly could a Stalin, familiar with Russian revolutionary-minded workers, have anything more than a theoretical understanding of a bourgeois working class? Practice rectifies what is lacking in theory, as Mao has pointed out. Stalin had never heard British workers tell a DAILY WORKER seller to "Go back to Moscow!" And what goes for Stalin goes for all other revolutionary leaders without exception, they cannot "lead" the working class of another country to socialism. Even Lenin, the Maoist of his day, gave rather stupid advice to the so-called Marxist groupings of Britain in 1920, telling them to sink their differences and form a party. Among the leadership of certain of these groupings were hysterical neurotics: the Pankhurst sisters, as an example.

It is one thing for a couple of dozen revolutionaries to meet in China and form a revolutionary Marxist party, another thing for a similar grouping to meet in Britain. The Chinese people were already rich in revolutionary experience, they had poured out their life-blood, hardship and sacrifice was their common lot. But could this be said for Britain of the period of imperialism?

Politically, the British working class followed outright bour-

geois parties, and do so to this very day. Is not the Labour Party a bourgeois party? That is what Mao states. Even the scattered individuals who embraced Marxism did so only in a formal sense, for Marxism to the British Communist Party means back-stage manoeuvre and endless compromise for tactical "gains". How could things be different considering British history? Are not its schools, universities and cultural organisations moulded by the capitalist class to suit its own ends? Subjective wish-fulfilment is a form of madness peculiar to a leadership thrown up by a bourgeois working class. Endless meetings and countless periodicals and schemes going round and round, with little attractive power for the masses of workers.

Why? Because the masses of workers are pragmatists and follow pragmatism on the job and outside it. Under conditions of a high, or comparatively high standard of living, nothing else can be expected from the British working class. However, it should be clearly understood that while it is more than silly to rely on direct revolutionary guidance from abroad it is necessary to emphasize that there will be a growing need for a world revolutionary organization as more and more nations take the socialist road. In elevating practice we also elevate theory; like sweethearts they walk hand in hand: they are separate, yet to be fruitful are as one.

Sooner or later a world revolutionary Maoist authority must be given the power to force a high degree of wage and salary equalitarianism on all socialist nations. Further, questions surrounding the wastage of natural resources will come in for ever closer examination. For example, the wastage created by the privately-owned automobile is eating up enormous quantities of vital raw materials as well as perpetuating anti-social ideas on an ever-growing scale.

The family unit must become increasingly integrated in a much wider and fuller social life. It is the duty of the coming world revolutionary authority to remember that the family is a product of history and, as such, subject to laws of social development. Socialist theory, which will stand up to the most rigorous of time-tested examination, will be enforced upon future socialist states, which will eventually encompass the entire world.

Sound Advice

Mao Tse-tung has given us sound advice: not to be afraid to voice our opinions even if certain of such opinions are in opposition, or seeming opposition, to a majority opinion. Mao Tse-tung has pointed out that even a revolutionary people can degenerate and follow a reactionary leadership. Who but a Trotskyist or an opinionated fool can deny this? Did not the German working class turn out the tools of war for Hitler and furnish most of his soldiery? Has not the working class of the Soviet Union digested the semi-literate Khrushchov without an audible murmur? Is not the Soviet working class hungering for millions of privately-owned cars in which to gallivant in endless streams of monstrous wastage across the countryside? Unless the process is drastically put to an end, Soviet economy, like capitalist economy, will revolve around a parasitic product and the roads necessary for it to travel upon. Should China start manufacturing on a large scale automobiles for private use this would signify that socialism has suffered a rebut, that danger is at hand. Private automobiles must be state-owned and not many of them will be needed. Trucks, coaches, tractors, these are things a socialist state requires.

Readers will have to forgive this writer's departure from a strict presentation of his thesis dealing with the national problem, he pleads for indulgence on the ground that what has been touched on above, the question of the privately-owned automobile, is of very great importance, and little has been written on this problem from the view of its innate parasitism as an anti-social unit.

STALIN AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION

We will commence by this quotation from Stalin: "There is no nation which at one and the same time speaks several languages." This statement will not stand up to examination. In Ireland and Scotland a small minority of the population still speak Gaelic; in Wales a large minority, approximately one-fourth of the population, speak Cymreig as their mother tongue. Even the English are forced to acknowledge the indisputable fact that Ireland, Scotland and Wales are separate nations. This should be slightly amended: there are a small minority of English people whose chauvinism is so deeply embedded as to completely blind them to British

history: they have brought into "being" a monstrosity, "A British Nation"!

What must be remembered is this: a people which consummates itself becomes a nation and accumulates an historical storehouse of common identity; a deep sense of their special history permeates their being and this defies even language change. But this should be pointed out: as long as even a small minority cling to their mother-tongue, the language question for that particular nation has not been solved; either the ancient language finally vanishes into history or it is revitalized through subjective action and becomes once again the living tongue of that particular nation. The heart of man is a living thing, not all the appeals to "common sense", to "business reasons", to "but what good is it?", can smother a nostalgia, a feeling of great personal loss, for a vanished or vanishing tongue in which the mothers of that particular people lulled their children to sleep, in which the warriors of the race fought to preserve their identity in countless battles.

The process of obliterating a language, particularly a language with a long literary history, is not an easy task. But even where the language has been denied literacy by a conquering "great race" it grimly hangs on. Such is the history of Albania, a small country dominated for five hundred years by the Turks who did all in their power to weaken the will of the Albanian people to resist, forcibly preventing a native literature from coming into being. Yet today Albania is a highly literate nation; is it to be wondered at that the Albanian Communists deeply respect and honour the memory of those bourgeois revolutionaries of the last century and the first decades of this who devised an alphabet and, defying the Turks, set up schools? So, likewise, will a future Socialist Wales honour and respect such men as Gwynfor Evans who held aloft the honour of their country even in the face of Welsh Pharisees and down-right Judases who bootlicked the English bourgeoisie, who remained silent when English intellectuals spat at the Welsh language as "a guttural tongue, fit only to rhyme in!"

Albania will not always remain a people of two or three millions; there is room in Albania for ten times the present population. It is the duty of Albanians to populate their piece of the earth and, by enriching their culture, add to the splendour of the culture of all peoples. Socialist science will find no difficulty whatsoever in feeding, clothing, and housing fifty or a hundred times the present world population. It is the duty of socialists to rid their minds completely

of the ideas of scarcities implanted in them by a parasitic capitalist society whose profits are always threatened by what these thieves term "overpopulation". How much food has been destroyed to keep up prices, to force them higher! Not an old and senile population, but a young and vigorous one, that is the communist future for mankind! There is plenty of room in the sky, we will find a thousand habitable earths, and we will make many more habitable, suitable to man.

An Historical Mistake

Stalin states that nations came into being during the era of capitalism, but capitalism, as Marx proved, came into being during the last third of the 14th century and the first decade of the 15th, but Stalin says: "The British, French, Germans, Italians and others were formed into nations at the time of the victorious advance of capitalism and its triumph over feudal disunity". Who with but a cursory knowledge of history can deny that England, Scotland and Wales had achieved nationhood as far back as at least the 11th century? That France was a nation, and a highly centralised one, hundreds of years before 1789, the date of the triumph of its bourgeoisie? Or that China achieved nationhood with centralised state power long before any of the above-mentioned countries?

Are we to believe that England was not yet England during the reign of Henry VIII, when England, jointly with a Welsh nobility, established the so-called "Act of Union", in 1536? Stalin goes on: "Whereas in the West nations developed into states, in the East multi-national states were formed, states consisting of several nationalities". Yet when Comrade Stalin penned this thought Belgium consisted of a state with two major and fairly evenly divided nationalities, Flemings and Walloons, and a very small minority people, the Frisians. In Switzerland a multi-national state came into being in early feudal times, consisting of run-away serfs from Germany, France and Italy, each division settling in a particular area, keeping its language and, in very large measure, developing distinct cultures. Such multi-national states are doomed to disappear, the strains which pivot around the language barrier become unbearable and, eventually, there will be a re-uniting of the component parts to the numerically more numerous kindred peoples. Exactly what the form will take cannot be foreseen; probably autonomy

will play a very great role; already the Flemings have established fairly close ties with Holland, and the Swiss French look more and more to Paris as their true cultural centre.

Stalin continues: "The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation, repressed on every hand, is naturally stirred into movement against the oppressors." It would be easy if history moved as simply as this but, at least in a good many cases, the "oppressed bourgeoisie" sided with the "oppressor". We have seen this in the case of Wales, where a Welsh feudal Prince, later Henry VII, at the head of a mainly Welsh army, defeated his English opposite yet was accepted with little further trouble by the defeated English as "their King" and, instead of Welsh supremacy, Wales very rapidly lost political independence. Much later, when an "oppressed bourgeoisie" had come into existence we find the Scots bourgeoisie of the early 18th century selling out the national interests of their own people for narrow sectional ones, that is, their economic welfare via the slave trade and the opening up to their vessels of the West Indies meant far more to Scots businessmen than national interests.

Still later, by the middle of the 19th century, Wales was rapidly developing a powerful industrial base under the driving force of a Welsh-speaking native bourgeoisie—who were almost solely responsible for the development of the coal industry. According to Stalin, this bourgeoisie should have found itself in conflict with the English bourgeoisie and placed itself at the head of a nationalist movement. Nothing of the sort took place, the Welsh bourgeoisie, as well as the landlord class—with few exceptions—did all in their power to assist England in Anglicising Wales. Why? Because the industrialisation of Wales brought into being a native working class who successfully assimilated migrants from England, Ireland, Scotland, with minor groupings from other countries.

A rising population concentrated more and more in industry, a mounting class war of savage intensity, the interlocking of British industry, the usefulness of the English dominated British state to the Welsh industrialists, convinced them that their basic interests were identical with those of England. Not that they needed much convincing, for their predecessors, the Welsh landowners, had long since decided that their interests lay with England's; in the great majority of cases they had very largely lost their sense of nationality and had become totally Anglicised.

It must be clearly stated: the struggle for Welsh political

independence is of comparatively recent origin, for no serious attempts had been made by England to destroy the Welsh language and culture before the beginning of the industrial era. The English language had entered into the border-counties, but, with the exception of parts of Radnorshire, had gained only a very slight foothold. Welsh resistance to England centred around its middle class, with close ties to the working farmer and the village labourer. Non-conformist preachers sounded the alarm; credit must go where it belongs.

But the weakness of the non-conformist position was that it exclusively relied on God to protect the Welsh language and culture; by the very nature of their being, their innate pacifism, the non-conformist preachers, for all their honesty and love for Welsh culture, were helpless in the face of the concerted attack which the English upper class, aided and abetted by their Welsh counterparts, launched upon the Welsh people through the passing of the general educational Act of 1872, when English teachers were poured into Wales by the thousands and little children were beaten, physically beaten, and humiliated, for speaking Welsh, the only language they knew! What devils are great race chauvinists and their supporters.

Only in our day are some workers beginning to realise that true nationalism is not alien to internationalism. Internationalism cannot be anything but cunning and pretentious humbug as long as one nation, no matter how small, is subjugated to another. As Lenin pointed out, it is the duty of the greater, more populous countries, to "bend over backwards, to overcome countless wrongs of the past, in its dealings with smaller neighbours".

Many and Varied Problems

The questions surrounding the national problem are many and extremely varied, only dogmatists would write *finis* to anything as involved as the national question. For example, we have seen from the above that a national bourgeoisie can bow before a greater one, that such a wealth-loving class is quite prepared to sell out a thousand-year-old culture, that love of country means nothing, nothing whatsoever to it. But we must also recognise the fact that a bourgeoisie can, under specific circumstances, take full advantage of competition and acute rivalry among the great powers to emerge with clear cut political independence which it then uses to build up and strengthen its economic base. Marx pointed this out, using the U.S. as an example. Later examples are Japan, followed by such states as the Argentine and Brazil and the mass of states now coming into existence in Africa and Asia.

Thus we find that Comrade Stalin grossly over-simplified the national problem, that his formula, "There is no nation that at one and the same time speaks several languages", is simply not true. If he had stated that a nation cannot remain a nation indefinitely in face of internal language barriers he would have been right, for unless the individuals who make up a nation maintain means of direct language communication, maintain and cherish a mother tongue, then reserve and mounting hostility are bound to emerge sooner or later.

Engels correctly observed, "ruthlessness is the first condition of all criticism", and Mao Tse-tung has repeatedly pointed out that without criticism, without the *feeling* that you have not only the right but the *duty* to examine and criticise to the highest level, a people's democracy is such in name only. We must emphasise that Stalin inclined to the position of great race chauvinism. At first glance this seems incredible for Stalin was a native of a small country, Georgia. But, compared with the Russian revolutionary movement with its stress on internationalism, the Georgian movement was strongly nationalist. It was extremely difficult, in the face of brutal oppression by Russia, for the Georgians to be anything else. This Lenin understood from the viewpoint of practice as well as theory, unfortunately Stalin, even in theory, let alone practice, brought into being a defence of autonomization.

Lenin sharply denounced Stalin's view, calling it, "The notorious theory of autonomization. . . . I think that Stalin's

haste and enthusiasm for pure administration, and also his spite against the notorious 'Social-Nationalism' (of the Georgians) played a fatal role here. . . . I have already written in my works on the national question that an abstract presentation of nationalism is no use at all. A distinction must be made between the nationalism of an oppressing nation, the nationalism of a large nation, and that of a small nation."

He continues: "In respect to the second kind of nationalism we, nationals of a large nation, have always been guilty of an infinite number of violences and insults without noticing them . . . how the Poles are called by no other name than Polyachiskin, the Ukrainians only as Khokhols, the Georgian and other nationals as Kapasians. That is why internationalism on the part of the oppressing, or 'great' nations (though they are only great in their violence) must consist not only in observing formal equality of nations, but in an inequality that would make up, as far as the oppressing nation—the great nation—is concerned, for the inequalities which obtain in actual life. Whoever does not understand this has not grasped the real proletarian attitude to the national question. . . . A detailed code is required, and that can only be drawn up successfully by the nationals living in the republic in question."

The reader may think I am belabouring Stalin—a great revolutionary—hence it is necessary to present Lenin's view in some detail. He continues: "The Georgian who is neglectful of this side of the matter, who carelessly flings charges about of 'social-nationalism' (whereas he himself is a genuine and true social nationalist and even a Great Russian Derzhimorda), violates, in substance, the interests of the proletarian class solidarity, for nothing so much holds up the development and strengthening of proletarian class solidarity as national injustice."

All the above quotes from Lenin are taken from his notes of 31.12.1922. A party commission had been sent to Georgia and Lenin reacted to the "work" of this commission, denouncing it in the strongest terminology and stating: "The political responsibility for all this Great-Russian nationalistic campaign must, of course, be laid on Stalin and Dzerzhinsky."

Lessons must be driven home: is it not a fact that the English sneer at "Scots tightness", "Scots 'pride'", "Welsh shiftiness", 'the Welsh 'useless language' "? The English people, including its working class, has been com-

pletely indifferent to the attempted butchery of the Welsh language, in fact, they have condoned the acts of barbarism of the English state against the Welsh people and a language that was civilized long before English came into being. And is it not a fact that under the influence of England Welsh so-called Marxists such as Idris Cox have adopted Stalin's theory of autonomization instead of Lenin's insistence on unquestioned right to secede and break away from any union with another state or any other states whatsoever?

Unless there is absolute clarity on the national question the result will be bad for the working class, for great race chauvinism and narrow nationalism are forces which still must be contended with, even within the socialist world orbit. Just as Mao Tse-tung respects the memory of the Chinese national leader, Sun Yat Sen, so do Welsh Marxists respect such individuals as Gwynfor Evans who clung to their "Welshness" in the face of many difficulties, the chief of which came from within Wales itself. What utter wretches are the scoffers, the philistines.

The Jewish Question

The Jewish question has agitated Marxism since the appearance of Zionism and its "socialist" instrument, the Bund, active wherever there was a sizeable Jewish community. Karl Marx stated that the Jewish question was essentially a Judean one, meaning that its quintessence lies within the framework of historical Judaism. What is this essential feature which has shaped the Jews as a people apart from the gentiles? It is the way the Jews have made a living down the European centuries, and the reflection and intertwining of this way of making a living through religion and its philosophical offshoots.

An agricultural people reflect the specific type of agriculture they engage in; herdsmen are "natural horsemen", while tillers of the soil by oxen know nothing of horses, nothing whatever. This particular merges into the general, not the general into the particular.

The Jews engaged in trade, but increasingly in trade of a particular type, that of usury, which was prohibited by the law of the Catholic Church of early mediaeval times so that Christians could not engage in it. The early European feudal period was one which was dominated by a landed aristocracy, chief of which was the Church itself. A class develops a psychology suitable to its basic needs and the ruling class does all in its power to impress this psychology into the heads of those it rules. We call it brain-washing, and our modern universities are adepts at this game, taking a brainy working class offspring and turning him into a strident defender of capitalism. In fact, it is often the case where intellectuals "born in the purple" break from the tenets of class background more easily, for it is impossible to patronise a scion of the ruling class. Of course, such intellectuals are a very small minority, but a firm alliance with such people must always be sought, for the simple reason that they are intellectuals.

Owing to the ban on usury the Jewish ruling class found itself in a position of sole monopoly; it increasingly suited their pocketbooks to keep the Jewish people as separate from the gentiles as possible; the rich Jews brought into being and perpetuated the ghetto. In this they were aided by Rabbinical furies, who reflected the Pharisees' love for the market place. Accepting usury, the Jewish people were hated from the top of the gentile social scale to the bottom. The thieves and cut-throats at the top hated paying interest

—even the principle! The Church denounced the Jews as anti-Christ, and this was followed by the Luthers when they marched on to the scene. In their turn the Jews lambasted the Christians; the Jews, and they alone, were the chosen of God.

The majority of the Jewish people were slaves to Jewish masters; few indeed left their ghettos and became assimilated. Not until the rising European bourgeoisie successfully challenged the laws against usury, not until the feudal system tottered—and it did so over a fairly long historical period, at different rates of tempo in different countries—do we find an attempt on part of the Jewish possessing class to free itself from the narrowness of the ghetto, which had now become a fetter instead of a help in amassing wealth.

A fiction has been historically created that when attacked the Jews perished, one with the other, rich with the poor. This is a lie, the rich Jews down the ages converted their wealth into swiftly movable property. As a people apart they had class connections in all European countries; wealth was easily transferred. It was the poor Jews who suffered physical extermination, not the great majority of the wealthy parasites. The Rothschilds of each age have always managed to take good care of themselves.

Let us prove this by recent history. The British Council of Christians and Jews, a bourgeois organisation, publishes these figures about Jews fleeing before the Hitler terror: "it is estimated that, by September 1939 . . . about 73,000 Jewish refugees from Germany and Austria had arrived in England, and about 17,000 from other countries." No figures are given for the U.S., but it is highly probable that the number escaping to that country was greater than that to England. The report continues: "The immigration of German and Austrian Jews was more particularly a middle class one than the main Jewish immigration of 1880 to 1905." This earlier migration was aided by rich Jews in order to get docile slave-labour into the factories, such as in the garment district of New York City where Jewish capitalist exploitation of Jewish labour became a by-word, even in capitalist U.S.A.

The wealthy Jews in Germany and Austria took early measures to save themselves—had they not a wealth of historical experiences? Nevertheless, in Poland, it is quite possible that certain wealthy Jews were caught in Hitler's net, thinking themselves safe. It was the poor Jews, the Jews who

were forbidden to assimilate by their Jewish masters, who suffered as they had suffered so dreadfully down the ages. The Rothschilds have a lot to pay for.

Lenin, in his essay, *THE POSITION OF THE BUND IN OUR PARTY*, exposed the swindle of Jewish separatism, saying: "But the Bund's third argument, which invokes the idea of a Jewish nation, is undoubtedly of the nature of a principle. Unfortunately, however, this Zionist idea is absolutely false and essentially reactionary." A pamphlet embodying Lenin's views on the Jewish question was on sale in the U.S. in the thirties, but then it disappeared under the influence of camouflaged Bundists inside the Communist Party of the U.S.

Today, Zionism is fully exposed as a monster as vicious and cruel as Hitlerism. It is using methods of terror against an Arab population who have inhabited Palestine for over a thousand years. Can any idea be more reactionary than the claim of wealthy Jews and their Rabbis that "God" gave them Palestine? At one time most of England was inhabited by the ancestors of the Welsh people. What would be said if the Welsh claimed to be a "chosen people", the English interlopers on "Our God's land"? They would rightly be regarded as being insane by neighbouring peoples.

Jewish Racism

It must be emphasised and re-emphasised: the spiritual, rabbinical leadership of the Jewish people preached racism from very early times. The life of the Jewish people was centred around the ghetto, which was centred around the Bible. Their teachers and intellectuals, apart from the Rabbis, were shaped by the deep feeling that the Jews were a people apart, the blessed of God, the cursed of men. Even as the Gentiles spat at them so they spat that hatred back. The ghetto became a living grave, dwarfing them, denying them the right of assimilation, yet it is through this natural process that peoples and nations have come into existence. Did not families unite into gens, gens into tribes, tribes into nations?

Even to this very day a brand of intellectual Jewry is still preaching the vile and evil racism that, "The Jew is chosen to outlast the world and its temporising solutions, to be borne up at the end of time as HIS alone, to stain and winnow the pride of the world." The only difference is that the above religious dogma has turned to "science" to "prove" the distinctness of Jews, that they are a people apart and thereby are giving the enemies of the Jewish people a new and terrible weapon to goad the Jewish people to further self-destruction.

This is what Leon Poliakov says in his work, *THE HISTORY OF ANTI-SEMITISM*, Elac Press, 1966: "The most striking illustration of this state of constant vigilance and accessibility is the Jew's remarkable psycho-physiological resistance to the effects of alcohol. . . . They do not "discover their nakedness", that is, lose their lucidity and self-control, and for the most part, in comparison with non-Jews, do not suffer the various classic consequences of alcoholism. "Heredity or environment?" Note the cunning question, the attempt to cover up the idea he is trying to put over, that the Jews possess a "particular gene", making them "different" from the gentiles. This is a racist argument, the "blacks" possess such a "gene", "yellow-skins" another, "whites" another. In short, we are all helpless victims of particularity which has gained force during the long ages of our descent from the original tree! And this shit in the name of science!

An entire section of this man's book is given over to a supposedly "scientific examination" called "Origin of the Jews in the light of Group Serology". Poliakov quotes extensively from Sigmund Freud, C. G. Jung and others, to

"prove" that the biological make-up of the Jews differs from all others. "A Jew is always a Jew!" "All Jews are born swindlers!" "Jews cannot help but make money!" In the name of science Poliakov is defending gentile racism as well as Jewish.

The Jewish people must break completely with the ghetto mentality, they must firmly oppose "leaders" who claim to speak for and represent the people as a whole. The Jewish poor should remember how little they have in common with the owners of Marks & Spencer, with the House of Rothschild, with rich Jewry in all lands. The Jewish poor should follow the splendid example once given them by the New York garment workers and furriers, who fought the Jewish cut-throats who owned the establishments and the Jewish and gentile gangsters those devils employed.

As for religious fanaticism, it should be recalled that not only ordinary Jewish people have suffered countless agonies, this has been the fate of all peoples who allowed religion to be turned into an oppressing tool. In our day, only yesterday, hundreds of thousands of the poor and downtrodden in Indonesia have literally been hacked and butchered to death, men, women and children, in the name of Allah—the wealthy of Indonesia using Allah as a tool even as the Rothschilds and rich Jewish merchants use Jehovah to bend the Jewish people to their evil will.

A Word on India

India is ripe for a people's revolution, at long last the ordinary people of India are beginning to face up to caste, to understand what is back of it, the blood-stained hands of reaction. India has a population of almost 500 millions which are split among many nationalities. The approach of Marxists in India to the national problem is of extreme importance. Up to this date there has been little evidence that our Indian comrades are successfully linking the struggle for national freedom with the all-over struggle for worker-peasant state power. In the past our Indian comrades have all too often backed away from great race chauvinism in the person of Hindi control of the central Delhi government. Our Indian comrades should always remember what happened in Indonesia, face up to caste, fight it, claw it to death in countless struggles.

The Bengali are represented by approximately 90 million, Tamils 38 million, Marathi 35 million, Teluga 42 million, Urdu 55 million, Hindustanis number approximately 166 million. The above figures are living proof that intelligent use of the national question will hurry forward the coming victory of the poor and downtrodden masses of India. Further, Calcutta and other large cities, such as Bombay, must never be forgotten in the correct all-round tactic of arousing the countryside.

China can teach many a lesson to our Indian comrades, but to copy-book the road of Mao Tse-tung to power is not enough. China has many nationalities, nationalities who had suffered oppression at the hands of the Hans. But the minor nationalities in China totalled 30 million or so, compared to over 250 million in India. Our Indian comrades must never forget this fact! Don't be afraid of nationalism, as we in the West were afraid of being dubbed anti-semites. Narrow nationalism is a thousand times easier to handle and, when necessary, to destroy, than great race chauvinism. And it should be remembered: within the above-mentioned nationalities there is overlapping, and numerous smaller minorities live within their boundaries. These smaller minorities must be assured that their rights will be fully protected. If our Spanish comrades in 1936 had given a solemn guarantee to the Catalans and Basques of complete independence the issue would not have been decided in favour of Franco.

NATIONALISM IN A SOCIALIST WORLD

Most people think that once the working class establishes state power the problems surrounding the national question will evaporate as swiftly as the mists of early morning, but this is not so. Great race chauvinism and narrow nationalism rise like evil winds out of the brutality of class struggle, including the struggle of a dominant class to subdue a dominating class of another people or nation. Mao Tse-tung has proved to any thinking person that the coming into being of a workers' state shifts the balance of class forces, the class struggle remaining and utilizing new forms of theory and tactics more suitable to the new situation.

It is necessary for Marxists to raise theory to ever new and higher levels through a broadening and deepening of the way we do things, through actual practice. We should have this thought driven into our heads: nothing, nothing whatsoever, disappears of its own accord; things come into being and change into other things because all things are full of many-sided contradictions and a fierce struggle is always going on between that which has become temporarily dominant, which appears very firm and fixed, and the old which has been shifted out of its former position. Mao Tse-tung's thoughts on contradiction and antagonism should be gone over with a toothcomb, they are very fine indeed.

As the reader will remember, Lenin was firm in his insistence that in order to dispel suspicion on the part of small peoples and nations it would be necessary for great nations to "bend over backward", to heavily favour the smaller people in its dealings with them. What has happened and is happening in the Soviet Union? It is this: Great Russians are migrating into territory formally in the possession of other nationalities. Great Russians are settling in these territories without becoming or intending to become assimilated. Great Russians—in the name of Lenin, the scoundrels!—preach assimilation to Russian Jews—and enforce it on them to the best of their ability—but they themselves press into the Ukraine, into the Uzbek and other lands with no sense of shame whatsoever. Are the Russian language and spiritual heritage things which must be taken with them wherever they go? It would seem so, for the Russians in Ukraine, even after three generations, refuse to accept the equality of the Ukrainians, refuse assimilation.

So in all other Soviet lands, Russians are pressing in, par-

ticularly where nature has favoured a land with a good climate, such as that in Uzbekistan. Is it to be wondered at that Ukrainian narrow nationalists look upon the Soviet Union with hatred, that in the minds of countless Ukrainians the thought is bound to arise: "Why don't the Russians send their children to our schools?" Two languages cannot live indefinitely inside a given territory, one conquers the other. No one but a fool would deny this. The Russians of today are great race chauvinists of the first magnitude. But the day will come when the peoples of Tashkent, when the peoples of the Ukraine, when the peoples of many other nationalities inside the Soviet Union will offer the great Russians a choice: "Assimilate with us or get out!" And the world's poor and downtrodden will side with them!

It is all very well for great Russians to point to Biro Bezhan and say, "We offered Jews a country." But what attempts did they really make to coax Jewish migration to that territory? None worth talking about. The Russians, more than the Jews, doomed Biro Bezhan. Who can deny that the majority of Jewish people are only too eager for assimilation? Britain and the U.S. are proof, if such proof were needed.

In actuality certain states inside the Soviet Union, such as Kasakstan, are ceding territory to great Russia, and this is right and proper under existing circumstances; it is a socialist way of doing things. Large parts of Kasakstan need developing and the natural population is far too small to accomplish this development. It is also a fact that the native population would find it impossible to furnish teachers in sufficient numbers to rear the children of the immigrants in the native tongue. But this is not true for its southern regions, they are far more thickly populated and could easily absorb waves of Russian migrants.

Nationalism and People's China

Let us glance at People's China. Inner Mongolia is a huge territory with clearly defined and historically recognised borders. But the Mongolian and other peoples inhabiting this area the size of Western Europe is small, very small, not exceeding 3 million. It is obvious that the task of fairly rapidly developing Inner Mongolia is beyond the numerical strength of the original inhabitants. Yet rapid development of all parts of People's China is a political imperative.

What should be the attitude of true socialists, the followers in our day of the thought of Mao Tse-tung? In order to develop Inner Mongolia people are needed, where can we find people in great numbers, people who are thrifty, willing to accept hardship, willing to die for the thought of Mao Tse-tung, for true socialism? The answer is obvious, it is the duty of the Hans to migrate to Inner Mongolia and other sparsely populated regions in very large numbers.

But, the reader will think, what of the Mongolian and other minority peoples? Are they to lose their identity, be swallowed up as a separate people, as a nation, become assimilated? No, this would be anti- the thought of Mao Tse-tung, anti-true socialism. The Mongolian and other minority comrades should do all in their power to persuade their people to settle within a fixed territory of their own choice, and that territory should be large enough to take care of a very large increase in their population. Any Hans wishing to migrate within this territory must assimilate, become in speech, manner and custom, Mongols and nationals of the other small minority peoples. At one blow the Hans will have removed suspicion of great race chauvinism, the Mongols' and the other minority peoples' suspicion of being upholders of narrow nationalism.

In regions thickly, or fairly thickly populated by non-Hans, it should be the duty of the Hans who migrate to such lands to assimilate; more than this, in certain regions the Hans should offer back to the original people part of the land which was stolen from them, they should "bend over backwards" to show in practice that great race chauvinism has been completely rooted out of their minds. Then, indeed, will narrow nationalism lose its *élan vital* and pave the way for a gradual historic transformation of national relations which will not offend but enhance the dignity of mankind.

A Final Word

There are also problems arising out of certain states claiming as "theirs" vast and enormous territories because, a few hundred years ago, this or that explorer planted "their flag" among primitive peoples incapable of defending their rights. Where colonisation proceeded on a big scale, as in the United States, no one but a fool would deny that the presence of 180 million people is proof that the territory they populate is theirs. But even here, under true socialism, adjustments would have to be made, heavy redresses to make up for the many wrongs inflicted upon the Red Indians.

But in another case, that of nearly all of Siberia, we find a reluctance of the Russians to migrate to that territory, even to those parts where the soil is not bad but good enough to support a population of some tens of millions. Siberia is a territory of vast potential. Socialists have every right to demand that Siberia be really opened up, after all, Russia has called this territory theirs since the 17th century, yet the population today is below five million. It would appear that the Russians prefer to migrate into the lands of the Uzbeks, Kassakhs, Tartars, Kirgisiens and Georgians, etc., lands with comparatively soft climates, rather than into the bracing lands of Siberia. If the Russians cannot do the job of populating Siberia, then the coming socialist world will have to consider a hardier and fitter people, that is very evident.

World socialism will demand a great deal of centralization and the question will undoubtedly arise: has a socialist state the right to conduct its own internal affairs brooking no outside interference? Viewed on a world scale we find, somewhat to our surprise, that the national question is still with us! A socialist state, no matter what its size and population, which closes its frontier to advice is adopting an attitude of narrow nationalism, and, as such, it will be the duty of the rest of the socialist world to bring it to its senses. The world must never again tolerate a half mad, cowardly buffoon of the Khrushchov type. Without a high degree of centralisation there can be no truly socialist world order.

A PLEA: To those readers who think this pamphlet and its predecessors are worthy of study I state quite clearly and without shame that the money for publication comes out of my weekly pay-packet, a take-home pay of approximately £16. I ask readers for financial support; without it this pamphlet will probably be my last.

A. H. EVANS.

Epilogue

Elsewhere I have touched upon the U.S. negro problem, recent events, an intensification of the struggles of the black people for equality with the whites, necessitates a short re-examination of this subject.

The exploitation of black people in the United States is only equalled by white treatment of the original inhabitants, the Red Indians. The white man's treatment of the Red Indians led to the extermination of entire tribes and, eventually, to the setting-up of reservations, hemmed in ghettos, the Indians being scorned by the majority of the whites as a sub-human species.

The basic reason for the exploitation of man by man has nothing whatsoever to do with the colour of skin, or any other physiological characteristic. White people have mercilessly exploited white people. An example was the holocaust of the majority of European Jewry, white people, by German and other white fascists.

Brown-skinned people have also mercilessly exploited, persecuted, and driven to death other brown-skinned people. Only yesterday brown-skinned Indonesians butchered scores of thousands of families, wiped them out, in an orgy of blood-letting.

Yellow-skinned people have likewise turned on other yellow-skinned people. For example, did not the Japanese do all in their power to turn China into a colony? Did they not murder, rape, torture, millions of Chinese? And were they not aided and abetted by Chinese degenerates, vermin with the souls of willing slaves? In the last century, in one uprising of the Chinese people against the upper classes it is estimated by bourgeois authorities that some 30 million perished.

The basic cause for all this killing, for all this rape, for the seemingly endless torture of so much of humanity, is greed for material benefit, for loot of one kind or another, for profit. Eliminate the profit motive and the pre-requisite to eliminate race and national hatreds is reached. To put it in sharper form: in our day capitalism is the cause, solely and completely, for racial and national hatreds.

But why do people, quite ordinary people, neighbours, turn like venomous snakes on others indistinguishable from themselves? Why are such people turned into butchers? The answer is this: religious intolerance and raging fanaticism

is implanted in their heads by the wealthy, whose passion for gain, for profit, is their all-in-all.

All those who put the well-being of ordinary people above all else should never forget for a single moment the role religion has played in the history of mankind. Examined philosophically, we find that religion had an ascending ark and various religions have played a progressive role—usually manifesting itself in a struggle against other, more backward and primitive types. But religion has also a descending ark which obstinately clings to the past; religion, of even the most humanitarian hue, becomes an impediment, for advancing science has completely undermined its *raison d'être*.

That being so, it is our duty to point out to Afro-Americans that the Black Muslim movement offers no real hope for them. In the name of ALLAH Indonesians were murdered in droves. In the name of ALLAH Arab slave drivers for centuries carried terror into the very heart of the black people's original home, Africa. Who can deny this?

To refuse to face up to religion as an instrument, a tool of the rich, to refuse to fight it, to cower away because religion still holds hundreds of millions in thrall, is to give up the struggle for world socialism. Yet there are comrades, particularly in India, who are frightened of the hold religion has on the masses. Such comrades back away from caste, as they back away from the national question—for fear of being accused of narrow nationalism. Victory does not go to cowards.

It is wrong for spokesmen of black people to negate the class struggle, to allow blind emotion to run away with their heads. Is it not a fact that in Africa black traitors to the majority of the African people are bent on continuing the capitalist system, the sole cause of a people's misery, of unemployment as well as its opposite, the sweat-shop?

Afro-Americans in the United States have every right to demand equality with the whites and, if the demand for complete assimilation is refused—as it has constantly been refused—to demand a separate territory in the United States upon which they can build a state of their own choosing.

There is a special duty placed upon all Marxists, of whatever colour: not to forget the class struggle. This means to fight intelligently for the unification of the majority of the people, as true followers of the thought of Mao Tse-tung. It is a struggle which must be conducted in stages, according to

the precise *ideological* development of each given area. Only fools and Trotskyists demand a steady chanting "class against class".

There are times when it is possible to forge an alliance with other classes. For example, when the Japanese poured soldiery into China even such a dyed-in-the-wool reactionary as Chiang Kai Shek was forced into an agreement with the Communist Party of China. As times change so does the nature of this or that alliance; some become completely disregarded, as with the temporary alliance between Chiang Kai Shek and the Communist Party, others become much deeper-rooted, more stable and firm, as with the alliance between the poor and middle peasants, between the better-paid and poorer workers, and between the worker masses and the peasant masses.

Politics comes out of a barrel of a gun, as Mao Tse-tung has splendidly phrased it. Black people in America are learning fast; faster, much faster, than the poor whites—for the exploitation of the blacks is by far the most vicious of all. Fire is a great cleanser and unifier. As the black struggle advances more and more poor whites will come to understand the justice of black demands, the demand for a job with decent pay, for decent housing, for the right to intermingle as men, one with the other.

On the complete and total ruin of U.S. imperialism a new United States will arise, a Socialist United States, where whites and blacks, together with their brothers, the Red Indians, will learn to fully respect one another and, in the course of time, become completely assimilated.

Pamphlets —

By A. H. EVANS

ON MAO TUN, Enemy of Mao Tse-tung	1s 6d
TRUTH WILL OUT: against modern revisionism	2s 6d
ONCE AGAIN TRUTH WILL OUT	2s 6d
ON KHRUSHCHOV, FERTILISER, THE FUTURE OF SOVIET AGRICULTURE	2s 0d
AGAINST DR. NEEDHAM: an exposure of his anti- Marxism	1s 0d
WHAT'S WRONG WITH PETER SELTMAN	1s 6d
GEORG LUKACS AND MARXISM	2s 0d
MODERN LITERARY REVISIONISM AND THE CHINESE CULTURAL REVOLUTION	2s 6d

Obtainable from Collet's, Charing Cross Road, and A. H. Evans, 27 Gerrard Road, London, N.1.

Recommended reading: The complete works of Mao Tse-tung; His pamphlet: **ON CONTRADICTION; ON PRACTICE.** Lenin's complete works; His pamphlet: **STATE AND REVOLUTION.**